DOMINION OF CANADA

OFFICIAL REPORT

OF

DEBATES

HOUSE OF COMMONS

SECOND SESSION—FOURTEENTH PARLIAMENT

13-14 GEORGE V, 1923

IN FIVE VOLUMES

Volume I: Pages 1-1025 **Volume II: Pages 1027-2045**

Volume III: Pages 2047-3044 **Volume IV: Pages 3045-4005**

Volume V: Pages 4007-4756

VOLUME CLVI

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE TWELFTH DAY OF MARCH TO THE NINETEENTH DAY OF APRIL, 1923, INCLUSIVE



OTTAWA
F. A. ACLAND
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1923

CANADA

House of Commons Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT

Monday, March 12, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

RETURNS—ORDERS IN COUNCIL

Mr. MEIGHEN: In connection with the returns brought down in answer to motions for papers, I would suggest to the government that instead of referring to an order in council by number, the subject matter be given, which I think has been the usual practice. Then hon. members will know in answer to whose motion the return is made.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. HOEY: I should like to ask the Prime Minister if it is the intention of the government to bring down and submit to the House at this session amendments to the Dominion Elections Act. I understand that certain amendments have been suggested by the Chief Electoral Officer, and there is also the matter of the single transferable vote endorsed by this House some weeks ago.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: In this matter the government will wait to see what further suggestions may be made to the House before reaching a decision. There is a committee on redistribution, which will have to report to the House. Up to the present time it has not been thought advisable to bring in any amendments, but during the course of the session if it should seem to be advisable the matter will be taken under consideration.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS — COAL SUPPLY

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I am informed that the Canadian National Railways are refusing to take the run of the mine coal from any small companies in Maccan and River Hebert districts and that this means that some eight hundred men are thrown out of work, and these districts are being ruined. Has the government any information with regard to the withdrawal of orders from these districts?

Mr. GRAHAM: The matter is under consideration at the present time. Time may be given in order to install certain screens that will help out the difficulty. That matter is now being considered by the Vice President.

PRIVATE BILLS

THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 5, respecting certain patents of Charles A Channell.—Mr. German.

Bill No. 19, respecting certain patents of Albert Manvers.—Mr. Jacobs.

Bill No. 25, respecting a certain patent of Arthur R. Wilfley.—Mr. Chevrier.

Bill No. 27.—respecting a patent of Hans M. Olsen and Esther Maud Butcher.—Sir Henry Drayton.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 14, to incorporate La Banque Rurale.—Mr. Parent.

Bill No. 18, respecting the Dominion Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. Ryckman.

LA SOCIETE DES ARTISANS CANADIENS FRANÇAIS

On motion of Mr. Hanson the House went into committee on Bill No. 26, to amend the act incorporating "La Société des Artisans Canadiens Français."—Mr. Seguin.—Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

On Section 4—General Convention.

Mr. CALDWELL: I cannot help thinking we are passing these sections without very much consideration. For example, I notice that in this section it is proposed to strike out the words "a majority of." I think this should be explained.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: An increase of protection is it not?

Mr. CALDWELL: We want to be sure of that.

Mr. HANSON: This bill was before the Banking and Commerce committee and all the sections were carefully considered. I can

assure the hon. member the change referred to is in the way of increasing the protection to the society.

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

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): Will the hon. member give us a summary showing what the general purpose of the bill is?

Mr. HANSON: The bill changes the method of government of the society, and re-enacts in a proper form the French sections which, I understand, have been improperly translated in the original bill. The powers of the society are also increased.

Section agreed to, bill reported, read the third time and passed.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

POSTMISTRESS—MORINVILLE

Mr. DENIS (St. Denis):

1. In what year was Mrs. Gibeau appointed postmistress at Morinville?
2. Did the Civil Service Commission institute an inquiry before making the above appointment?
3. If so, who had charge of said inquiry?
4. Did the Civil Service Commission not follow the recommendation of its inspector? If not, why?
5. What is the name of the person recommended by the inspector?
6. Who recommended Mrs. Gibeau?

Hon. Mr. COPP:

1. Mrs. Gibeau was never postmistress at Morinville. In July, 1918, following a vacancy in the postmastership at Morinville, the Civil Service Commission approved of the temporary appointment of Mr. Trancrede Gibeault, pending the return of a qualified returned soldier for the position. Mr. Gibeault was temporarily placed in charge of the post office, and from the official records it appears that Mrs. Gibeault was actually performing the duties. This arrangement was in effect until 6th August, 1919, the date on which a returned soldier, appointed by the Civil Service Commission, was placed in charge as postmaster.

2, 3, 4, 5, and 6. No information.

EXPERIMENTAL FARM, SAINTE ANNE DE LA POCATIERE

Mr. BOUCHARD:

1. On what date was Théogène St. Marie appointed herdsman at the experimental farm of Sainte Anne de la Pocatière, Quebec?
2. Who was intrusted by the Civil Service Commission with the examination of the above candidate?
3. What was the result of this examination?
4. What recommendations were furnished by the candidate?

[Mr. Hanson.]

Hon. Mr. COPP:

1. August 23, 1922.

2. The superintendent of the experimental farm at Ste. Anne de la Pocatière, Mr. J. H. St. Marie, where the vacancy occurred, was instructed to receive applications and forward them with all other papers and his report to the commission.

3. Mr. L. T. Ste. Marie was the only candidate and he was found to possess the necessary qualifications. He was accordingly assigned to the position. There was one other applicant from Western Ontario whose non-residence disqualified him.

4. As to experience and qualifications: Mr. Henri Gerin, Coaticook, Que., Mr. Leo Broderick, Mr. P. O. Lock. As to character: Mr. Oscar Lessard, secretary, Agricultural Council Quebec; Mr. Louis Philip Roy, agronomist; Mr. Emile Belanger, manager of the Central Co-operative Society of Agriculturists, Princeville.

DISPOSAL OF WASTE PAPER

Mr. DENIS (St. Denis):

1. How do the various departments dispose of the waste paper coming out of their offices: (a) in Montreal: (b) in Ottawa?
2. Is the waste paper sold under contract for a given period or otherwise, to any firm or individual in particular: (a) In Montreal; (b) in Ottawa?
3. Are the departments under contract at the present time? If so, with whom and when does the contract expire: (a) in Montreal; (b) in Ottawa?

Hon. Mr. COPP:

Post Office Department:

1. (a) In Montreal the postmaster is authorized to sell waste paper to the highest bidder. (b) In Ottawa, Post Office Department waste paper is disposed of under contract made by the King's Printer for the disposal of all waste paper from government offices.

2. (a) Answered by No. 1. (b) No information as to terms of contract in Post Office Department.

3. (a) No. (b) Yes.

Public Works Department:

1, 2, and 3. (a) In Montreal, the waste paper in the Customs buildings is baled and sold to the best advantage by officials of this department. The paper in the post offices is baled by this department but disposed of by the Post Office Department. (b) Understand that all waste paper is disposed of under contract, by the Department of Public Printing and Stationery.

Department of Public Printing and Stationery:

1. (a) No knowledge; (b) by contract.

2. (a) No knowledge; (b) the waste paper in Ottawa is sold by contract for a given period to an Ottawa firm.

3. (a) No knowledge; (b) Yes, with Sachs Bros., Ottawa. The contract expires January 31, 1924.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—FIDELITY INSURANCE

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton):

1. What is the name of the company that carries the fidelity schedule of the Canadian National Railways?
2. What is the total amount of the schedule?
3. What is the annual cost or premium?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. London Guarantee & Accident Company; Guarantee Company of North America; Lloyd's, London.
2. Approximately $10,000,000.
3. Approximately $16,000.

Mr. W. N. TILLEY, K.C.

Mr. BENOIT:

1. On what date was Mr. W. N. Tilley, K.C., employed by the Dominion govermnent in connection with the Grand Trunk arbitration?
2. On what date did his services in connection with the said arbitration cease?
3. How many hours per day did he devote to the service of the government at the time he was drawing fees amounting to one hundred dollars per day?
4. How many hours per day did he devote to the service of the government at the time he was drawing fees amounting to four hundred dollars per day?

Sir LOMER GOUIN:

1. On or about 1st December, 1919.
2. July, 1922.
3. Not specified.
4. Not specified.

GRAND TRUNK ARBITRATION

Mr. BENOIT:

1. What was the name of the minister of the government who engaged the various counsel in connection with the Grand Trunk arbitration, during the years 1919, 1920 and 1921?
2. Was the said minister, at the time he fulfilled such ministerial duties, receiving any pension whatever from the government of Canada?
3. If so, in what capacity, of what amount; and what amount, if any, is he at present receiving in this connection?

Sir LOMER GOUIN:

1. Right Honourable Charles J. Doherty, Minister of Justice.
2. Yes.
3. As a superannuated Judge of the Superior Court of Quebec, he receives an annual statutory pension of $4,666.66.

66½

PORT COLBORNE ELEVATOR

Mr. MANION:

1. Does the government own an elevator at Port Colborne?
2. If so, is it leased or do they operate it themselves?
3. How much grain did it handle during 1922?
4. What were the charges for handling grain during the season of open navigation?
5. What profits, if any, were made for the past year?
6. What is the total amount of government investment in site and plant?
7. In reporting profits, is any interest charged on invested capital, and is any reserve made for depreciation on plant?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Yes.
2. Operated by the government.
3. 53,349,811 bushels.
4. On grain forwarded by vessel: Shovelling and elevating into elevator, $4.35 per 1,000 bus.; Delivery to canal vessels loading, $1.15 per 1,000 bus.

On grain forwarded by rail: Shovelling, $4.35 per 1,000 bus., elevating, domestic grain, .01 cent per bushel; elevating, export grain, .00¾ cent per bushel; storage, when in excess of fifteen days allowed, .00¼ cent per bushel.

5. $210,395.29, less an amount to be determined for electric power.
6. Approximately $2,100,000, which includes cost of elevator reconstruction after explosion.
7. No.

MORRISBURG AND WADDINGTON FERRY

Mr. STEWART (Leeds):

1. Has a license been issued for the operation of a ferry between Morrisburg and Waddington, N.Y.?
2. Was such license issued pursuant to an order in council?
3. If so, what is the date of such order in council?
4. What is the date of such license?
5. What is the duration of such license?
6. What is the name of such license?
7. Was the council of the corporation of Morrisburg asked to approve the application for such license?
8. Did the council of Morrisburg approve of such application?
9. Was an investigation or report made by any official before the issue of such license; if so, what official made such report or investigation?
10. What recommendations were made in favour of the applicant for such license?
11. What regulations are applicable to:—
    (1) The size and description of vessel to be used.
    (2) The accommodation and convenience of passengers.
    (3) The tolls or rates at which persons and chattels shall be carried.

Hon. Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil):

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. July 6, 1922.
4. July 1, 1922.
5. Ten years.
6. Walter V. McGannon.
7. Yes.

8. No.

9. Yes. District Engineer R. deB. Corriveau.

10. A petition signed by Rev. L. B. Garvin and others.

11. (1) The license shall provide and place on the route a substantial seaworthy steamer, of not less than seventy-two feet keel and seventeen feet beam, propelled by steam, and running at a speed of not less than ten miles per hour, so constructed and equipped as to adequately and satisfactorily care for the transportation of passengers, horses and other live stock, automobiles and other vehicles and freight on said route. The vessel shall be kept in all respects fully equipped and shall be kept in a cleanly state throughout, and subject to the inspection and approval of the Dominion Board of Steamship Inspectors. The vessel shall have a respectable and efficient commander, and the Department of Public Works shall be at liberty to reject any steamer which may at any time be placed upon the said ferry or the commander thereof, should it consider them or any of them respectively unsuitable to the service, or inadequate to meet the wants of the public.

(2) During the continuance of the license in each and every year the licensee shall maintain during the season of navigation which is governed by the operation of St. Lawrence canals the following schedule of trips between Morrisburg and Waddington:

Leave Morrisburg, Ont.

Trips.		
1.—	8.00 a.m.	Daily except Sunday.
3.—	9.00 a.m.	Sunday only, from June 15 to Sept. 15.
S.—	10.15 a.m.	Daily except Sunday, from June 15 to Sept. 15, if there are any cars to cross.
5.—	1.45 p.m.	Daily except Sunday.
7.—	4.15 p.m.	Daily except Sunday
9.—	4.15 p.m.	Daily from June 15 to Sept. 15.

(Trip 1) is connected at Waddington, N.Y., with jitney service between Massena, N.Y., and Ogdensburg, N.Y.

(Trip 5) is connecting at Morrisburg, Ont., with G. T. Ry. train No. 9 going west from Montreal to Toronto.

Leave Waddington, N.Y.

Trips.		
2.—	9.45 a.m.	Daily except Sunday
4.—	10.00 a.m.	Sunday only, from June 15 to Sept. 15.
6.—	2.45 p.m.	Daily except Sunday.
8.—	5.00 p.m.	Daily except Sunday.
10.—	5.00 p.m.	Daily from June 15 to Sept. 15.

[Mr. C. A. Stewart.]

If, in the opinion of the master of the ferry boat, there is sufficient fog or foul weather to endanger either life or property, the schedule herein provided to be maintained shall be suspended during the continuance of such weather.

Provided, however, that if regular crossings are temporarily suspended, the crew of said boat shall remain on duty until the time for the final trip shall have passed in order that regular crossings may be resumed whenever and as soon as the condition of weather warrants.

(3) The charges for fares and tolls to be made on the said ferry for each way during the hours stipulated shall not at any time exceed the following:

*Passengers, incl. drivers of vehicles and automobiles	$0.35
*Children under 12 years of age	0.20
*Children under 12 years of age round trips	0.35
Trunks, not exceeding 100 lbs.	0.15
and for each additional 100 lbs.	0.15
One-horse vehicle, light or loaded	1.25
Two-horse vehicle, light	2.25
Two-horse vehicle, loaded	2.25
Plus for each 100 lbs. of freight	0.15
†Automobiles, roadster or 5 passenger	1.00
†Automobiles, 7 passenger	1.25
Auto-trucks, light	1.25
Auto-trucks, loaded	1.25
Plus for each 100 lbs. of freight	0.15
Motorcycle, with rider	1.00
Single rig, without horse attached	0.25
Double rig, without horses attached	0.50
Lumber, per 10,000 ft. B.M.	2.00
Horses, each	1.00
Horned cattle, per head	1.00
Sheep, each	0.35
Pigs, each	0.35
Grain, potatoes, etc., per bag	0.15

*Remark 1.—From the opening of navigation to the 1st of June and from the 1st of October to the closing of navigation, the fares for passengers shall not exceed 0.50 and for children, 0.25 each way.

†Remark 2.—On Sundays, the charges for automobiles shall not exceed $1.50.

HOMESTEAD PURCHASES

Mr. McTAGGART:

1. How many letters patent were issued in 1922 for pre-emption and purchased homesteads within the pre-emption area as defined by Dominion Lands Act, 1908?

2. What was the total revenue received in 1922 from pre-emptions and purchased homestead lands within pre-emption area?

3. How many pre-emption and purchased homestead entries were cancelled in 1922?

4. How many pre-emption and purchased homestead entries were abandoned in 1922?

Hon. Mr. STEWART: (Argenteuil):

1. Pre-emptions, 596; purchased homesteads, 94;

2. Pre-emptions, $321,379.74; purchased homesteads, $26,760.49; total, $348,140.23.

3. Pre-emptions, 363; purchased homesteads, 14.

4. Pre-emptions, 440; purchased homesteads, 25.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—DIRECTORS

Mr. GRIMMER:

1. Is the Mr. Talbot who has been appointed a director of the Canadian National Railways, the same Mr. Talbot that was appointed to the department of the collector of provincial revenue of the province of Quebec in the district of Quebec, on November 18th, 1911, at a salary of $2,500 per year, and whose name appears in the Comptes Publics, 1921-22, of the province of Quebec, at page 257, as being still employed at the same salary of $2,500?

2. If the fact is that this employee of the provincial government of Quebec has been appointed to the board of the National Railways, does the government propose giving other provincial governments similar representation on the board by appointing one of their servants to that body?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. No information, but probably he is the same gentleman.

2. No director has been appointed to represent a provincial government.

LIVE STOCK INDUSTRIES—CANADA

Mr. HODGINS:

1. What did the trip of Messrs. Dryden and Marshall to South America and return, in the interests of the live stock industry of Canada, cost the government?

2. How long were they away?

3. What countries did they visit?

4. Has any report on the possibilities of developing a trade in live stock with South America been made? If not, when will such report be made?

Hon. Mr. MOTHERWELL:

1. Mr. Dryden, only, visited South America; cost of trip, $2,127.76.

2. 72 days.

3. Brazil, Uruguay and Argentine.

4. Yes.

POSTMISTRESS—ST. CLAIRE

Mr. BOYS:

1. Was Miss Evangeline Cayouette, postmistress at Ste. Claire, county Dorchester, Que., before December 25th, 1922?

2. If so, has she been since relieved of her duties?

3. Were any accusations made against her or for what reason was she discharged?

4. Have any petitions either for or against Miss Cayouette been sent to the department?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM (for the Postmaster General):

1. Yes.

2. Yes.

3. Representations were received that the post office was not centrally located and after inquiry the office was removed to a more convenient site.

4. Yes, both for and against.

CANADIAN EXPEDITIONARY FORCE

Mr. ARTHURS:

1. How many men were enlisted in the Canadian Expeditionary Forces in Canada?

2. How many men so enlisted went overseas?

3. How many men so enlisted went to England only?

4. Was any record kept of men who returned to Canada and afterwards went overseas for a second time?

5. If so, what number so returned?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. 590,572.

2. 418,052.

3. This information is being tabulated but will not be available for some time.

4 and 5. This information has not been tabulated.

SOLDIER SETTLEMENT—CARLETON

Mr. GARLAND (Carleton):

1. How many farms were sold by the Soldier Settlement Board to returned men of the county of Carleton, Ontario?

2. What price was paid for each of these farms?

3. From whom were they purchased?

4. What inspectors or inspector recommended paying the purchase price?

5. Who were the purchasers?

6. Are any of said farms now vacant?

7. If so, in what township or townships?

Hon. Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil):

1. Twenty-eight.

2. Price paid by the board: $3,050, $2,700, $4,500, $2,880, $2,970, $4,500 $4,300, $2,970, $3,600, $3,150, $4,500, $3,240, $1,970, $4,300, $4,500, $2,700, $2,565, $3,600, $3,150, $4,000, $2,645, $3,600, $3,600, $1,800, $3,550, $4,500, $4,140. $4,500.

3. M. Leduc, J. S. Moxby, J. Robillard, W. J. Buell, M. T. Power, Mrs. E. M. McLatchie, B. Shanahan, A. Brown, W. J. Bradley, W. J. Bradley, G. D. Armitage, Andrew Brown, W. J. McCurdy, J. MacArtney, James Bradley, M. J. O'Meara, H. Lusk, R. Graham, J. Plunkett, F. S. Richardson, James McNeil, W. Conlin, J. Hunt, Mrs. Godfrey, Peter Anderson, John Graham, O. H. Switzer, A. Dolan.

4. E. F. Leidy, E. F. Leidy, W. J. Spratt, W. J. Spratt, W. J. Spratt, D. J. Mather, W. J. Spratt, W. J. Spratt, Geo. Hopper, Geo. Hopper, W. J. Spratt, W. J. Spratt, W. J. Spratt, W. J. Spratt, W. J. Spratt, G. N. Aeyue, E. F. Leidy, D. J. Mather, W. J. Spratt, E. F. Leidy, W. J. Spratt, W. J. Spratt, Geo. Hopper, W. J. Spratt, W. J. Spratt, D. J. Mather, W. J. Spratt, W. J. Spratt.

5. J. Briere, Peter Budd, S. Liboiron, F. Mole, O. Charron, A. V. Roles, E. P. Shanahan, A. N. Smith, N. G. Bradley, A. W. S. Phillips, Godfrey D. Armitage, H. Pope, S. Elley, T. E. Binks, Robert Bradley, A. Dyer, T. P. Beasley, J. E. Welch, L. Eggins, W. H. Otto, W. J. Stewart, Chas. Goodwin, H. T. Shirley, W. H. Snider, Wm. Anderson, J. W. Prophet, J. Christie, T. A. Dolan.

6. Yes, one vacant and two leased.

7. Township of Osgoode, township of Goulbourne.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURN

SCHOOL LANDS

Mr. McTAGGART:

1. How many quarter sections of school lands within pre-emption area as defined by Dominion Lands Act, 1908, were sold up to December 31, 1922?

2. What was the total revenue derived therefrom up to December 31, 1922?

3. What amount remained unpaid upon such lands at December 31, 1922?

4. How many quarter sections of such lands have been surrendered to the government?

DOMINION LANDS—PRE-EMPTION AREA

Mr. McTAGGART:

1. What is the total area in acres of all lands within what is known as the pre-emption area as defined by Dominion Lands Act, 1908?

2. How many acres of such lands are under the administration of the Dominion government by virtue of: (a) Unproved pre-emption; (b) Unproved purchased homesteads; (c) Forest reserves and parks; (d) Grazing leases; (e) School lands?

CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT

Hon. H. H. STEVENS (Vancouver Centre):

For a copy of all correspondence exchanged between the Attorney General, Honourable Alex. Manson of British Columbia, and the Solicitor General, in reference to the proposed amendment to the Canadian Temperance Act, together with copies of resolution of the British Columbia Legislature, with the accompanying brief of the Attorney General of British Columbia, containing his references regarding the vote of the British Columbia Legislature.

Hon. D. D. McKENZIE (Solicitor General): I have no objection to the proposed motion, but my hon. friend must not be disappointed when he finds that I have no document of the class he is calling for except one letter with a draft amendment which came to me from the Attorney General of British Columbia.

Motion agreed to.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

HALIBUT FISHERIES TREATY

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN:

For a copy of all correspondence, papers, communications, cablegrams, telegrams, writings, documents, etc., passing between the government of Canada or any member thereof and the government of Great Britain or any member thereof or the representations respectively of other governments referring to the recent negotiations for and to the execution of a treaty with the United States respecting halibut fisheries, and also between the government of Canada or any member or representative thereof, and the British Ambassador at Washington respecting the same subject.

MR. CAMILLE BOLTE

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

For a copy of all papers, correspondence, letters, documents, telegrams and other writings exchanged between the Post Office Department, the Civil Service Commission, at Ottawa, and Mr. Camille Bolté, an employee of the Post Office, at Montreal; also between Mr. Gaboury, Superintendent of Post Office, at Montreal, Mr. P. E. Coolican, at Ottawa, Mr. Lionard, Postmaster, at Montreal, and the Post Office Department, in regard to Mr. Camile Bolté.

HUDSON BAY RAILWAY

MOTION OF MR. ANDREW KNOX FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE REPORT

Mr. ANDREW KNOX (Prince Albert) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government of Canada give further consideration to the report of the Senate committee on the Hudson Bay railway with a view to safeguarding the investment of public moneys made in the construction of that portion of the work completed to date and that the government recognize the priority of this undertaking with reference to other transportation projects started subsequent to the Hudson Bay railway.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in moving this resolution, which is seconded by the hon. member for Nelson (Mr. Bird), I wish to say that we have no apologies to make. The resolution should be its own justification, because the matter has been before the people of Canada for the last forty years and has been discussed annually from every angle. I admit that some of the more enthusiastic supporters of the scheme may have painted the picture in colours that would not stand the acid test; on the other hand, we know that its opponents have in many cases tried to enlarge the difficulties. No great project has ever been carried through without the overcoming of difficulties. In the observations I intend to make I shall try to be fair and to lay the facts dispassionately before the House.

The Hudson Bay railway project has been investigated time and time again, and as the result of the various investigations held, both the old historic political parties have endorsed the scheme. Nothing has ever been brought forward to prove that it is not feasible or not workable. For the benefit of any hon. members who may not have heard the discussions of previous years, I should like, by way of introduction, to draw attention to a few facts in connection with the project.

Work on the Hudson Bay railway was started by the government of Sir Wilfrid Laurier in 1910. The present Acting-Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) turned the first sod at that time, and I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that it would give us a great deal of satisfaction if before the end of the present season we could see the same hon. gentlemen drive the last spike. When Sir Robert Borden assumed office in 1911 he and his party again investigated the scheme, and the result was that they also were convinced of the feasibility of the work and the advisibility of carrying it on. Work proceeded slowly during the war years up to 1918, when, without any apparent reason, except possibly that of necessity for economy, the work was stopped, and during the past four years or more nothing has been done.

The railway consists of 424 miles from the Saskatchewan river at The Pas right to the bay. The grading has been done to the bay, but there still remain 92 miles of steel to be laid, and it is for the purpose of asking the government to proceed to lay that 92 miles of steel and to bring the road up to the necessary standard that we are pressing for a reconsideration of the matter.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Is any part of that line in operation to-day?

Mr. KNOX: Yes, a part of it is in operation, but only once every two weeks. I have not the exact mileage—

Mr. GRAHAM: Two hundred and fourteen.

Mr. KNOX: Two hundred and fourteen miles; a train goes out every two weeks. The amount of money expended on the road up to the time the work was stopped was something like $14,000,000, and on the terminal at Port Nelson, nearly $6,000,000. It was shown on the evidence of the Deputy Minister of Railways, Mr. Bell, before the Senate committee which sat in 1920, that the balance of the $25,000,000 which had been estimated as the amount necessary to complete the whole work, would actually have completed it, terminals and all.

It is not my intention to discuss at great length on this occasion the feasibility of the project, because that has been established time and time again. The report of the Senate committee, in which the view was expressed that the project was feasible and would likely be profitable, was placed on Hansard by myself last year; I do not therefore, care to take up the time of the House now by going into it further. I would like, though, before leaving the question of the feasibility of the scheme, to read a short extract from a speech delivered by Sir James Lougheed in the Senate on May 15, 1918. He said:

> I have no doubt that when that road is completed, as completed it will be, it will be found of inestimable advantage to the development of that western country.

Further on he said:

> Permit me to say that so far as the carriage of materials is concerned, construction work has not been proceeded with seriously since 1914, but in that year no less than 36 passages through the straits, through the bay, and through the estuary were successfully made, over 20,000 tons of freight for the construction of that road being carried. The ships which navigated the straits were not built for the ice traffic they were simply tramp steamers without any special constructive features for this particular navigation; yet during that year those ships, not at all adapted for the navigation of the waters in that Hudson straits, made no less than 36 passages. It seems to me that should be unanswerable evidence of this fact.

I would also like to read a short extract from a speech delivered by the late Hon. Frank Cochrane, who was Minister of Railways in the government of Sir Robert Borden. After making a personal inspection of the proposed route, this is what he had to say:

> I have every faith in the scheme and I will push the Hudson Bay road for all I am worth. We intend to make this a good road—we have a four-tenth grade; we are using 80-pound rails. I believe the Hudson Bay route will mean much to the West in the way of lower freight rates.

If the Solicitor General (Mr. McKenzie) were here I would call his attention particularly to this:

> Just consider how much cheaper iron, steel and coal, for instance, from Sydney, N.S. would be shipped to the prairie. It would be the greatest advantage to the East and I believe eastern opposition is dying out. We found the bay free from ice, in fact the only ice we saw to amount to anything were the bergs near Belle Isle where all the Atlantic steamers encounter them. The straits are very wide and with the aid of wireless I believe can be kept open for a long period. The early settlement in the North West was made through Hudson bay and straits and what sailing vessels have done steamships can accomplish with much more ease.

I think I am justified in dismissing that side of the argument. Taking it for granted that the feasibility of the undertaking has been demonstrated, and nothing to the contrary having been established, I think we can dismiss the argument in that respect. What I want to impress upon the House is the absolute necessity for more outlets.

Mr. CLARK: How many months of the year would the route be open?

Mr. KNOX: The senate committee state, from the evidence laid before them, that they consider that the route could be kept open four months of the year, and, with up-to-date appliances, probably much longer.

Mr. CLARK: What are these months?

Mr. KNOX: I believe they are July, August, September and October. And I would point out that these are the months during which it would be most beneficial to the western provinces for the route to be open, because it is during this period that the grass-fed cattle, which we hope we shall now be able to ship to the British markets in view of the removal of the embargo, would be ready for shipment overseas. And with the route open during these four months, we should have had during the past season two clear months for the shipment of grain. Grain was going to Port Arthur about the first of September, and if the route were open for these four months that have been mentioned, it will be seen that in the past season we could have had two clear months in which to ship grain. But we believe the route could be kept open much longer than that.

It will be observed that in the resolution I ask that the government shall:

—recognise the priority of this undertaking with reference to other transportation projects started subsequent to the Hudson Bay Railway.

Now it has been suggested to me that some people have interpreted this request to apply to branch lines. I wish to point out at once that I had no reference whatever to branch lines when wording this resolution, because I realize quite well that there are some branch lines in the West that are an absolute necessity at the present time; and I may say that there are some that are urgently needed in the constituency I represent. Although there are no better districts in the West than those which these branch lines would serve, at the same time I must say that unless these people obtain the necessary railway connection they will be compelled to pull up stakes and leave. I have in mind the line running north-east from Prince Albert to Paddockwood, and the line extending from Melfort north-easterly. Let me emphasize the fact that there is no opposition between the branch lines and Hudson Bay line; they are both necessary. And there is no more relationship between these two classes of railways than there is between the branch lines and Welland canal or some of the other big projects which have been started and which are consuming a great amount of money without giving any adequate return. As a matter of fact, the Hudson Bay railway is not in the same position as these other undertakings, for the building of this railway was provided for by the sale of western lands which were especially earmarked for that purpose. The road was intended to be built from the sale of these lands. Whether the proceeds will be enough to complete the project I cannot say, but I know that enough has been raised up to the present practically to cover all expenditures; and we believe that the amount still to be obtained from these sales will pretty nearly provide all that will be required to complete the road. I think that those who try to drag the branch lines into the discussion might just as well come out in their true colours and show themselves as being opposed to the scheme, because there is no connection whatever between the building of branch lines and the completion of this railway.

I have no quarrel with the Vancouver route, because I know that what we want to-day are more outlets. It is imperative that the West especially should have more outlets than it has at present. The cost of getting our produce on the markets of the world is consuming the profits which formerly probably went to the producers. It is therefore absolutely essential that we should get more outlets. I want to say here that in spite of all we are passing through to-day I have every confidence that the West—and when I say the West I include British Columbia—has ahead of it such a future that it will be absolutely necessary to provide more outlets for its products. We know the congested state of the grain route last fall, and we hope that we shall be able in some measure to relieve that condition. It requires no great stretch of imagination on my part to foresee the time when the Pacific ports will not only be used as outlets for our own produce but will be utilized in connection with the trade from the Orient, which will be landed there and transhipped to the port of Nelson and thence across the ocean, thus effecting a saving in both time and expense in getting shipments from the Orient to European ports. The strongest argument in favour of the Hudson bay route in preference to any other is the short railway haul, which is necessarily the cheap haul, and in that connection I might give some of the distances. The distance from Winnipeg to Port Nelson is 892 miles as against a distance from Winnipeg to Montreal of 1,422, which shows a saving of 530 miles. Brandon is 870 miles from Nelson and 1,555 from Montreal, or a difference of 685 miles. Regina is 694 miles from Nelson, via Sturgis—the line is not yet quite completed—and to Montreal it is 1,780 miles, a saving of 1,086. Medicine Hat is 996 miles from Nelson and 2,082 from Montreal, a saving of 1,086 miles. Calgary is

1,176 miles from Nelson and 2,262 from Montreal, a saving of 1,086 miles. Edmonton is 1,038 miles from Nelson and 2,247 from Montreal, a saving of 1,209 miles. Battleford is 766 miles from Port Nelson and 1,994 from Montreal, a saving of 1,228 miles. Saskatoon is 736 miles from Port Nelson and 1,924 from Montreal, a saving of 1,188 miles. Prince Albert is 670 miles from Port Nelson, and 1,958 from Montreal, a saving of 1,288 miles. The fertile Swan river valley in Manitoba and other good wheat producing areas are still nearer to Port Nelson.

Mr. MANION: In regard to these figures, of course my hon. friend will admit that the distance to Montreal is less from a practical standpoint, due to the fact that much of the route is by water in the summer season?

Mr. KNOX: Yes, Mr. Speaker; but I think my hon. friend will admit that the distances to Nelson which I have shown are in nearly all cases less than the distances to Fort William and Port Arthur. However, even if they were the same to these respective points, it would enable us to eliminate the carrying charges on grain from Fort William to Montreal, which, during the past year, have been particularly heavy. The transhipping charges as well would be saved.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Is there a net saving in freight rates by way of Hudson bay as compared with any other route?

Mr. KNOX: If the freight rates are the same per mile as they are by any other route—and I see no reason why they should be higher—there certainly must be a great saving.

The ruling grade on this road is particularly good—only four-tenths. Besides this favourable feature, the natural watershed of the prairies is towards the bay, so the route would be practically all down grade, but in any case there is nothing worse than a four-tenth grade, and, with 80-pound steel, we have one of the best roads for carrying grain that can be found on the continent.

Mr. EULER: Would the hon. member contend that the shipping charges after reaching Port Nelson or Fort Churchill are as low as those from Montreal?

Mr. KNOX: We have really nothing to go on at the present time, but we see no reason why there should be any difference. We fully expect there would be a higher insurance rate at the beginning, but the elimination of so much rail transportation would far more than offset this extra expense.

Now, as to the sentiment in the West in regard to the completion of this road. I need only point out that the legislatures of Manitoba and Saskatchewan after fully debating the matter have both passed resolutions urging that the Dominion government complete this work. The organized farmers—the United Farmers and Frain Growers' associations—in all three of the prairie provinces have passed similar resolutions. I have copies of resolutions passed by many boards of trade in the West, by the Associated Boards of Trade of Saskatchewan and by numerous other organizations. There can be no question about the sentiment in the West in relation to the completion of the Hudson Bay railway.

I could quote many extracts from western papers, but I do not think it necessary to do so. In fact I am confident that before the debate closes the House will be convinced that the West means business in this matter. In proof of that statement I would point to the resentment which was expressed in the West when the order was given last fall to lift one hundred miles of rail from this road. Happily that order was countermanded. I should like, however, to read two short extracts from eastern papers which go to show that even in the East the importance of this railway is not overlooked. The Toronto Star some six weeks ago contained the following editorial:

> More grain last year poured into Port Arthur and Fort William by rail, and poured out of there by boat than ever before. But the cost per bushel to the western farmer of getting his wheat from his front gate to the docks at Liverpool is regarded by him as a handicap almost fatal to his hope of success.
>
> The West wants and needs cheaper access to Europe with her grain. How is it to be had? Competition with grain from everywhere fixes the price of Canadian wheat at Liverpool; the railways and boats fix the price of hauling the grain to Liverpool; the producer of the grain gets what's left. It isn't enough. What the western grain growers see in this Hudson Bay route is that in shipping their grain to Europe they can cut out the long haul from Fort William to Montreal and place their farms as near tidewater as the farms of their competitors in Australia, Argentine and southern Russia.
>
> Isn't it too splendid a possibility to be left untried, or abandoned when so nearly completed? The West is growing insistent about this enterprise and eastern Canada must consider it seriously. Canada has not at Montreal a large enough spout for the trade she has to pour out and will have to pour out in the future.

The other extract is from the Port Arthur News Chronicle, and I would particularly draw the attention of my hon. friend for Fort William (Mr. Manion) to the following:

> In ordering the stripping of the road of rails and material the government has flown into the face of the West. It is not surprising that the West looks with suspicion and fear upon the attitude the government has adopted towards the Hudson Bay road. Whether

we believe the road will prove a failure or success is beside the question. The whole matter may be concentrated into the statement that the West wants the Hudson Bay Railway and will never be satisfied until it gets it. Give them what they want. It will not break Canada, the few millions that are required, and it will do more to remove western suspicions of eastern motives than anything else in the world.

If this only were the result it would be worth far more than all the completion of the road will cost. The eastern provinces can form no conception of how fierce is the demand of the west for the Hudson Bay Railway. That road must be completed and an appropriation of the necessary funds for that purpose should be made at the forthcoming session of parliament.

Mr. MANION: If I may interrupt my hon. friend for a moment—I do not wish him to think that I am opposing the completion of this railway; I was merely trying to elucidate the point regarding comparative distances.

Mr. KNOX: I quite understand that, Mr. Speaker, I also have a short quotation from an Old Country paper, the Monthly Trade Review of London. This appeared in its issue of November, 1917—not of recent date, it is true, but it is interesting as indicating the view taken in England:

At the moment, when the Canadian government is pressing forward the completion of the new railway from The Pas to Port Nelson on Hudson's bay as a new outlet for the gigantic wheat fields of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, it is opportune to focus attention on an undertaking which will need every encouragement and support from the home government.

Canada's prairies to-day are the crucible of the nations, the imperial granary, the nearest and most prolific wheat-producing areas of the empire. What, therefore, can be done to ensure that they shall be developed for enormously increased supplies remunerative to the Canadian farmer and making the Briton's bread at home secure and more reasonable in price?

The most direct and practical answer is, develop transportation—transportation on the railways and lakes of Canada and transportation from Dominion ports to the ports of the United Kingdom. The completion of the state railway from The Pas to Port Nelson on Hudson bay and the establishment of a line of grain-carrying and other ships by the Hudson strait route is the beginning, therefore, of a movement of enormous importance, both to Canada and to the United Kingdom.

It is evident from this, Mr. Speaker, that the people of the Old Land are not unmindful of the importance of the wheat-growing provinces of the Dominion and realize that they are within much easier reach of tide-water and much nearer the Old Land than the present route would suggest.

A few days ago the hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. Evans) instanced the cost of transporting a steer from Saskatoon to Liverpool—$51 and some cents. Since then I have been making a little investigation, and I find that the portion of that amount which would be attributable to the rail haul from Saskatoon to Montreal would be something like $18. Applying that to the rail haul from Saskatoon to Nelson, at the same rate there would be a saving of something like $12. But that is not all. The shrinkage on such a rail haul amounts to at least five per cent. The average shrinkage between Winnipeg and Montreal is between three and five per cent, and the longer the haul the greater the shrinkage. The shrinkage, therefore, between Saskatoon to Montreal is easily five per cent. Now, five per cent is a very important item in connection with the price which the farmer would receive, and adding that to the saving on the rail haul which I have just mentioned, we can easily see that there would be a great saving if we could cut off something like twelve or thirteen hundred miles of rail haul. If we could save only $10 per head on these cattle to the farmer who produced them, I want to emphasize that that would mean the difference between success and failure to the stock industry of the West to-day. We in the West have been urged to go into mixed farming; it has been said that we cannot possibly succeed by continuing with grain alone. Now that the embargo has been lifted I see a great opportunity for bringing the stock industry into something like the condition we had some years ago, but unless something of this nature can be done the stock industry is doomed in the West. I have no hesitation in saying that, and I have a right to know because I am interested along that line myself.

Along with the shipment of our beef, we have also our dairy products, and a number of other products which will benefit very, very largely if we can make this route work out as we believe it will work out.

There is one other point I would like to make, and it is this. The Ontario government at the present time is projecting a line of railway to the southern extremity of James bay. We in the West are determinedly looking forward to the completion of the Hudson bay lines, thereby giving us connection with that great Canadian sea at the other side. When these are both accomplished facts, we shall have something more in common with the East, and I believe that is urgently needed at the present time. We also look forward to the development of great natural resources in that country, a development which I believe would justify the completion of the road even if the route to the Old Country was never opened up. The resources of that north country are something wonderful. We have assurances of that from every man who has gone up there, and we

look forward to the development of these great resources.

Speaking on this subject last year I expressed myself as somewhat doubtful if the proper selection had been made of the port, but since that time I have convinced myself that the port of Nelson will supply all the necessary requirements of a shipping port. I was confirmed in this view by a conversation which I had with a gentleman who was in charge of the machinery for several years while working at the bay. This man informed me that there would be ample room and ample protection for the shipping there and for the ships which would lie at the harbour. The harbour was being constructed alongside the main channel, and he said that it would be a crime to abandon the work which had already been done, and which was still standing up well. Consequently I am convinced that the government should carry on the work which has been in progress there. As I pointed out before, there is 80-pound steel on the road, and the grade is four-tenths.

To sum up, I would just like to say that this project has been found feasible after repeated investigations, and nothing has ever transpired to prove it otherwise. The people of the prairies claim the completion of this road as their right and as a national enterprise. Money was provided for it by the sale of lands in the West especially set aside for that purpose. We believe there is no great opposition to the road except possibly among a few doubting Thomases and those who may be directly interested. Conditions demand that if we can get a shorter and a cheaper route to the European markets we must take advantage of it, and this fact is all the more emphasized since the tariff barrier has been increased between us and the United States market. We believe that with an increase in the British preference, coupled with this shorter and cheaper route, much of the handicap imposed upon us by the American tariff would disappear, and that a better, brighter day would dawn for the western provinces and incidentally for the whole of Canada.

Mr. T. W. BIRD (Nelson): It is usual for the opponents of the Hudson Bay railway to magnify the usual difficulties of the engineer and the navigator into insuperable obstacles. I am reminded of an incident which occurred during the original survey of the railway. The engineers came to a soft place that required considerable filling. Of course, the engineers took it as part of their ordinary day's work, but a certain eastern journal, which I think is still hostile to the project, immediately announced that the engineers had come to a standstill before a bottomless bog. The matter was taken up in this House, and it was found that the bottomless bog had no existence except in the mind of the editor of that journal.

Before I go on to deal with the feasibility of the route, which I think is a very important, in fact, a crucial matter, I want to say a few words as to the question of expediency as it has been applied to this matter. We of the West, Mr. Speaker, have sometimes had an uneasy feeling that we have been bamboozled by this plea of expediency. Up to 1917 it was thought expedient by two successive governments which to all appearances entered upon this enterprise with the feeling that they were doing so in the national interest—up to that time I say two successive governments spent over $20,000,000 upon the enterprise. Then suddenly in 1918 it was thought expedient to close down the whole thing, and from that time onward it was thought expedient to neglect the work done, to allow it to deteriorate and decay; and to crown everything, it was found expedient last fall to add human devices of demolition to those of nature, and to make an attempt to blot the whole thing out of the remembrance of man. During all that time yearly expenditures were made, amounting to tens of millions of dollars, upon other projects which had not one whit more claim than the Hudson Bay railway had. One is disposed to exclaim: "Oh expediency what wrongs have been committed in thy name!" and we of the West feel that there is a good deal of explanation to be made on that score. So much for the plea for expediency.

What has been the actual condition in regard to this matter financially? The hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Knox) has referred to this. The impression that the construction of the Hudson Bay railway up to date has run the country into a debt of something like twenty millions, with enormous interest charges, is, of course, totally false. I think it is well understood in the House here, that every cent that went into construction was paid out of current revenue, and that current revenue was amply reimbursed by the provision which the hon. member (Mr. Knox) has referred to—that is the setting aside of certain lands, certain homesteads and preemptions. So the plea of economy can only apply to the small amount it would have taken to complete the route; and I think it can scarcely be denied that four or five millions, or six millions, would have been ample to have placed the Hudson bay route in a condition that would have allowed of an operation of at least an experimental kind.

Therefore, the amount of saving that has been accomplished amounts to that four or five million dollars spread over two or three years; and when you set that over against the amount of deterioration that has taken place in four or five years one fails to see where the saving comes in. There is an old saying that "a dollar saved is a dollar earned"; but in this case a dollar "saved" was a dollar wasted.

Now, let me deal more particularly with the question of feasibility, for I know that in the minds of certain members there is some doubt as to the feasibility of this route, although it is a matter that has been discussed for a good many years. I want to say that the sources of what may be termed exact knowledge concerning the feasibility of the Hudson bay route consist of the reports of the several expeditions that have been sent out by successive governments. A vast amount of money has been spent, at one time and another, in sending out competent people, properly equipped, to ascertain the truth about this route. It is no use contending that the governments—the Liberal government and the Conservative government—undertook this thing for purely political reasons, and went into it blindly and inadvisedly, because there is evidence that is readily accessible to show that all the material facts were at hand, and those facts are very well set forth in these reports. Now the more important of these reports are: the Gordon report of 1884-5-6, the Wakeham report of 1897, and the reports of of the Hydrographic surveys under Captain Anderson, and others, from 1910 to 1914. I know that attempts have been made, at times, to discredit these reports. Partisan zeal has sometimes led people to try to discredit these reports, but I say that any candid student of them must admit their great value, and, I would add, to a certain extent their finality. The evidence which they give is cumulative and progressively convincing, and you cannot get away from it. They vary as regards details but on essential points they pretty nearly all agree. I think they may be taken as being trustworthy, and practically nearly all that you need to consult—I think they may be said to be a compendium of all that can be said for or against this route. Another thing I might interject is this—that these reports have an added value because they contain, embedded within them, all the available unofficial evidence, evidence that has been gleaned for a long period from sea captains, from Hudson's Bay Company officials, and from others that are qualified to speak. All this evidence is to be found in these reports.

Now, having carefully studied these reports the conclusion I have come to—and I hope my bias in favour of this route has not in any way interfered with my judgment; I do not think it has—is that, as was stated a few moments ago, the months of reasonably safe navigation are July, August, September and October. Indeed, in some favourable years you may add part of June and a part of November to that period. The opening and the closing of the straits for navigation depends upon the Arctic stream of ice, coming from Baffin's bay, which closes the eastern entrance to the straits from the latter part of November to early in July. In the early part of July, usually in the first week of that month, the ice opens out and permits steamers to enter, and the date of that opening is fairly constant. Reports that extend away back for two hundred years show that the first week of July is a fairly constant date for the opening of the straits. Sometimes, indeed, steamers can go in there in the middle of June and instances of this having been done can be quoted. The closing of the straits is also pretty constant and takes place every year about the last week in November, although sometimes the closing is extended to December, and in some cases the beginning of January, on one or two occasions in fact the straits might have been cleared in the first week in January. These are the facts concerning the navigation of the straits, and although I believe that on the west end of the straits the Fox channel ice is a factor, yet from the evidence given it cannot be said that the Fox channel ice governs the navigation of the straits. Whatever you prove of the eastern end of the straits applies to the western end also. In establishing this, one does not contend that the route is such that it will not require a certain amount of adaptation on our part. The difficulties are great of their kind, but they are not at all insuperable. They can be overcome. They have been overcome and are being overcome. The reports of Captain Anderson of the Hydrographic survey prove that with every successive season of investigation something of value is discovered concerning the navigation of the straits, and perhaps the most instructive thing is this: that in 1911 when the Minto went into the straits it had a very difficult passage and suffered considerable damage, but in 1912 under similar conditions the Minto, benefiting from its previous season's experience, went in and made the passage with the

greatest of success. Another matter that is very instructive is the experiences of different steamers in the same season and at the same time. These experiences which are in documentary form can be examined and are very instructive. For instance at one time the Acadia was hopelessly stuck in the ice between Mansell island and Coats island, and yet practically at the same time the Bonaventure found a passage five miles wide at the same place. In the eastern end of the straits Captain Anderson—I think it was in 1914—was badly stuck in the ice, and at exactly the same time there was a fleet of five ships, including the Sheba which is an ordinary unprotected tramp steamer, went through unscathed. So that you see these incidents prove that with every season of navigation something new is learned, and the conviction that comes to one is that continued investigation with its accumulated experience, and with the advantage of modern methods, the navigation of those straits will be increasingly safe and practicable.

Perhaps I may be allowed to refer to the Senate report of three years ago. Now I will admit the weakness of that report from an argumentative point of view. It has its limitations. That has to be conceded, but I think it was an honest attempt to co-ordinate all existing evidence on material points. One of the things I might refer to briefly is the fact that it confirms unequivocally the opinion that has prevailed for over a generation that the straits are navigable for at least four months of the year, and the only point on which it is inconclusive is that respecting the comparative merits of the two ports. I want to interject a word here to show this much disputed question of the comparative merits of the two ports is not such that it need retard the completion of the Hudson bay route. The choice that exists between them is not very important. Take, for instance, the initial cost. There are some figures in existence that were given by the present hon. Minister of Defence (Mr. Graham), I think in 1909 or 1910, showing the comparative estimates for these two ports. The estimate for Churchill was over $4,000,000 more than the estimate for Nelson; that is, for the initial expenditure. Then with regard to operation, does it not seem reasonable that the additional mileage that would be required at Churchill would cost at least as much as the dredging that would be necessary from year to year at Port Nelson?

As to the question of terminals, we have been told on official authority that development at Churchill on a small experimental scale would be no more favourable than at Nelson, and at Port Nelson, development on a big scale would be distinctly favourable. I would not have hon. members forget also that $6,000,000 had been spent on Nelson harbour, that the railway had been headed in that direction and is nearly completed to Nelson. As to navigation of these ports, I may say that it is a delicate matter for a layman to deal with. One does not even begin to understand the technical words used, but I think it is self evident that, from the point of view of natural accessibility, Churchill has the advantage. Nature meant it for a port. But then the difficulties that are associated with Nelson are not insuperable, and by no means formidable. Before any survey was made it was not difficult for a skilled mariner to approach the port, and an accurate survey exists to-day. It has been properly charted, and with the addition of the necessary buoys and beacons, and perhaps radial stations, the accessibility of Nelson will be beyond the shadow of a doubt. Without expressing any personal bias in either direction, I simply want to point out that the choice between these two ports is not such that it need retard the completion of the Hudson Bay railway.

I would like to say a word as to the desirability and urgency of this route. I do not know whether I should detain the House by giving some idea as to the enormous natural wealth that exists in the country bordering on the Hudson Bay railway, but in a brief way, without giving many figures, or reading many quotations, I think I can convey to the House some idea as to the natural wealth that does exist there, which certainly some day will be a contributing factor to any railway that runs into that region. Taking the country that is already traversed by the Hudson Bay railway, beginning at Mile 82, we find that wonderful country called The Pas mineral belt. It commences a few miles west of Mile 82 and stretches to the Saskatchewan border. In that district there have been invested in the last few years over $2,000,000. At one period during the war $2,000,000 worth of copper was taken out of one mine under most difficult conditions. The area called The Pas mineral belt is rich not only in copper but in gold, and has big promise for the future.

Then, if you proceed to Mile 130, you enter that large area—I think it is 10,000 square miles—of valuable agricultural land—good clay land that is capable of producing and ripening wheat. That alone is a consideration that ought to have influence. Then, proceeding from that valuable agricultural area toward the bay, the railway actually

parallels—indeed, twice crosses—the Nelson river with its wonderful water-power potentialities. At the very place where the railway crosses the Nelson river, Kettle rapids, there is a possibility of developing over 1,000,000 horse-power. That northern country is perhaps richer than any other place in Canada in that respect, with possibly one or two exceptions.

Mr. GOOD: What about the development of water-power in the winter time at those places?

Mr. BIRD: I would remind the hon. gentleman that the Nelson is a mighty river; it is one of the biggest in the world, and has a very strong current. While I have not investigated the matter in detail, I believe the government reports refer to minimum flow in connection with this potential power development. I suppose that means that it is the flow all the year round.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): May I interpose an answer to the question? I was talking with Sir Adam Beck less than two weeks ago, and he tells me that it would be possible to generate over 4,000,000 horse-power on that slope to Hudson bay. That power can be used for the mining country to the north all the year round, as well as for the railway.

Mr. BIRD: I have seen the total available horse-power in the north of Manitoba estimated as over 6,000,000; I think the government report gives it at about $3,000,000. All that power is adjacent to the Hudson Bay railway and may be utilized at points where the railway crosses the river. In addition to these major resources there are minor ones, such as fur, fish, and possibly pulp, which will in a smaller way be contributing factors to the traffic that will some day maintain the Hudson Bay railway.

When we get beyond the railway we have the Hudson bay. Although the extent of the resources of the bay itself is somewhat problematical, it is the only means of access to an area in Canada comprising over 2,000,000 square miles—an area the extent of which almost baffles the imagination. I say that the Hudson Bay is the only means of access to this vast territory which everywhere shows signs of being richly mineralized. This is not imagination; it is not especially got up for the purpose of debate. To prove that, I will read my only quotation; it is from Dr. Corless, President of the Canadian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy, an utterance he made only last year. He said:

> We can well afford to stand off for a few moments in order to try to estimate the probable significance to mining of the enormous region surrounding Hudson bay, with an area of 2,000,000 square miles, occupying considerably over one-half the entire surface of Canada.

I will summarize by saying that Dr. Corless emphasizes the fact that not 10 per cent of this area has been investigated and that only a small proportion of that 10 per cent has been thoroughly investigated. But the result of the investigations made goes to prove that this vast area is very similar to the area in northern Ontario that has already produced such vast wealth for this country. Further on he says:

> Fortunately, enough is known to make reasonably certain that the broad average formations of the less known parts will closely resemble those of the part already more fully examined. In the only parts where any detailed geological examination and prospecting have been carried out there have already been discovered fabulously rich deposits of iron, nickel, gold and silver containing many thousands of millions (billions) of dollars in gross value of these metals.

If anyone desires further information respecting the character of that country I would commend to his perusal a publication issued by the Department of the Interior in 1914, entitled The Unexploited West. It would make all of us better Canadians if we knew that this vast country, equal, as Dr. Corless says, to one-half the total area of Canada, and often represented on our maps by a blank, is not totally devoid of use, but is full of splendid possibilities. And the only key to that area is the Hudson Bay railway.

I would like for a moment to divert my remarks to the accumulated traditions that have gathered around this route during centuries of adventure and of trade. From the splendid old sea-dogs of Queen Bess right down to the modern Yankee whaler, there have been those who from one motive or another have been prepared to brave the obstacles of this route. In those days it was not only the play writer who was of such stuff as dreams are made of, but every bluff sea-master who went down to the sea, sometimes to do grim business, was animated with vision. It is often difficult to know which to admire most, their splendid seamanship or their visionary power. Such men as Frobisher and Davis and Hudson dreamed of Cathay and the route thither, and dreaming of it were able to accomplish things that they could not otherwise have accomplished. Those northern waters had a fascination for them; they played upon their imaginations in such a way that unconsciously they began the process by which Canada has become what it is to-day. We would not know Canada as it is now had it not been for the vision of those brave men of old. The spirit of those olden times speaks to us now;

It has been enshrined imperishably in story by such men as Hakluyt and to-day it is voiced in thrilling song by such men as Sir Henry Newbolt, from whom we had the privilege of a visit the other day. Sir Henry Newbolt is Britain's finest interpreter of the spirit of those early days; through his verse it seems to call to us like a "far bell a-ringing," imploring us not to become urbanized and sophisticated, not to allow ourselves to suffer the blight of soul in which vision perishes and heroic effort languishes.

Coming down to a later time, we find this route associated with traders who for generations enriched themselves through its natural wealth and associated with their prowess was the vigorous contention of the nations of Europe.

I would pause here just to express my appreciation of the decision arrived at by the Department of Interior to preserve for all time to come Fort Prince of Wales on the shores of Hudson bay. There it stands and will continue to stand, we hope, for all time as mute evidence of what this bay and this region meant to minds of the eighteenth century. Surely a route which the ill-equipped Elizabethan seamen conquered, which has enriched generations of traders, and for which nations have contended, has something for the imagination of the Canadian of to-day.

Returning again to the urgency of this route I want to say that for the West it is primarily a matter of transportation. The western farmer has slowly realized that the profits of his toil from year to year are fated to be continually precarious; and that fact has worked upon the mind of the western farmer and the residents of the West generally. The western farmer has felt himself in recent years constantly ground between the upper and nether millstones of high cost of production and high cost of marketing. With respect to the high cost of production, he scarcely knows to-day whether the fiscal system, against which he has protested so many years, or the financial system is his greatest enemy. If he has as much success in attacking the financial system as he has had in attacking the fiscal system a great deal of sympathy is coming to him. With respect to marketing, last session something like a gleam of hope came into the breast of the western farmer, although I am afraid it was almost entirely illusory. He asked the Dominion government for a wheat board and it was granted him, but granted him grudgingly and with much opposition, and, I am afraid, in such a way that it will never be of any use to him. And then as to transportation, he did get some satisfaction, but he had the chagrin last season of seeing the advantage filched from him by the predatory interests of the Great Lakes. Now, it is this hopeless fight in order to stabilize the products of his toil that has worked upon the mind of the western farmer; and it explains to a large extent the phenomenal revival of interest in Hudson bay which took place last winter. The farmer realizes that this fight is almost hopeless, and the Hudson Bay railway fascinates him because he thinks, and rightly I believe, that it offers at least a partial remedy for the malady of distance from which he suffers. And distance to the western farmer is a malady. It is a blight, just as much as the rust on his wheat is a blight, just as much as foot and mouth disease would be in his cattle; and a few million dollars that the Dominion government might expend in removing this blight would bring a benefit not only to western Canada, but to the entire Dominion.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): Has the hon. member considered what effect the opening of this route would have on the Canadian National railways?

Mr. BIRD: Well, I have not; other considerations have had precedence in my mind; and having watched the writhings of the western farmer upon the grill of economic conditions during the last few years I think his case has a right to have precedence over the National railways. I believe a way could be found to solve the problem of the National railways, but in the meantime I think the western farmer has a right to go ahead and deliver himself in the most speedy manner he can. The western farmer has come to the point where he sees in the Hudson Bay railway a gleam of hope denied him in other quarters, and the reason is that the Hudson Bay railway brings his farm, his cattle and his grain just one thousand miles nearer to his market. I have read somewhere that the Parisian truck farmer, when he goes from one farm to another, takes his soil with him. He digs it up and carries it away to the new farm. Suppose the western farmers of Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Alberta could dig up that wonderful soil of theirs and transport it one thousand miles nearer Liverpool, imagine what that would mean to them. You will see, then, why they insist on this thing. In conclusion, let me refer to another aspect of the question which is not quite so tangible as those I have dealt with, but which is just as important, and that is the psychological effect that the completion of the Hudson Bay railway would have on the western farmer. We have heard recently some talk about the discontent of the

West in comparison with the contentment of the East. I imagine that the placidity of eastern conditions has been somewhat exaggerated; and I am convinced also that the discontent of the West has been misinterpreted. I think that trivial causes have been alleged to explain that discontent. But the real causes are not trivial; they go to the very roots of western life. The fact is that the West, like every other spot on earth, has been endowed by Providence with certain advantages and certain disadvantages. And this is what has happened. Under the pretext of a national policy, in the name of Canada, we have ruthlessly cut through natural conditions, emphasizing in every case the disadvantage and nullifying the advantage. That is what we have done in the name of a national policy. Shut out absolutely from its natural outlet to the south; its outlet to the east preyed upon by the bold, bad, barons of the "Big Sea-waters", and its only outlet to the north too often made the sport of political caprice, you cannot expect the West to be content under conditions of that kind. No intelligent and vigorous people ever have been content under such conditions. The West suffers from its isolation and it knows it. Buried, so to speak, in the depths of a continent,—people who live in the East cannot realize what this means—and with no outlet to the outside world except such precarious ones as are controlled by other people, how can you expect the West to be content? The sentiment which an isolated people develops towards its natural outlets is the most potent sentiment that can actuate any people; and to tamper with it, to make it a political question, to refuse it in the supposed interest of any other section of Canada, is almost utter recreancy to the best interests of the Dominion as a whole.

We often hear—at least I have heard more often during the past year than ever before—irresponsible talk about separation. There is a stirring in the tops of the mulberry trees which our statesmen would do well to note before it becomes a tornado. Now if this irresponsible talk be folly, it is only surpassed by one other folly—the constant refusal of this spontaneous and universal aspiration of the West. I repeat, its refusal under any pretext whatsoever is a species of folly that surpasses even the folly that I have mentioned almost under my breath.

Mr. WILLIAM DUFF (Lunenburg): Mr. Speaker, I am sure we have listened with a great deal of interest to the excellent speeches of both the hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Knox) and the hon. member for Nelson (Mr. Bird) with regard to the possibilities and the feasibility of the Hudson bay route. Before dealing with the question I should like to say that as far as I am personally concerned I have a great deal of sympathy with the aspirations of the western people. On one subject which is very close to our hearts —the tariff—I think I would go almost as far as they would. I realize too the handicaps under which they suffer by having to bring their grain and other farm products such a long distance by rail to reach the European markets. We in the Maritime provinces suffer just the same in that we are kept out of our great market to the south, with the result that any goods we might find an outlet for in Quebec, Ontario or the western provinces we cannot very well sell on account of the high freight rates. So in any remarks I shall make I want my friends to understand that my sympathies are entirely with the West, and if I thought for one moment that this Hudson bay route was feasible I would support the resolution.

Now, Sir, it seems to me that this matter may be dealt with in three phases. The first is, whether it is feasible to build the line of railway from The Pas to the terminal at Hudson bay. I think everything any government can do should be done for the people of northern Manitoba. If, as the hon. member for Nelson says, there are great possibilities of development in that part of the province, and if it is demonstrated to the satisfaction of the railway authorities, of parliament and of the government, that it would be wise for the line to be completed, then I think the work should be undertaken. But I cannot deal with this phase of the question satisfactorily because I do not know very much about it.

The second phase I should like to discuss is the feasibility or otherwise of the water route from the terminals at Port Nelson to Europe. As the hon. members have both said, a great deal has been written in the past two years in regard to this route. The hon. member for Nelson quoted what Captain Anderson, who was out there for several years, wrote with regard to the Hudson bay and strait. I have under my hand his various reports from 1911 to 1915, and I intend to deal with them in a few minutes. The hon. member for Nelson said that some years this route was navigable for four or five months of the year, and he added that during that period whilst one vessel could not get in for a long time another vessel came in a day or two afterwards without any difficulty. If the hon. member had had the slight experience I had in the ice fields for

about two seasons he would understand exactly what that meant. In my opinion it was a very poor argument in support of his case because it proved that the bay was full of ice at the time both these steamers attempted to get in. While one was jammed in the ice, the other vessel, perhaps on account of pressure of wind from a certain direction making a lead in the ice, was enabled to get through. I have under my hand some photographs taken of Hudson bay, showing ice conditions there, from 1911 to 1915, and if any hon. gentleman thinks that the Hudson bay route is feasible for ordinary steamers, then after looking at these photographs I am confident he will change his opinion. In every one of these photographs where the Minto, the Acadia, the Bonaventure and the Boethic are trying to get through the ice, it will be observed that this ice is not merely five or six inches thick, but extends to a thickness of ten or twelve feet, and it is impossible for any steamers to get through such a solid obstruction without a great deal of difficulty.

Mr. KNOX: Has the hon. member never seen conditions of the same kind in the straits of Belle Isle?

Mr. DUFF: Yes. If my hon. friend and I could this afternoon travel by aeroplane to the Isle-au-Bois, in the straits of Belle Isle we would find the channel completely blocked with ice. If we went down to Quebec this afternoon we would find there that although the lower reaches of the St. Lawrence right down to the straits are blocked with ice, at Quebec it is possible for any vessel to get part way to Montreal by working her way through what is known as drift ice. So although a ship may be able to navigate a way through the ice flows, out in the mouth of the strait near Button island and cape Chidley practically throughout the whole year the ice blocks that strait. It is quite true that after a southwestern gale when the wind blows at a high velocity for four or five days the ice is shoved away over to the northeastern side, and if a vessel arrives at that particuliar time she is able to work her way into Hudson strait and reach the bay.

My hon. friend from Nelson said that if this railway was completed and the terminals built the farmers of the West would be a thousand miles nearer their market than they are at the present time. That is quite true so far as distance is concerned but he forgot to take into consideration the fact that even if steamers were able to get into the bay and take aboard their cargoes they would be two or three days longer navigating out past cape Chidley, even if there was little or no ice. The captains would not navigate their ships after dark fearing ice conditions. Consequently there would be so much more time taken in navigating the passage which would offset the saving in distance. I might say that the photographs to which I referred were taken during the months of July and August, right in the height of the season when if this route was at all feasible there would be no ice in the bay or the strait yet every one of these photographs shows a heavy field of ice covering practically the whole of the bay.

The hon. member for Nelson said that if they could get the railway built to Hudson bay and the terminals constructed a route would be established between Hudson bay and Europe which would be a great thing for the western country. I do not think it would make very much difference. If parliament and the government decided to complete this road and make a test of this route, what would we have to do? In the first place, after the railway had reached Port Nelson, which it has been acknowledged here is better than Fort Churchill for the purpose of terminal facilities, it would be necessary to construct there docks and terminals. I am told by men with whom I have talked, and who have worked in Hudson bay for several seasons on the dredges, that it is practically impossible to get proper dockage facilities at that place, and for several reasons. The first reason is that although $6,000,000 has been spent practically all on dredging at Port Nelson, yet to-day there is very little if any more water there than there was when the dredging started. It is also a well-known fact that it would be necessary to build miles of terminals, not miles in width but in length, because the water at Port Nelson where the railway is supposed to end is very shallow. The result is that perhaps miles of dockage would require to be constructed. That would take a large sum of money.

But even when these docks were constructed I am told that the current coming down the Nelson river is so strong and the velocity of the wind in Hudson bay so high most of the time, that it would be practically impossible to hold these vessels to the dock for loading and unloading except in very unusual weather for that part of the country. My hon. friend perhaps knows himself that in Hudson bay we hardly ever get summer breezes. The wind blows at a terrific rate of speed practically every day, and what with the strong current coming down the Nelson river and the wind and undertow from the northwest blowing across these docks where the steamers would

lie, it would be almost impossible, I am told, to hold them at the docks for loading.

But supposing all these difficulties were overcome. What next do we have to contend with? I think everybody will agree with me that the ordinary cargo steamer would not be suitable for this route on account of the ice conditions. A special kind of ship would have to be constructed and especially strengthened from the bow to the fore rigging and perhaps further aft. These steamers, of course would cost very much more than the ordinary tramp steamer or cargo boat and as they would only be able to operate in Hudson bay, as my hon. friend himself says, for four months at most during the summer, what would they do during the other eight months of the year? They would not be practical business carriers for this reason: They would cost about twice as much as the ordinary boat to build, and when they went into competition with other steamers on other routes after they had finished their charters on the Hudson bay route for four months, in order to pay dividends and even make expenses they would have to get higher freight rates than competing boats. It would be impossible to let these boats after only four months on the Hudson bay route lie up for the rest of the year. It is hard enough now for people in the shipping business to make both ends meet with their boats running twelve months in the year instead of only four. Consequently, I say that unless my hon. friends expect the government to build these steamers and spend large sums of money in building proper dockage facilities no shipping man is going to invest in boats which would have to be specially constructed for the Hudson bay route.

If the government did construct these boats, or if shipping men did, what would be the result then? I think every hon. gentleman will agree with me that no boats are going into a dangerous business, no steamers would go over this route unless when their charters were made with their agents or with the railway companies, they were guaranteed a higher freight rate than if the Hudson bay were all clear of ice and they could go in and out night as well as day without any difficulty. Consequently, special steamers having to be constructed, operating only four months in the year and demanding a higher freight rate, the insurance companies also asking a higher freight rate both on the steamer and cargo, my hon. friends would find that instead of getting lower freight rates than at the present time the freight rate on the Hudson bay route would be much higher than the rate via Quebec, Montreal, St. John or Halifax.

I think it is unnecessary for me to say much more. The hon. member for Nelson (Mr. Bird) has referred to what Captain Anderson had to say about this route. I do not wish to weary the House by quoting at length, but I hold in my hand Captain Anderson's report for the year 1914, and I shall give a few extracts to show what he thinks of the feasibility of the Hudson bay route. He says:

> After clearing the ice about Belle Isle, the course followed was from 75 to 100 miles off shore and little or no ice was seen until we hauled in for cape Chidley, on Sunday the 19th.

That is the 19th of July. Cape Chidley is the cape outside of Hudson bay.

> At 3 a.m. light winter ice was entered and passed through without difficulty until 7 a.m., when about 90 miles southeast from cape Chidley and 60 miles off shore, heavy winter and Arctic ice was entered, making progress slow and hazardous. Later in the day, the rudder received damage by coming in contact with a large pan while "backing up" and the ship was hove to for repairs.

Backing up means that when the steamer cannot get through the ice she has to back up in the water behind her and go ahead a second time.

Mr. SHAW: What was the name of that boat?

Mr. DUFF: The Acadia, but I can also quote from the experiences of the Bœthic, the Minto and the Bonaventure. It goes on:

> It was found that the rudder stock had been twisted, necessitating the removal of the quadrant and cutting a new key slot. This operation took the remainder of the day and the night.
>
> The ice fields appeared very extensive, no open water being visible from the mast-head. The steamer Bonaventure, chartered by the Department of Railways and Canals for carrying supplies to the Hudson bay terminus at Port Nelson, was picked up by wireless and reported that she was icebound about 25 miles southest of the Button island.

The Bonaventure was icebound about twenty-five miles away from the other steamer, showing conclusively that this was a very extensive field of ice covering practically the whole of Hudson bay.

Mr. HOEY: You mean Hudson strait.

Mr. DUFF: The water outside Hudson bay.

Mr. BANCROFT: The location the hon. member is speaking of is Hudson strait, which is a good many miles from the bay.

Mr. DUFF: How can you get into the bay unless you pass through the strait?

Mr. BANCROFT: I did not understand the hon. gentleman was arguing that.

Mr. DUFF: I do not quite understand what my hon. friend is driving at. I am saying

that the ice conditions were such that these steamers were jammed there for a considerable time, whether it was in the Hudson bay or the Hudson strait.

Mr. FORKE: It is the strait.

Mr. DUFF: What difference does it make? The steamer must pass through the strait before it gets to the bay.

Mr. IRVINE: Unless it comes in on the railroad.

Mr. DUFF: I did not quite catch my hon. friend's remark. Captain Anderson goes on:

On the following morning, Monday, 20th July, a move was attempted, but with little success, as it was not safe to try and force a passage in such heavy ice and so closely packed.

Mr. MARTELL: Was not the steamer Bonaventure that is referred to formerly a Newfoundland sealing boat specially constructed for ice conditions?

Mr. DUFF: It belonged to the Newfoundland sealing fleet and was sold to the Department of Railways and Canals for the special purpose of trying to get into Hudson bay. Here is another extract:

From this date until the 30th of the month—July—the ship was more or less hemmed in by the ice pack, which apparently extended to the land. Though able to make an occasional move of a few miles, there was little gain as the southerly Arctic current would carry the ship back again.

The general position was about forty miles off shore and sixty miles S.E. of cape Chidley. During a gale from the south-east, considerable swell entered the ice pack and made a very uncomfortable berth with huge pans of ice bumping and scraping against the sides of the ship, however, we finally succeeded in securing the ship to a large pan in such a way as to afford protection to the propeller and rudder.

Although no serious mishap took place, minor damages were received. A leak developed in the forepeak tank, necessitating pumping out frequently, and the shell plates were much dented especially at the turn of the bow, breaking connection inside and causing leaks, but we were lucky enough to get them stopped up.

I need not read any more but I may be—

Mr. MILLAR: Would my hon. friend give the summing up of Captain Anderson?

Mr. DUFF: When I come to it. But it will be a long time before I do reach it if I read all the paragraphs I have marked here. What I was going to say was this: In addition to this report and these photographs showing the ice conditions in Hudson strait and Hudson bay it is also a fact that during the very months when the hon. member for Prince Albert and the hon. member for Nelson said that navigation was feasible, they have very heavy fogs there. This fog is caused, as hon. members no doubt know, by the atmosphere being warmer than the ice. with the result that it would be very dangerous for steamers to try to navigate either the straits or the bay even if there was very little ice; the fog is so thick that you cannot, perhaps, see any more than the length of the steamer, and no steamship captain would dare to let his vessel go ahead at very much speed in the effort to navigate this channel. So I say, for that reason, in addition to the ice, the conditions are such that no shipping man would want to charter any boats to go into Hudson strait or Hudson bay.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Would the hon. member say that the fogs in Hudson bay and Hudson strait are any more dangerous than they are on the southern coast of Newfoundland?

Mr. DUFF: I cannot answer my hon. friend's question. I do however know what the Newfoundland fogs are like. All I know is that Captain Anderson in his report says that fogs are very heavy there sometimes. I do not care whether it is only for one day, or for the whole season, the fact is that in Hudson bay and Hudson strait they have fogs, ice, and gales. Consequently, these conditions do not make satisfactory reasons for shipping men or such as to cause them to feel justified in chartering vessels either to go into Hudson bay or out of it.

Now, I need not quote any further from these reports. My hon. friends can see these reports, they can read them for themselves —I refer to the reports from 1911 down to 1915, every one of the reports made by Captain Anderson. I think a reading of these reports will convince every man who has some knowledge of the sea that no shipping company, or no captain, would want to take a chance of going into Hudson bay to load cargoes if he could get freights elsewhere.

Let me say to my hon. friends opposite that although I speak this way, I would be very glad indeed if the Hudson bay route in the opinion of competent men was found to be feasible and for this reason: It would open up a new route for shipping, would give cargo boats more business and in the present depressed state of shipping it would be an excellent thing for the people who own shipping, whether they are steamers or sailing vessels.

Mr. KNOX: Does my hon. friend think he is fair in quoting exclusively from the reports of Captain Anderson and ignoring the reports presented to the committee and upon which they founded their conclusions submitted to the Senate?

Mr. DUFF: I may say in answer to my hon. friend that the reason I am only quoting from one report is that I do not want to take up too much time to-day. Moreover, I do not think it would help the case of my hon. friend if I did quote from other reports. For instance, I think it was my hon. friend (Mr. Knox) who quoted the opinion of the former Minister of Railways, Mr. Cochrane, "that the strait and the bay could be kept open by means of wireless telegraph." Now, I would like to know how either the strait or the bay could be kept open by that means.

Mr. KNOX: Would it not be an aid to navigation?

Mr. DUFF: I understand that a certain amount of electricity would—

Mr. KNOX: Would it not be an aid to navigation?

Mr. DUFF: I cannot see how the wireless would be an aid to navigation either at the terminals or at Port Nelson when a vessel was off cape Chidley or half way in the strait trying to make her way through the ice. You could not put a wireless station out on a pan of ice so as to be of any use to a vessel between Port Nelson and cape Chidley.

Mr. KNOX: It would not be necessary to do that. We have islands in the straits. The strait is five hundred miles long and between thirty-five and one hundred miles wide and one of these islands could be used for the purpose.

Mr. DUFF: If the dimensions given by my hon. friend are true one of these islands would not be of very much use; a tower many hundred feet high would have to be erected in order to look out over the ice and see whether there was ice or open water so as to advise steamers coming round cape Chidley.

Mr. BIRD: I quoted an incident showing that an ice breaker was stuck in the ice at the eastern end of the strait and at the same time the Sheba had a clear passage all the way through. In that case a radio would have been of service in pointing out the open channel.

Mr. DUFF: I may say to my hon. friend that I had a similar experience when a ship that I was on board of, called the Greenland was caught in the ice one spring and had to stay there for thirty-two days with a catch of seals on board. Only about ten miles away there was open water and other vessels were able to get through. They saw our predicament and when they got home reported that we were stuck fast in the ice without any seals. That was the case in regard to the vessels of which he speaks. There may be a lead or channel of open water through the ice caused by the wind or the current where vessels can pass. Not far away other vessels may be caught fast in the ice. But let me tell my hon. friend that no shipping man is going to send his vessel into Hudson bay if he is likely to meet with that danger.

Mr. BIRD: Does my hon. friend apply his statement to the early part of July or to the whole of the period I have referred to?

Mr. DUFF: This investigation showed the conditions in different months—in July, August and September. The hon. member spoke about the experience of the Minto. I would advise him, if he wants some information about Hudson bay and Hudson strait, to consult Captain John Reid who was commander of the Minto when she was in Hudson bay. Captain Reid has enlarged photographs showing the exact conditions in Hudson bay and Hudson strait during the period he was there. Looking at these photographs any reasonable man will be convinced that the navigation of either the bay or the strait under such conditions is a very difficult proposition. I repeat that I am not opposed to this route if it can be shown to be practicable and would be glad if I could get evidence showing that it is feasible. We have not all the information that we should have on this project and for that reason I would suggest to the government that they should make further inquiry before spending any more money on it. From the financial standpoint I think it would be unwise—and I am sure my hon. friends from the West will agree with me—to spend any large sum of money in continuing the railway to Port Nelson, or in the building of terminals, or the construction of steamers, to open this route, until we are possessed of further information. Before spending any further large sums of money parliament and the government should go very slowly in this matter.

What I would suggest, in fairness to my hon. friends from the West who desire to secure a fresh outlet for the grain and other commodities of the West is commendable, is that parliament should ask the government to have a proper survey made of the whole field both with regard to the railway to Hudson bay and the terminals there, and with regard to the feasibility of the navigation of the bay and strait. I would suggest that practical men such as Captain Reid, Captain

Bob Bartlett, and other men who have spent many years in the Arctic, should be asked to go up there, stay one or two years, and make proper surveys, inquiring into the whole situation and investigating the advisability and the feasibility of this route. In that way the government would get information that we have not got now. I know practically nothing about the project except what I have read and what I have heard from Captain Bartlett, and others, who have voyaged for years in the Arctic and worked in the Hudson bay, and who have made statements to me which I have given to the House this afternoon. I would suggest that before spending any further large sums of money qualified engineers and qualified seamen, used to Arctic work should go up there and make a thorough inquiry into the whole situation, and then report to the government. Then it will be possible for us to discuss the matter in an intelligent manner. At present we cannot do this.

Mr. ROBERT FORKE (Brandon): I am glad the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) closed his speech in the manner in which he did. He admitted that he did not know the exact facts of the case. Nevertheless, he maintained that it was unnecessary to go any further into the matter as he was already satisfied that the strait was closed the whole year round. My hon. friend added that he had the results of investigations to prove it. Now, if his contentions are correct I do not see why this debate should proceed any further.

I think perhaps he is right in saying that a very close study of this question should be made by the members of this House. Perhaps the members more directly interested in the matter have already made considerable study of the whole question, and for many years it has been described on the one side as a route feasible and on the other side as a route very difficult, but I have never until to-day heard the statement made that at no time of the year was the route feasible. I have always understood that there was no doubt about at least two months of the year. I had the privilege of looking over a great many charts not very long ago, comparing the voyages of the boats in and out, from Sydney and other eastern ports to Hudson bay, and I did not find in any one of these charts any great difficulty at any time—in fact no difficulty during two months or so. I believe it is correct to say that the Hudson bay route is feasible for at least two months of the year. The question then would be: Is it a feasible or a right project to go on with this work on the supposition that we have only navigation for two months in the year? It has been discussed pro and con for a great many years. I would like to read a short extract from a speech delivered in 1908 by Sir Wilfrid Laurier at Niagara Falls, where he stated:

> We have undertaken the construction of another railway, the Hudson bay railway. We have come to the conclusion that the time to build this railway is now, not to-morrow, but now.

That is a long time ago. On September 22, 1908, the Hon. Clifford Sifton, now Sir Clifford Sifton, speaking at Brandon, said:

> Now we come to the latest development and indeed the best is still to come. The prime minister proposes to build for these provinces the Hudson Bay Railway. (Loud cheers). That pronouncement was a very material factor in inducing me to become a candidate for this constituency in this election, because I felt, and feel now, that the time has come when we men from the west have succeeded in proving that a Hudson bay railway is no mere chimera—no foolish project, but one which the people of the West are bound to see carried into effect, and the time to do it is now.

Fifteen years ago the people of Canada and of the West were convinced that it was no mere chimera, that it was a feasible project, and now we find ourselves debating as seriously as ever the question as to whether the project should be carried on or given up. When we realize that two different governments have investigated this project, have pronounced it feasible, and have declared that it should be carried on, that its completion was only deferred on account of war conditions, that $20,000,000 has already been spent upon it, is it reasonable that we should now come to the conclusion that the work should be stopped and that nothing more should be done?

It has been discussed again and again by the public men and parliaments of this country, both Dominion and provincial. The matter has been so well discussed and so well placed before the House by the mover (Mr. Knox) and the seconder (Mr. Bird) that I really cannot add very much to what has been said. However, I would like to point out again the necessity of some other outlet than the one which we have at present for the products of the western provinces. It is needless for me to repeat, but I sometimes think cannot be too often repeated, that we will have tremendous resorces in those western provinces when they are properly developed. We have realized during recent years the difficulties and disadvantages from which we suffer on account of being located in the centre of the continent, where transportation has become the one great problem which we must and shall overcome. It seems to me that the Hudson bay route as

an alternative outlet for our products will to a very large extent solve our transportation difficulties. Not only will it be an outlet but it will be a competing outlet for our produce to the sea, bringing into line the other routes and the interests that control the other outlets.

It has been pointed out by the seconder, and I think also by the mover of the resolution, that Canada has suffered no loss through the building of the Hudson bay railway. Too often we hear repeated what the East has done for the West. I do not like that kind of argument, because I do not believe there is very much in it. Most of the money that has ever been invested in the West has been at so much per cent, and I hope the interest has been paid most of the time. When we come to deal with the building of railways I think we will find that the railways of the West have been largely financed from the values that have accrued through the building of the railways in the West, and the Hudson bay railway at the present time, as far as I can understand the situation, has not cost this country very much, because the land that has been set aside for that purpose has met the demands made in this respect. So that from a financial point of view we have not suffered very much in the building of the Hudson bay railway up to the present time.

It has been pointed out that the natural outlet to the western provinces has been to the south of us. Those of us who live in the West realize that fact, but I think we are good enough Canadians to say that if we can possibly make things go along successfully, we are prepared to do anything we possibly can to develop a national feeling and a national business within ourselves. We appreciate to a very large extent anything that would tend to develop trade between Great Britain and Canada, which I claim would be of great benefit both to Canada and Great Britain.

Now the opening up of this suggested route, should it be feasible—and I believe it is—would do a great deal towards solving one of the great problems we have in the West at the present time. Agriculturists who have studied the situation in the West, and who know the conditions as they exist, are pretty well convinced that the salvation of our western provinces will be in the development of the live stock industry. I know very well that for a great many years to come wheat will be the principal export value that will be produced in these western prairie provinces. Not only that, Mr. Speaker, but I believe the public debt will have to be paid to a very large extent by the produce of those same western provinces, and that the wheat will play a very large part in paying that debt. Nevertheless from experience we are finding out that, in order to carry on agriculture successfully, there must be diversified farming, and there must be a rating of live stock. The transportation of live stock to the sea by a long railway haul is a much more difficult problem than the hauling of grain, and if we could make it possible to export cattle by the Hudson bay route, I believe we would be going a long way towards solving a great many of the difficulties in the way of the development of agriculture in the western prairie provinces.

I should like to point out to the eastern people that the eastern agricultural interests can well supply all eastern wants in that direction. That is one of the unfortunate situations of the western people. I do not care what interests you have in the East, you know very well that the eastern provinces are quite capable of supplying all the agricultural needs of any industries you are likely to have in the East for many years to come, and the western provinces are impressed with the fact that they have to find a market outside for their products.

I hope hon. members of this House will look upon this situation sympathetically and will not dismiss it without consideration. I have heard round the corridors of this House, almost with a laugh, the question: "I suppose you are going to bring up the Hudson Bay railway question"? I want these gentlemen not to dismiss the matter without giving it the attention it deserves. If it can be shown that the project is impracticable, then by all means we do not want the Hudson Bay railway. I would qualify that, however, by saying that I believe the completion of the railway would in itself be a feasible thing, even though the development of the bay should not go on. As the mover of this resolution has said, the road would be a colonization road, and the completing of the line would be something well worth doing, something which would contribute to the development of northern Manitoba. We do not want money spent foolishly; we want the question decided on its merits. But I do believe there will never be contentment in the West; never will the western people be satisfied, until that railway has been completed and the question has been decided by actual experience. It has been demonstrated conclusively that the route is feasible, because the charts in the department show that vessels have made the trip back and forth time and again without encountering ice at all

I met the proprietor of a magazine not long ago and he told me he was going to publish photographs which were similar to the ones the member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) was displaying this afternoon. Well, they never appeared in the magazine; I suppose he got a little more knowledge of the subject and thought it just as well not to publish them, at least for the present. I have no doubt that there will be abnormal ice conditions up there at times and if you are anxious to do so you can get photographs that will present the matter in a very unfavourable light. Anybody who knows anything about the northern seas —and I know the hon. member for Lunenburg knows about ice floes and all that sort of thing —will realize that the conditions vary a great deal. I do not think we need take seriously the hon. gentleman's little joke about melting the ice with electricity, but it is possible that a great many difficulties that were formerly considered insuperable may under modern conditions be easily overcome. By the use of electrical appliances, aerial inventions, beacons, buoys, and so on, navigation into the harbour at least can, perhaps, be made perfectly safe.

So far as dredging in the bay is concerned, I do not think dredging has been very extensively carried on. The information I have is to the effect that what has been dredged has remained clear; so that these difficulties may be very easily overcome. I know it is difficult to get within quite a number of miles of where the harbour would be, but that area has been charted and the investigations already made no doubt point to a solution of the difficulty in that respect. It would surprise hon. members who have not gone into the question to find what a large amount of data the department has accumulated in this connection. It would well repay the attention of those who have not investigated the conditions to find out just what they are to-day. I had an opportunity of seeing the photographs to which reference has been made, and a great many more, and quite a number of them are favourable to the proposed route, indicating, as they do, that the bay is open for a great many months of the year.

I do not wish to take up any more of the time of the House; other hon. members are very much better posted than I am in regard to the conditions that exist in Hudson bay. Of course the difficulty is not in the bay, but in the straits; the great question to decide is how far the straits are navigable. I have not discussed the matter with the mover and the seconder of the resolution but I think it would be well to go a little carefully at first, and to that end a thorough investigation would be in order. I do think, however, that the government should at least complete the railway to the bay and put us in a position to obtain more accurate information along these lines. I hope that the matter will not be dropped without further investigation and without a decision to complete the construction of the line to the bay.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York): Mr. Speaker, I am thoroughly in sympathy with the proposal that has been made. My view of this matter is that Canada is committed to the early construction of the Hudson Bay railway. The boast of Great Britain in connection with her war debt to the United States—and it was expressed by the Chancellor of the Exchequer the other day—has been that England keeps her word and pays her debts. Just as seriously have we committed ourselves to the people of the West to build this road. We voted the money, and for the psychological reason alone, if for nothing else; if only to put heart into the people of the West we ought to complete it. But I can give another reason, and it has been advanced this afternoon. The opening up of that country would result in the road paying for itself. There would be made available the most valuable mineralized area in the world. Ontario to-day has a road within 120 miles of Hudson bay, and it is the intention of the province to complete that line to the bay this year. One of their reasons for doing it is to open up the northern portion of Ontario, a district, which, sloping down to the bay, has much good land and much valuable timber. A fine fishing industry can be worked up in Hudson bay, and a traffic in fur can be carried on. Power can be developed on the rivers on the Hudson bay slope and made available to the mines that have been opened up in that part of Ontario —the most marvellous mines in the world. The territory in Quebec adjacent to Hudson bay is equally rich, if we are to believe the reports of the geologists who have made investigations there; and the same applies to portions of Manitoba. The hon. member for Nelson (Mr. Bird) quoted from the remarks of the president of the Canadian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy, who pointed out that that pre-Cambrian shield was the richest mineral area on the whole face of the globe. The successes in Cobalt and Porcupine are such as to justify the completion of this line on its own account. I believe there is enough power on that Hudson bay slope to drive all our locomotives on the Canadian National between Winnipeg and Montreal, and to meet the needs of all the mines and pulp mills in

that district. Besides, employment would be furnished to large numbers of people and opportunities for settlement would be afforded.

For these reasons and many others I could give, I say we should complete that road. The amount involved would not be very great, and the experiment is worth making, if only in order that we may keep our word. The main source of the money expended on that road has been the public lands of the West. The West is therefore security for it, and there certainly will be just as much local traffic over that road to Hudson bay, altogether apart from any consideration of sea traffic, as has followed from the development of the Northern Ontario and Temiskaming road. That is almost the best piece of railroad in Ontario to-day, although when it was first projected everyone declared that it was a mere chimera, that there was nothing in it for the province or for those who put their money into it. That part of the country is one of the best sections of the Dominion to-day; it is the best country in the world for men to go to, whether they have capital or are seeking labour. It is the best market in America for labour at the present time, because the demand for men for the mines cannot be supplied. And it may be a great coal country; we shall probably get anthracite there if we are to believe what some of the geologists tell us. But at all events there are great coal and timber resources in that part of the country, and there is also a good chance for farming.

One thing, however, is lacking; and for some reason or other this parliament is reluctant to keep its word. Why should we not keep our word and complete that road? I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the government will see its way to complete this railway, and I hope that before this debate closes the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) will announce on behalf of the administration that it is the intention to carry out the contracts that were made, first by Sir Wilfrid Laurier and then by the Conservative government. I do not know whether the Union government was committed to the undertaking, but certainly this House has pledged its word in the matter; and the people of Canada want to see the road completed. The people of Ontario, the people of Manitoba, and the people of the West generally are anxious to have the work carried through, because they see in the completion of the road some hope of relief from the excessive freight rates that have obtained in the past. The western people hope for some relief from the opening up of the Vancouver route, in conjunction with the Panama canal, as an outlet for the grain of the West. And we in Ontario wish to see the waterways between Port Arthur and the Atlantic, by way of the St. Lawrence and the canals, improved as another outlet for the products of the West. We must try all these things and make various experiments, because the providing of more outlets for our products is a vital necessity.

And here let me say a word for the National Railways. The greatest asset Canada has to-day is its national railways. These railways have not done their best; they have done their worst so far. But a new and better management is perhaps coming into operation, and the men now in charge will be held responsible for a genuine attempt to solve the grievances of the West in so far as the railways can do so. Up to the present this has not been done; there is rather too much delay in putting the National Railways to the work they are capable of doing. Certainly a reasonable time should be given the new board to organize. But after all we want results; and I have no doubt as to what the National Railways will be able to do if they are properly managed. There is not a better railway in the world; and I will say, to the credit of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, although I do not know where he got the inspiration, that the greatest branch of the National Railways to-day is that line running form Winnipeg to Quebec. It is on the top of a great plain and has a two-fifths grade; and the part of the country through which it runs is rich in agricultural possibilities and in mining. It is a fine country in every way, and the railway from Winnipeg to Quebec is one of the best pieces of railway we have on the Canadian National. No matter what we do with the waterways, this line from Winnipeg to Quebec is one of the solutions of the grievances of the western farmers. These farmers have two real grievances, one in regard to transportation, and the other the fact that they are debarred from the great American market. Whether in the new and broader view that mankind is inclined to take of some of these problems that have arisen since the war, this impediment will be removed, I do not know. There seems, however, a possibility of better relations between the people of the United States and those of Canada, although I do not say that there is. At any rate, there is a better feeling growing up between English-speaking people generally. On the whole, therefore, I do not despair of the future of the Canadian West, but this parliament must help them in the present situation; and I will give what little support I can to this proposition. Canada owes it as a duty to carry out this work, because the country has been

pledged to it. The government is committed, not so much to further investigations as to a completion of the work that has been undertaken.

If we do that work the West will have no great grievance against this parliament, except that we must also do what we can to develop the port of Vancouver and our waterways. We must go after the railways, both the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canadian National Railways, and try to find out, either by experiment or by litigation, what justification there is for these abnormal charges that have obtained in the West. This parliament, too, or the Railway Commission, or whatever body has jurisdiction in the matter, must get after the shipping profiteers on the upper lakes. I do not know anything more discreditable in the history of America than these abnormal freight charges which have been put into force since the war by the people who control the shipping on the upper lakes and on the St. Lawrence. Every concession which the railways have given to the western people has always been absorbed in shipping charges. There seems to be, I was almost going to say, an infamous understanding between the two. Perhaps there is a quiet "divvy"; I do not know whether that is so or not. The fact, however, is that there have been unfair charges levied by the shipowners and the railways. We have got after the railways in an endeavour to obtain reductions and we must get after these other people as well. The main thing is to put heart into the people of the West by building this railway which they require. If we do I feel confident that substantial results will accrue to the people who live in the western provinces and who to-day ask this parliament for relief in various ways. I hope that this parliament will give them that relief not only in regard to transportation but in regard to reasonable banking facilities, and possibly the improved credit which has come to the United States in the last two or three years might also come to the people of the west of Canada. I shall therefore have much satisfaction in supporting the motion. Still greater satisfaction will it be to me if the government make good the pledge of Sir Wilfrid Laurier and complete this experiment —even if it is only an experiment—and so keep faith with the people of the western provinces.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. C. C. DAVIES (North Battleford): In rising to support the resolution moved by my hon. friend for Prince Albert (Mr. Knox) it is not my intention to deal at any great length with the subject. I understand that there are a number of other speakers who will have something to say on this question, and it would not be fair to them if I made any extended remarks at this moment. But the question of transportation, and especially the question of the early completion of the Hudson Bay railway, is of such vital importance to the agriculturalists of western Canada that I feel I should be remiss in my duty if I did not in my poor way try to add something to this debate.

Public opinion in the West has been practically unanimous upon this subject for very many years. I remember when I first came to this country over twenty years ago how the Hudson Bay railway was dangled as a bait to the settlers in the West, and it seems almost inconceivable to me that after twenty-three years we are debating in this House of Commons the question whether this is a feasible route or not. From the beginning of this year the question has been discussed in practically every public assembly in western Canada. Unanimous resolutions have been passed by all the great farmers' organizations in western Canada, and by the board of trade of practically every city and town of importance in that part of the country. During the past few weeks the question has been thoroughly discussed in the legislature of Manitoba and the legislature of Saskatchewan, where unanimous resolutions have been passed pressing this government to complete the Hudson bay route as early as possible.

I wonder if hon. members who represent the eastern part of Canada ever realize the vital importance of the question of transportation to the western farmer. We in western Canada have a great problem to solve: how to raise our agricultural products and place them on the markets of the world in open competition with agriculturalists from every other part of the world, situated as we are fifteen hundreds miles away from a seaport. That is the question we have to solve in western Canada, and it can be solved if we open up the Hudson bay route. The problem of transportation in relation to the distribution of agricultural products is of vital interest to western Canada, and a route which brings us one thousand miles nearer the sea is a route which must receive the earnest consideration of this government.

I listened with very great interest to the speech this afternoon of the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) and I was pleased to note the warm feeling of sympathy that he manifested towards the western farmer. I have noticed before that a number of members on the government benches are willing to show us very great sympathy in some of these projects which are of such importance to the farmers of western Canada, but I would say to them that a little practical help is worth a great deal of sympathy, and at this time if they will support this project which we believe will help to solve the agricultural problems of western Canada, it will perhaps be better than showing us quite so much sympathy.

The statement has been made on the floor of this House a number of times this year that when the economic chaos in Europe rights itself once more, the price of our agricultural products will be enhanced. I cannot subscribe to that doctrine. I do not think the price of agricultural products will go up in Europe, and consequently they will not go up here. Wheat in the Old Country markets is above normal value. Beef and meat products are away above normal value in the Old Country markets. Butter is 100 per cent above normal value at the present time, and if our agricultural products are to compete in the European markets we must reduce the cost of production and the cost of transportation. The question before us is the question of reducing the cost of transportation. We have to compete with the other nations of the world who are not under the physical and geographical handicap that we settlers in western Canada have to contend with. We are in competition with the Argentine with its peon labour, with its short railway haul, and no expensive handling system. We are in competition with India, with practically slave labour, and no long railway haul. We are in competition with Australia, with its fringe of agricultural land around the coast, and with a twelve months working season. We have also to compete with Denmark and other European countries which are rapidly coming back to normal, and I say that if we are to build up in this country a permanent agricultural policy which will leave the farmers something over the cost of production, then this question of the Hudson bay route is of vital importance to us.

I am not going to talk about the feasibility of the route for very long, but I should like to bring to the attention of hon. members a report which was issued by the Manitoba government in the year 1884. I am taking that year because in those days the various aids to navigation in the matter of buoys and so forth, the depth of vessels and their strength, were not nearly so perfect as they are to-day. If, as far back as 1884, practical men who had great experience in navigating these northern waters said that the route was a feasible one, how much more feasible should it be at the present time in view of the perfection that has been reached in the construction of ocean-going vessels? Now, I want to read a few extracts from the report to which I have referred. Dr. Bell, director of the Canadian Geological Survey, who made five voyages through the straits, stated that the straits are: "Navigable from middle of June to middle of November. Captain Chisby, of New London, Conn., who has had fourteen years' experience in these waters, stated that "the straits are navigable for four months and often five." Captain William Kennedy, who acompanied an expedition in search of the remains of Sir John Franklin, and who had had eight years' experience of the straits, declared that the straits are navigable "from June to November."

Captain William Pritchard, who was in the Hudson's Bay Company's service for 39 years, reported as follows:

> The straits never freeze; there is no reason why steamships should not navigate at any time.

He also said:

> The icebergs seen in Hudson's straits in August and September would form no great barrier to navigation, nor do those met with off the straits of Belle Isle, nor were they more numerous in Hudson's straits than they frequently are off Belle Isle.

Further on in his evidence, he stated:

> Steam has now effected a complete revolution in ice navigation and the most advantageous time for pushing on is when the ice is loose.
>
> Under similar circumstances a sailing ship would be utterly helpless. It is therefore only reasonable to infer that what has been performed regularly and year after year by sailing ships can be accomplished with greater regularity and certainty by well-constructed steamers, especially built for ice navigation and provided with powerful machinery.

The legislature of the province of Manitoba appointed a select standing committee in 1884 to procure evidence and report upon the practicability of establishing a system of communication via Hudson bay. After taking the evidence of a number of men, with thorough knowledge of the subject, the committee say in their report:

> Many of the gentlemen examined have had personal and extended experience as officers and servants of the Hudson's Bay Company at their ports on Hudson and Ungava bays. No evidence has been given that goes to prove that Hudson straits and bay proper freeze over or that the ice met with in these waters is sufficient to prevent navigation at any time of the year; that consequently the period of navigation is defined

by the time during which the ports, harbours, or roadsteads on the shores of the bay can be entered by vessels of a suitable description for such navigation.

From the evidence adduced it appears that such ports or harbours are open on an average from four and a half to five months in each year to ordinary vessels.

The latest report that we have had on the subject, that of the Senate of Canada, declares that the route is a feasible route and that in time it will be profitable.

I said a moment ago that I first heard of the Hudson Bay railway when I came to this country over twenty-three years ago. I well remember how, in the first general election in Canada of which I have any knowledge, that of 1908, speakers on behalf of Liberal candidates made a number of statements at that time referring to the Hudson Bay railway. They pointed to the courageous manner in which the late Liberal chieftain, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, had made his announcement in the town of Welland, Ontario, that the Liberal government of that day were going to build this railway. When the Conservative party came into power in the year 1911 they took up the question of the Hudson Bay railway and began to carry it to completion. I cannot conceive that the Liberal government in 1908 would undertake such a work as this without full and complete investigation. Neither can I believe that the Conservative party, when they came into power, would carry on such a work without a very exhaustive investigation as to the possibilities of this route. Engineers were sent out by both governments. Both governments proclaimed that the Hudson Bay railway was a feasible route and that they were going to carry it to completion. I know, Mr. Speaker, that sometimes in the West we hear it said, in regard to the completion of the Hudson Bay railway, that both parties were playing politics, and that the project was simply a bait used at election time to obtain the votes of the western people. I cannot, Mr. Speaker, subscribe to that idea either. I do not believe that our governments and our statesmen have sunk so low in this country that they would willingly spend $20,000,000 of western money in order to bribe the electors of western Canada. I believe that both governments came to the definite conclusion that this route was a feasible one and determined to carry out the work.

I would like now, for a moment or two, to discuss the question of the financing of this railway because I know that it is not generally understood in the West—or in the East either for that matter—how the financing of the Hudson Bay railway was undertaken. It has been understood that the whole of Canada had been financing the Hudson Bay railway. The facts, however, are as follows: In the year 1908, when the Dominion Lands Act was brought before parliament, provision was made whereby homesteads, or second homesteads and pre-emptions were set apart, a large area of land in western Canada being selected for the purpose, and the proceeds of the sale of this land were to be devoted to the financing of the Hudson Bay railway. Under the statute of 1908 approximately 8,050,720 acres of land have already been sold, the revenue derived therefrom being $24,152,160, and the whole of this amount has not yet been spent. There are 2,500,000 acres at the present time which have not been paid for in full. You will see, therefore, that practically the whole of the revenue devoted to the building of the Hudson Bay railway came from the lands of the West. It is western land that is paying for this road, and there are enough homesteads or second homesteads and pre-emptions still in the West to yield sufficient revenue for the completion of the project.

I would like to quote here as an additional authority on this matter, what was said during the session of 1912-13 by a former Minister of the Interior, Hon Mr. Oliver. As reported at page 10951 of Hansard, Mr. Oliver said:

The question has been raised here in regard to the cost of this railway, the charge upon the treasury. Some years ago the principle of pre-emptions was introduced into the western country, with the understanding that the fund accruing from the sale of pre-emptions would be considered as an extra source of revenue from which the Hudson bay railway might be constructed. There was no ear-marking of money received. When the policy of the sale of pre-emptions was introduced, it was introduced with the understanding that a new source of revenue was being created, which would relieve the general treasury from the cost of the Hudson bay railway. Therefore, the treasury of Canada is not finding the money for building the railway. It is the land of the Northwest and the price that is being paid for that land that is building the Hudson bay railway. Enough money is being taken out of pre-emptions of the West to pay for that railway.

Again in the year 1901, during a discussion in Committee of Supply, the following question was put by Mr. Lake, the representative of a western constituency at that time, and replied to by the hon. gentleman who is now Acting Minister of Railways.

Mr. Lake: It was understood by this House I think that the money to be expended on the construction of the Hudson bay railway was to come from a special fund to be created by the sale of pre-emptions?

Mr. Graham: Yes.

I would like to take up the question of the Hudson Bay railway and the branch lines, which was referred to by the hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Knox) in his speech

this afternoon. When men who are in authority in the West are questioned upon the feasibility of the Hudson Bay railway, they always sheer off from the main question, and ask "which would you rather have, the Hudson Bay railway on branch line railways?" We know, Mr. Speaker, that branch line railways are vitally necessary to western Canada, but I claim there is no connection whatever between them. This special vote, as I showed a moment ago, was created for the purpose of building the Hudson Bay railway. It is a national undertaking and has nothing to do with the branch line construction.

I notice by the Estimates that we are going to spend $11,800,000 this year for the Welland canal. I claim it would be just as right and fair for us, and for hon. members who oppose the Hudson Bay railway, or who advocate branch lines in lieu of the Hudson Bay railway, to argue that we should cut down the estimates for the Welland canal. I noticed last year the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) took that side of the question, but when the question of a grant of $8,000,000 for the Welland canal was proposed, I observed the Minister of Agriculture had nothing whatever to say about branch line construction. I think he still holds that view. When the vote for $11,800,000 for the Welland canal comes before the House, I at least expect him to move for a very substantial reduction in that item.

I have the honour to represent a constituency in the northwestern part of Saskatchewan which is one of the finest mixed farming constituencies in Canada. There is no doubt about that. It lends itself to immigration. Large tracts of land are waiting for the settler, and I think the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart), if he would look over that country and see the land that we have there ready for settlement, would immediately become a very strong advocate of the building of the Hudson Bay railway, because it would be of very great assistance to him in bringing in new settlers. We must have a shorter outlet for our wheat, our live stock and dairy produce—the products of the farm. If the western farmer is to continue to place his products in the markets of the world in open competition with the products of all the countries of the world, having to buy all the commodities which enter into the cost of production on his farm, he cannot under present conditions succeed, but it would certainly be a vast help to the western farmer if the Hudson bay project were completed. If vessels were sailing out of Hudson bay with cattle, dairy products and wheat, and if it were only possible for the government to increase the British preference, so that the vessels coming back to Hudson bay could bring back a return cargo, it would have a very great bearing on the freight rate we would have to pay. I agree with the hon. member for Prince Albert and every other western member in the House, that we have a great country and a great heritage in western Canada. I am not pessimistic. The West does not breed pessimists. I believe if we had a fair field and no favour, if the government would assist us and complete the Hudson Bay railway, western Canada would yet become what we always conceived it was designed by nature to be, the granary of the Empire.

Mr. WILLIS KEITH BALDWIN (Stanstead): I cannot believe that politics have been played by either the Liberal or the Conservative party in undertaking such a vast construction as the Hudson Bay railway. I have listened to the speeches and I have not heard anything in this House in opposition to the proposition, as the hon. member who has just resumed his seat has suggested. The member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) has referred to the climatic conditions and has spoken of the ice which is to be found in the Hudson strait. Considering that so much money has been spent on this undertaking, I am going to say frankly, without hedging, that if I understand the amount that is to be spent on this railway, I am in favour of it, because I understand this railway has been graded and the rails are now there, and it would be a great waste not to open up a country that has such vast possibilities. The natural resources of this country have been mentioned in this debate, and I think it would be well worth while to construct the line, if we only got to the navigable part of the river, which I understand is about 30 miles from the end of the rails already laid.

I cannot believe that this railway would hurt Port Arthur, at the head of the Great Lakes, or would injure the railways of this country. Quite the contrary. I believe you cannot benefit one part of the great Dominion of Canada without helping the whole country. The member for South York (Mr. Maclean) has said that Ontario has a railway within 130 miles of—he said Hudson bay, although, I think he meant James bay. In looking at the map I see our Transcontinental railway, running from Quebec to Winnipeg, runs within 250 or 300 miles of the south end of James bay. I will be glad when the province of Ontario has completed that railway, and I likewise will be glad when the great province of Quebec, builds a railway to James bay. Hudson bay has more than 3,000 miles

of shore line; we may call it an inland sea, for I believe, according to the scale, it is the largest bay on the map of the world. Practically a thousand miles of the province of Quebec borders on Hudson bay; in Ontario we have 500 miles and in Manitoba more than 500; then there is the great district of Keewatin. People living to the south of us wonder why Canada has not struck out into its vast interior country. The amount it woud take to complete the railway is surely not a ponderous sum. I am emphatically in favour of the Hudson Bay railway because it would conduce to interprovincial trade. It is sometimes difficult for us to get a proper perspective of these things. We are asking immigrants to come here but we have not developed more thant one-tenth of the vast area which comprises the Dominion. Are we always going to be picayune, small in our conceptions of things? If we are to get people to come to our country we must do big things. We must let the world know that Canada is a country of vigorous people who are ready to take any reasonable step that will lead to its fuller development. The great barrier that is in the way of action of this kind, of course, is our vast debt, and more particularly is that true because of the fact that our railroads have been the cause of much of our present taxation. I wonder what my own constituents will think of my standing here to-night and advocating the extension of railways at this time. Well, I can justify my attitude by saying that we have already spent $20,000,000 on this project; that we have a road bed; that we have the rails laid on a great part of the line, though it is true that the ties are rotten. By making a further small expenditure at this time we can open up that great interior with all its possibilities. And it is an interesting fact that north of the territory through which this line runs lies nearly one-half the area of the province of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, I am entirely in accord with the resolution.

Mr. D. W. WARNER (Strathcona): Mr. Speaker, in discussing this resolution I wish to take occasion to present to the House a new idea. It is unnecessary for me to try to establish the feasibility of that route; that has already been done. I have been somewhat interested in the matter; I have taken note of the facts, and I am convinced that the evidence of its feasibility is beyond question. I would like to point out, however, that we have modern steamships which go where sailing vessels formerly could not. But with regard to the length of time during which navigation is possible on that route, I think there is more to be said than has been stated here to-day. I believe we can use the Hudson bay route during a longer period throughout the year than we can use the Great Lakes. In those parts of the world where ice conditions have to be overcome, ice-breakers are maintained to keep navigation open the year round, and they operate in ice to the depth of four feet. Salt water will not freeze as readily or as firmly as fresh water. I have just been reading of Mr. Stefansson's explorations in the north, and he tells us that the thickest ice he ever encountered, frozen in one season, was six feet. It has been represented here to-day by the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) that ice in Hudson bay freezes to the depth of eight feet in one season. Well, I do not see how the ice there could be so much heavier than the ice a thousand miles or more to the north, in the areas explored by Stefansson. We have evidence however, that will offset any argument of that kind, especially when that argument is brought forward by one who claims he does not know anything about it.

I am convinced that the straits are navigable for at least four months in the year, during which time we can be shipping our grain out in that way. That is important. The part of the country in which I live is as good as can be found anywhere else in Canada; so far as productiveness is concerned I would not exchange it for any other part of the world that I have any knowledge of. Our climatic conditions and our soil are such that there is a possibility of production beyond the imagination of the Canadian people—that is, if all the land is used. I am not going to lay much stress on what we want for the future; it is what we need now that counts. We do need that outlet; we are producing in such amounts that it would be of advantage to us. From a mixed farming country we are sending out large quantities of beef, pork, and dairy products, and if we had the advantage of a better transportation rate, our production would increase very substantially and very rapidly.

It has been stated here to-day that it would be of advantage to the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart) in connection with immigration to have this route in operation. I am sure that to go ahead with this project would be one way of giving heart to the people in the West and of making it easier for the Minister of Immigration to get people to come to our country.

We have in Alberta large coal seams; the coal is there in any quantity that we want to

take it. We want to sell that coal. There is a fuel problem before Canada that we cannot ignore. I have been told on good authority that this winter coal has been shipped 2,100 miles into Winnipeg, which is only 700 or 800 miles from our coal fields. Upon reference to a government map I find that the distance from Edmonton to Hudson bay is only about 800 miles, and from Port Nelson to the southern end of James bay is another 650 or 700 miles. According to the map the distance from this point to the National railway in Ontario south of James bay is 125 miles—I am taking the government maps for my measurement—and the total distance traversed by the time we reach Cochrane on the National line is 1,575 miles. At this point we commence to distribute coal both ways east and west on the National Railways. We also have government railways to carry it south to the bigger centres, and the railways could be getting traffic from the south as well to carry back west.

The hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) asked what the effect would be on the National Railways if we opened up this route. In my judgment we should be giving these railways more to do than they can possibly get if the route is left unopened. We should have increased settlement and production and should be able to supply our people with our own coal, so that we could retain in Canada about $60,000,000 a year that we now send out of the country for this commodity. If it is possible to haul coal 2,100 miles to Winnipeg, I contend that it is possible for our National Railways to haul coal from Alberta to central Ontario for distribution from Cochrane. We want to supply our people with our own coal and to employ our own miners in bringing this coal to the surface. At present, however, we are dealing with a financial problem in connection with our coal supply which we must solve sooner or later, and it is the duty of this parliament to solve that problem. It seems to me that we should do everything in our power to keep this $60,000,000 a year in our own country instead of sending it away to keep in employment the railwaymen and miners of another country. We can help to make our railways a success by hauling our own produce both ways. Now, we can ship coal from Port Nelson to the south end of James bay. Because the water is salt I am absolutely sure we can use that water route as long as we can ship on the waters of the Great Lakes, although probably there should be a greater emphasis on the facility of shipping grain, beef, pork and dairy products and lumber through Hudson Strait. I think that this route would be better than any other for the shipping of any perishable products such as meat, dairy products and whatever is produced in the mixed farming line.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): What would be the probable cost of that coal delivered at points in central Ontario?

Mr. WARNER: I can give only an approximate estimate, but I believe it could be laid down at Cochrane at $15 a ton, coming practically all the way over the National Railways.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): If it were shipped to Port Nelson and then by water carriage on James bay, and thence by rail into Ontario, what would it cost then?

Mr. WARNER: I could not give any definite answer to that question. I believe, however, that we could lay the lignite and bituminous coal down in Ontario cheap enough for the people to use it. Scientists have told us that our anthracite coal in Alberta is practically equal to the best anthracite in Pennsylvania. I have, of course, only their statement for that; but we can see what possibilities there are. And when we reflect that our National Railways are not paying and that we have been sending out about $60,000,000 for fuel, it seems to me that this House might give some consideration to this problem.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Suppose American coal could be landed at a given point in central Ontario at $9 a ton, would my hon. friend be in favour of prohibiting the importation of that coal by means of a customs tariff?

Mr. WARNER: I am not aware that American coal can be laid down in central Ontario at $9 a ton.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Well, say, $13.99.

Mr. BUREAU: Including graft?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Suppose it could be got in at that figure, how would the hon. member exclude it?

Mr. WARNER: The best information I have leads me to believe that $15 or $16 is about the lowest you can buy good coal for in Ontario to-day. Now, all that we want is something that is reasonable. I would impress upon the House this fact, that it would be worth something to eastern Canada to have western Canada given a better transportation service. If we were enabled, through the production of more coal along with the rest of our products, to use more of the manufactured goods of the East, surely that is a

matter that should be taken into consideration. The people of the district in which I live are more interested in shipping westward, and I want to express my appreciation of what has been done in the way of opening up that western route. The government did something worth while when they granted money to facilitate the establishment of elevators at Vancouver and the opening up of that western route, and while we are more interested in that route at present, we are nevertheless interested in the opening up of the Hudson bay route. We want that route opened up and tested, and we believe that Canada can afford to do this, because nearly all the money needed has already been expended. And as has been shown, the East was not called upon to pay for what has so far been done. I do not know whether there is enough money in the western lands to pay for the completion of the rest of the road and the opening up of the harbour. I do not know all the details, but, if we had to do it, it seems to me that we could afford to complete the work into which we have already put $20,000,000 by expending a few more millions on it. I do not believe there is any reason to doubt the feasibility of this route. By proving that the route is worth while you will have a more contented West, for the people will realize that you have done something to help them out. And they need your help. In order that they may develop that country as it should be developed we must give them a chance to feel that there will be a profit in what they undertake to do. Therefore we want eastern Canada to feel that it is worth something to the East to have this railway completed.

Mr. MARTELL: Is not my hon. friend afraid that in the event of the Hudson Bay railroad being completed and the sea route opened up oleomargarine might be imported from England?

Mr. WARNER: Mr. Speaker, I am not discussing the oleomargarine question now. I expect to do so later, and I hope then to have the support of my hon. friend. I want to impress on this House that it is worth while to give favourable consideration to this project. If hon. members want proof of its feasibility they have only to consult the records. All we ask is that the promises of two earlier administrations be redeemed. I do not know whether the Union government approved of the completion of this railway, as a matter of fact not much was said about it during the war, but at least two of our governments not only approved but promised to build this railway to tidewater.

I take pleasure in supporting this resolution, and I support without any fear of the railway interfering with the branch lines which we are asking, and expecting to have built. If I were undertaking to open up a farm on the prairies I would have to make a certain outlay in order to carry my development to the point where it would produce me an income. Similarly I do not see why Canada need be afraid to spend a little more money to complete this route and so provide a much needed outlet to European markets for the grain products of our western provinces.

Mr. JOHN MILLAR (Qu'Appelle): Mr. Speaker, before entering upon a discussion of this question allow me to refer to a remark made by the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff). I take it that when he selected from the evidence before the Senate committee the testimony of Captain Anderson he did so because it seemed to him above all others to favour the view that he was taking, that is, opposition to the project. This being so I think it pertinent to read the second paragraph of Captain Anderson's evidence which is as follows:

> Navigation in Hudson bay may be relied upon from the 15th July until the 15th November, with an extension of a week at either end according to the season.

If that is the strongest evidence which the hon. member for Lunenburg can find against this project, I take it that there is not much to be said against its completion.

The Hudson bay route is not an experiment. It has been open for 240 years. It was used in 1846 by the British troops landed here to assist the Hudson's Bay Company in retaining what was then known as the Northwest Territories for Canada and for Great Britain against the aggression of the Americans. If in 1846 it was a route of importance by which troops could be brought in to save Canada, it might possibly
9 p.m. serve that purpose again. Happily we are not at war with any country, but it is quite evident that the League of Nations has not abolished war, and we do not know when we may again be at war. In such an emergency what an advantage it might be to Canada to have a back door whereby we could maintain communication with the Mother Country.

In that connection let me point out that the port of Archangel during the Great War became a thriving centre, although it is seven hundred miles farther north than Port Nelson. When the Black Sea ports of Russia were closed it became necessary to have maritime communication farther north and at the close of the war Archangel had a population of

46,000. And I repeat this fact again for I want hon. members to give it particular notice, that this port is seven hundred miles farther north than Port Nelson.

It has been asked, what effect would the operation of the Hudson Bay railway have upon our National railway system as a whole. It seems to me that when we consider that there is tributary to this route a vast area rich in undeveloped agricultural and mineral wealth, the completion of this railway cannot be other than beneficial to our national system of transportation. It is worthy of note that the tar sands alone in that northern country contain great potential wealth. I noticed in the newspaper quite recently that a sample of these tar sands was taken to the United States, and in competition with similar products from all other parts of the United States and Canada it carried off the first prize. We do not know what vast wealth we have in this country; we have only touched the fringe of it. We know, for instance, that it is very rich in oil. There is a great oil gusher in the Fort Norman district. For a short time after it was discovered the flow gradually decreased and it became evident that the well had been blocked up. It has since been opened up again and is now a strong flowing well, I understand. When a country so little explored shows such indications, what vast mineral wealth may there not be awaiting development? If this country is opened up and settled as its climatic conditions show it can be settled—because we are told the snowfall is much less there than around Winnipeg and the cold is no greater—I see no reason whatever why it should not be a rich traffic producer for the local railway, which in turn will enure to the advantage of our national system generally. Probably some hon. members will remember that some years ago the Canadian Pacific Railway directors strongly objected to railways being built from the United States into Canada. Those lines were completed, and I believe it is a fact that now the Canadian Pacific Railway Company find those railways are an advantage to them. May it not be so too with the Canadian National railways in relation to the completion and operation of the Hudson Bay railway?

I believe those living along the St. Lawrence river especially the people of the port of Montreal, where a great deal of our grain is handled, are somewhat perturbed over the development of this project because they believe it is going to injure their port. I am very doubtful indeed if the Hudson bay route will have any detrimental effect on the business of the port of Montreal. Its only effect, I am inclined to think, will be to draw traffic from the United States. Is it not strange that with the St. Lawrence route open to the sea 65 per cent of our Canadian grain passes through American channels? Why is it so? Let us look at this feature for a moment. In 1913 Canal Statistics, a government publication had this to say:

> The rate Fort William to Buffalo and New York—

That is, New York by Buffalo.

> —was 8.796 cents per bushel. the rate Fort William to Montreal at the same time was 6.341 cents per bushel, an advantage to Montreal of 2.455 cents, and yet ten times as much of our Canadian grain went through Buffalo to New York as passed through Montreal.

Why is that so? Is it not natural it should take the line of least resistance? I will tell you. At that time, and this is what usually happens under normal conditions, the grain flows to New York because there is greater space in the boats from New York to Liverpool than in the boats from Montreal to Liverpool. At times the advantage in the ocean rate is sufficient to overcome that amount of 2.455 cents, and that is the reason that our grain passes through American channels. This is the point I wish to make. Just a very slight advantage, that difference of less than three cents, is sufficient to call to American ports 65 per cent of our Canadian grain at the present time. Now, though it is impossible to say exactly what will be gained by opening up the Hudson bay route, is it not possible that the advantage will be sufficient to draw that traffic from the United States? If we can save four cents it can be done, and the greater part of 65 per cent of our Canadian grain that passes through American channels to-day will be drawn to the Hudson bay.

I am quite convinced that Montreal will always be a live port, but there is this disadvantage at the present time. The Farm and Ranch Review pointed out some little time ago that there was danger of over-production. It gave the acreage of western Canada particularly, and pointed out that if we had a reasonable crop in any one year, with no large tracts being dried up or otherwise injured, we would have a crop and an exportable surplus that no country in the world had ever produced, that could not be consumed by Europe, and could not be handled by our present outlets. They would be glutted, and that would be disastrous. That may or may not be so, but I am convinced that with a fair chance the western provinces are going to produce much more grain than they have in the past, and you know what took place last year, that whereas grain was carried the year previous for 2½ cents a bushel, last year

the charge was 8 cents, and whereas for several years the cost to Montreal was from 4 to 4½ and 5 cents, last year at one time it went to 20 cents. There is the disaster that comes from having a bottle with too small a mouth. If you are going to increase our production in the West, is it not necessary, even though Montreal handles as much grain as it now does, even though the Pacific route is going to be opened up—is it not necessary to have a third outlet? I think it is.

I would like to meet a few objections. One is this. Some ask, where are you going to get a return cargo? You have not a population in that northern country, and for some years there will be very little return cargo. Let me point out this: Montreal has no large return cargoes in comparison with the amount shipped out. Canada ships out four tons for every one brought this way across the Atlantic. That means that even at the present time three out of every four vessels must come back across the Atlantic empty, or else the four vessels must return with quarter-cargoes. How much difference is there then? Is there any great disadvantage for the Hudson bay route in that respect? I think not, and it is quite apparent that with the development that will take place in the northern country considerable return cargoes can be brought back. That is something that must be developed.

The hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) made the statement that the advantage of the thousand miles saved—that is about the difference between Fort William and Montreal, and I would point out that that is a most difficult part of the route—was nearly all lost by the slow progress through the Hudson straits. I I would ask if that is any slower than the rate of progress of the boats that must pass through the 44 miles of canal in the St. Lawrence river, or go through the Welland canal or the St. Clair flats or the Soo canal? That is the more difficult and the more circuitous route. Surely by the Hudson bay route, with plenty of depth, with no canals, and wide open water for four months in the year, the progress will be greater, and therefore instead of the advantage being lessened by that route, it will be increased and mean a saving of perhaps 1,200 or 1,500 miles.

Remarks have been made by two or three hon. members that we ought to go slow in this matter, that we ought to take a year or two to investigate. Well, we have been twenty-five or thirty years investigating it already. Surely that is going slow enough. The idea of taking two years more to investigate I have no sympathy with, although it is a very good scheme for chloroforming the whole project. I see no need for any further investigation except of one particular point, and that is which is the better port, Fort Churchill or Port Nelson. That could be ascertained in a very few months, and I think it should be done as quickly as possible.

I shall not dwell upon the wisdom of spending a few more millions after $21,000,000 has already been spent on this project as that has already been touched upon. I pass on.

I have something that is a little bit new. It may be a little bit prosy because I shall have to read it. Some years ago Earl Grey made a trip to this northern country in order to investigate, and he was accompanied by a correspondent of the London Times. This correspondent on his return gave an address in the city of Toronto, from which I wish to give a few extracts. Objections have been taken to this project at times by men who are opposed to it because of selfish interests, and by men who living nearby are perhaps biassed, but surely that cannot be said of a correspondent of one of the world's greatest dailies and a man living in Great Britain. I think his evidence and opinion should be taken as worth something. He says:

> Now, I might, perhaps, begin by reminding you that the Hudson bay route is not a new experiment; for very nearly a century that was the predominant trade route to the west of the continent. You may remember that there was a period, lasting very nearly fifty years, of the acutest commercial rivalry between the Hudson's Bay Company and the North West Fur Company, with headquarters at Montreal. During that long struggle the Hudson's Bay Company enjoyed the advantage of being able to get goods to the interior about a month earlier than their rivals.

Further on he says:

> Franklin went by that route on his great exploration trips, and the description he left applies admirably to what we saw on our trip down there the other day. It was by that route that the British troops—infantry, artillery and sappers—were sent in 1846 to help the Hudson's Bay Company guard the great frontier country of Manitoba against the possibility of American aggression.

Again he says:

> I believe from my observations that the present Far Northwest of Canada can be reached from Liverpool by the Hudson bay route quicker than from New York.
>
> Hudson bay affords a back door to this continent, which might be easily used by the British in case of imminent need, and possibly mean, again, the saving of the Northwest to Canada; and that route, which has been so important in the past, may, therefore, not be unimportant in the future.

Again he says:

> Still, I do not think we can say the question of the Hudson bay route is, as it has been regarded, of supreme importance to the prairie provinces alone. I maintain that if the route is opened up it will be of great national interest to Canada—to the whole of Canada—and of great imperial interest as well.

Further on he states:

Owing to the shape of the Globe, the distance from Liverpool to the western shores of Hudson bay is practically the same as the distance from Liverpool to Montreal, just under 3,000 nautical miles.

One or two more extracts and I am through. He states further:

A ship ought to leave Churchill or Nelson the first week in November to get out the same year. As far as I can make out, the navigation of Hudson bay and straits is just as safe as navigation of the St. Lawrence.

At another point in his address he said:

This practically means that a ship could leave England before the middle of July, and with proper facilities for handling the traffic at Churchill or Nelson, could make three complete trips before the close of the season.

Again he states:

One other point in favour of this route might be mentioned here:

Now this is something entirely new, and hon. members can take it for what it is worth:

When the demand for harvest hands is at its height, instead of draining Ontario, they could be brought out from the Old Country in July by this route, work through the harvest, and return to England in the same season by the same route.

I now wish to read two or three extracts from a report containing the result of the explorations of Mr. Frank J. P. Crean, C.E., of the Railway Lands branch, Ottawa. After exploring 22,000,000 acres of country in northern Saskatchewan, Mr. Crean says:

It has been found that there are 3,000,000 acres of water, 5,000,000 of land suitable for settlement and 12,000,000 of wet land. The latter can all be drained and made good for settlement.

Further on in the booklet, which embodies his report, he says:

Many spendid gardens were seen and barley and oats grew to early maturity as far north as Lac La Loche, which is nearly 200 miles north of Prince Albert.

From another part of the booklet I cull the following:

There is an abundance of good hay land along the Sandy river. There is fertile land along the Buffalo lake and at La Loche lake the soil is very rich, being a heavy loam from 18 inches to greater depths. West of the height of land at Portage La Loche there is good soil and a large territory of good country.

I have one more extract to read and then I am through. There is this further statement in Mr. Crean's booklet:

The climate over the whole district is most favourable, the winters being no more severe than in the settled portions of Saskatchewan. The frost which damaged the grain in Saskatchewan in 1908 did not affect the grain and garden stuff in the north country at all. At Portage La Loche, the most northerly point reached by Mr. Crean, he saw potatoes on September 17 that had not been touched by the frost. He was struck by the variety of garden stuff that was grown in great profusion and with great success at all of the mission stations and the Hudson bay posts. The lakes began to freeze over on October 20, but this was followed by a warm spell and they were navigable for two weeks longer.

Mention has already been made of the necessity of encouraging those who are tilling the soil in the western country, and I think the fact that there is a shortage of money has also been referred to. Let me say that I cannot accept that as an excuse for not going ahead with the Hudson Bay railway. Neither can I accept it as an excuse for not building the branch lines. In view of the lavishness with which we have been voting money during the last few days hon. members opposite can hardly expect us to accept shortage of money as an excuse for not doing anything. Money is available in plenty to complete this line and in view of the fact that a great many of the appropriations which have passed in the last few days have been for public works in the eastern provinces I think we can well claim some consideration now for the provinces in the West—not as a matter of gift but as a right. I hope that hon. members generally will see the matter in that light and that they will not vote to further postpone the project under the plea of investigating it for another two or three years. Such a proposition is worth absolutely nothing. What we want is a hurried investigation of the relative merits of the two ports, and then a speedy completion of the line so that the twenty-one millions of expenditure already made will soon be earning money. I notice that when Sir Henry Thornton was travelling through the West he more than once took the view, in cases where money had already been expended on railway work in grading and so on, that it only seemed good business to make further expenditures in order to earn dividends on money that had already been laid out. That idea appeals to us as good business, and I hope it will be generally supported by the House.

Mr. C. WALLACE STEWART (Humboldt): I should like to make a short contribution to this debate. If all the hon. members in the group on this side of the House had had the same lengthy experience as some hon. gentlemen opposite and some hon. gentlemen to my right, I would hesitate to occupy time in trying to repeat arguments which I am aware have been placed before this House so often in the past. However, I have had but a very short parliamentary experience. Others of my colleagues have not served any longer in parliament. Such being the case I trust those hon. gentlemen who are familiar with the arguments that have been presented

during the present century, and indeed during the closing years of the previous century, will bear with me while I repeat some of these arguments and deal with the situation as it appears to me. In looking up the history of this movement I was struck with the number of times it had been debated in this House. While tracing the movement back I came upon a comment made by Hon. Thomas Greenway, a member of this House sixteen years ago, to this effect:

> I remember having had the honour of a seat on a committee of this House more than thirty years ago, when we took a good deal of evidence on this subject.

That would place the investigation referred to away back in the seventies, in the last century. I am not going to refer back that far. However, I went to the trouble of looking up in Hansard how many times this question had been debated in the House during the present century and I was somewhat surprised to find that it had been discussed over one hundred times—119 times to be exact. It was not always a full dress debate; sometimes the discussion was considerably shorter. At any rate the subject has been up many, many times and the arguments advanced in its favour may perhaps be termed old. They are none the less worthy of support. I think the time that has been spent on it to-day, and in past years, is well justified by reason of the growing importance which attaches to this project.

It means, as has already been emphasized, an additional outlet. I am not going to attempt to make larger than it really is the importance of another outlet, but I would ask you to consider this feature. Suppose that only one-tenth of the wheat crop that is grown in the prairie provinces is exported by this route, and suppose that only one-quarter of the sum that has been stated might be saved, what is the result? I believe it has been stated frequently that from 15 to 20 cents a bushel could be saved on the wheat carried over this route, but suppose one-third or one-quarter, say 5 cents a bushel, were saved on the tenth of the crop that might go out by this route, would it not, Sir, be a better paying proposition than any railway in Canada at the present time? I submit it would.

Then aside from the question of the outlet and a cheaper means of getting our crop to its ultimate market, there is the other question which I do not place second, but place alongside of that first, and that is the opening up of a new and valuable territory, the importance of which, I am glad to know has been very largely emphasized in the debate to-day. I refer again to the history of this project, and I note that when it really became of interest to this House, some 16 or 17 years ago, it was not a matter of political strife. Although that was not the beginning by any means, it had its resurrection at that particular time, about 1906 or 1907, because of certain facts relative to the necessity for another outlet and wider markets for the crop of western Canada at that time. There are members in the House who were at that time farming in western Canada, and who can well remember the difficulty there was in getting grain to market; how, particularly in the season of 1906, the railway facilities were utterly inadequate to remove the western crop, and there was great congestion at practically every point throughout the West. It was then this matter became a subject for debate, and the project was adopted by both old political parties as a necessity. I want to note a resolution that was passed in this House in July 1906 declaring that the construction of the Hudson Bay railway was necessary for the commerce of Canada and for the full development of our agricultural and other resources. That resolution was adopted by this House, and in the debate that followed it was shown that there was practically unanimity of opinion on the subject. I want to read a short extract from a speech by Sir George, then the Hon. Mr. Foster. Speaking to that resolution he said:

> I believe the time has come when the Hudson bay railway should be more than an academic question just to be talked of sympathetically. I believe it ought to be built and it cannot be built now any too soon;

Then speaking after Mr. Foster, the leader of the government of that day, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, made this comment:

> I agree altogether with what has been said by my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) that the time has come for the construction of this railway.

Perhaps hon. members might think there is very little use in going into ancient history, but I believe that these comments and these expressions should carry a certain weight with us at this time. Ten years after that the Hon. Mr. Hazen expressed himself as I would like to express myself at this time, in referring to this scheme. He said:

> The members of the House irrespective of party evidently thought that the scheme was practicable because both parties were pledged up to the hilt to build the Hudson bay railway.

And this House has reason for accepting their judgment as having some weight. Mr. Hazen continues:

I do not believe any policy would appeal so strongly to men of the intelligence of hon. members of this House unless there was merit back of it.

And so I think that is really a premise upon which we can build our argument at the present time if such a premise is required.

Now then coming to the present time, I am not going to attempt to express the opinion of any hon. member of this House who is capable of expressing his own opinion, and I presume every member is capable of doing that. I am very pleased to find so many expressing themselves as favourable to this movement. There has been a suspicion in the minds of a great many people in western Canada who are interested in the project that some of the members, perhaps not of the present government so much as of the government which dropped the work, were losing their interest, or perhaps had changed their minds with regard to the feasibility of this project. I have in my hand a letter published in a local newspaper in western Canada, the Melfort Journal, which purports to have been received by a resident of that town of Melfort from the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen). I wish to quote a paragraph or two of this letter from the leader of the Opposition. The letter reads:

The present government has involved the country in large sums much less justifiable than would be immediate completion of this outlet. I am opposed, and the Conservative party is opposed to the indefinite postponement of the execution of this work. Had it not been for the war we would have completed it long ago.

That letter is signed by the right hon. leader of the Opposition. I just offer that statement for what it is worth as I offered the quotations, from other hon. gentlemen's utterances of years ago. We will wait with very great interest for members of the government to express their attitude regarding this question.

Now the question naturally arises from the statement of the leader of the Opposition, who was at the time the work was discontinued, the leader of the government, as to why that work was discontinued. I have heard many rumours, of course, as I suppose every member from western Canada has, and probably members from every other part of Canada, regarding the reasons why the construction of that road was discontinued. I referred to Hansard for the years just preceding discontinuance of this work to see if I could find any good cause for abandoning the project at that particular time. In 1916 I find one of the earliest intimations regarding the possibility of not going ahead with the work, when the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Kyte) urged the government to discontinue work on the Hudson Bay road, to relieve the Finance Minister of further expenditure in that direction under the existing circumstances, the existing circumstances, of course, being the war that was then going on. Further, after perusing his speech at that particular time, I find that he based it largely upon a report that has been referred to very often during the debate this afternoon and evening, of Captain Anderson, that the project was not feasible. Then I think it was the year following that the report was handed to the government by a commission that was appointed to consider a number of subjects, and among others, that commission reported on this matter. I refer to the Drayton-Acworth Commission. Among other things it briefly summed up this matter as follows:

We recommend that future expenditures on the Hudson bay railroad be reduced to the lowest possible amount.

This was made the basis of a further attack upon the project. I am not going to quote at length the remarks of hon. gentlemen, but one of them who is a member of the House at the present time, the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), making an attack on the project based on that report, and criticizing the government of the day, said:

Hon. gentlemen are not honest with the people of this country when, after imposing taxation for the purposes of the war, they divert the money to building unnecessary works like the Hudson bay railroad.

I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, in the light of the facts that have been presented in the debate this afternoon as to the provision made for funds for the construction of this road, that that was not a fair criticism. Other attacks were made upon the project in that year, 1917, not going as far as the hon. member for Pictou went, but affirming that owing to the existing conditions, or words to that effect, it was inadvisable to expend more money on the Hudson Bay railway at that time. So apparently—for I can find no other reason—the government accepted the advice that was offered. Whether or not the conditions really did warrant such action, I am not prepared to state now. But if such conditions existed during the war, if the state of the public treasury was such that it was inadvisable to go ahead with the project, those conditions do not exist now. In the light of all the facts as they have been presented to the House during the last two sessions I feel that the people of western Canada are making a reasonable statement when they say that the time has now come to proceed with the completion

of this road and to make a sufficient expenditure on the harbour and docks at least to give the plan a fair trial, or to enable the experiment, as it has been called, to be made of shipping via that route. I am not one who would advise unlimited expenditure at this time on the harbour or on the railway; indeed, unlimited expenditure is not necessary on the railway, and I do not believe it is necessary on the harbour. A very small additional expenditure will make it possible to establish the value of that route as soon as suitable ships can be brought in to accept cargoes there.

I would like to say a few words with regard to the feasibility of the project. The ground was so well covered this afternoon that I shall cut out much of what I had in my notes on that phase of the subject, but there are just one or two points to which I wish to direct attention. The railroad is so nearly completed that it is not necessary to argue as to its feasibility. It is not so very many years since the question was raised in this House as to the practicability of building a railroad to Hudson bay. Nor is it much more than half a century since members of the Canadian parliament stated that it was not possible to lay steel across the continent in the construction of a transcontinental railway and make the undertaking a success. I ask you, then, to consider the arguments that are submitted as to the feasibility of this route.

As to the conditions in the bay, I am not a sea-going man; I am not a mariner, and consequently cannot make statements based on my own observations. I have never, I regret to say, visited the bay, but I have read reports made by men of long experience in those waters. I would like to quote from a report to which reference has already been made, that of J. A. J. McKenna, submitted to the Department of the Interior. One paragraph will suffice to sum up his opinion of the feasibility of the bay and straits route. It says:

> In the course of a century and three-quarters, 750 vessels ranging from 70-ton ships to 10-ton pinnaces, crossed the ocean, passed through the straits, and sailed the bay in the service of the company.

That is, the Hudson's Bay Company.

> Only two were lost—a marvellous record when it is remembered that all the craft were sailers and most of them small and of rude construction, and that the bay and strait afforded them none of the modern accessories to navigation in the way of coast aids.

I had occasion, Sir, to speak to a resolution similar to this last year, and at that time I expressed the conviction that Port Nelson was perhaps, not the proper port for the terminal of this road. But in the year that has elapsed I have searched the available records much further and I now believe that we make no mistake in urging that the road be built into Port Nelson. Should the time ever come when Port Nelson could not accommodate all the traffic that offered, there would still be the other port, which some hold to be a better natural port—Fort Churchill. The building of a few more miles of railroad would then make two ports available instead of one. But as the rails are now directed toward Port Nelson and a great deal of money has been expended there, I think the road should be built to that port as soon as possible. Port Nelson was chosen after great deliberation. In 1913, after a conference between Captain Bernier, Captain Bartlett—who has been mentioned as an authority in this matter—and the then Minister of Railways, the Hon. Frank Cochrane, Port Nelson was decided upon as the terminal. These gentlemen all had not only a theoretical knowledge of but practical experience in connection with the conditions there. The minister had visited the bay; the other two were sea-going captains who had had many years of Arctic experience. Port Nelson was regarded as the more desirable of the two ports, not only by reason of its more southerly location, but also because of its more favourable approaches from a navigation standpoint.

I have a few statements regarding Port Nelson which I would like to place before the House. A search of the records regarding the surveys of that port and the soundings made there shows that there is a deep water channel at least one-third of a mile wide up the middle of the estuary and separated from the shore by wide tidal flats over which the water is from one to three feet deep at low tide. The channel is 15 miles to deep water in the bay proper. The Hon. Mr. Hazen, then Minister of Marine and Fisheries, stated in answer to a question that without dredging at high water vessels drawing from 20 to 25 feet could safely go into Port Nelson. I will offer further testimony along that line in a moment. Later the Hon. Mr. Reid stated:

> The channel is quite safe with a depth of never less than 19 feet and from one-half mile widening to 15 miles at the mouth, and there is a rise of 15 feet with the tide.

I call your attention, Sir, to the fact that these statements were made before any dredging had been done in the channel. It is further established, I believe, that with the exception of a few bars across the channel, a much greater depth of water is there naturally than the 19 feet mentioned, and that by dredging out these few bars—which are clay bars not sand bars—the channel can be made to

accommodate an ordinary ocean-going steamer. Here are two illustrations showing what has been possible in the past in the navigation of that channel. The steamer Minto with a draught of 20 feet was twice into the place where the harbour works are now being carried on, previous to any dredging work having been done at all. At the time this steamer entered the channel there were no buoys to mark the course, and yet no trouble was experienced. Again, in 1914, two coal ships from England, each of 22 feet draught, entered the port, or approximately to the point where the harbour is now located. These facts bear out the statements that already have been made as to the existence of a natural channel through that estuary. I should like to refer to one other point, bearing not so much on the port as on the navigability of the straits and the bay. The hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) made a statement which showed that he was not altogether acquainted with the facts. At any rate, the statements I have are entirely contradictory of what he said this afternoon. The hon. member stated that fogs were a great detriment to navigation in the bay and straits. A statement made by Captain J. Hackland would seem to contradict the hon. member's assertion. Captain Hackland stated that navigation in Hudson bay and the straits is not dangerous. There are, he says, no shoals and there are very few fogs. Let me quote what he says:

During sixteen years of navigation of the bay—

Observe, he makes this statement after sixteen years' experience of actual navigation in the bay.

—we were never impeded by fogs.

As to icebergs, I will simply give two quotations from the report which the hon. member had in his hand, that is, Captain Anderson's report. The report states:

Many icebergs were seen and dense fogs prevailed off the Labrador coast.

I would draw the attention of the House to the fact that these same icebergs, and fogs of similar origin, are encountered by all ships that take the north Atlantic course, while no icebergs are encountered in the bay. This statement would seem to bear out the contention that fogs are not encountered in the bay either. In the same report we find this statement:

After passing the strait the weather was clear and very few fogs were encountered.

Now, to turn to the other aspect of the question, which I have placed second in order but which I by no means regard as being of secondary importance, namely, the development of the resources of the country lying adjacent to the route traversed by the railroad. I want to quote from an hon. member of this House who on one occasion gave expression to sentiments in which I heartily concur. The member for Saskatoon, Mr. George McCraney in the year 1907, stated that he believed, altogether apart from the benefits of transportation which the Hudson Bay road would give us, the opening up of that country would be sufficient remuneration for anything we might spend in that connection. I think that if we make a search, not of theories or suppositions, but of the actual records available in the various departments of government here after surveys and exploring expeditions have been made, we shall be convinced of the truth of this statement. I want, first of all, to refer to the fisheries of the bay itself. I think I can briefly sum up what I believe to be the truth regarding the fisheries of the bay in short extracts from three reports that were made in the year 1914. In that year three expeditions were sent to Hudson bay to investigate the fisheries. One took the western shore and the waters adjacent thereto, another the eastern shore and the waters adjacent, and the third James bay and its waters. In the report of the first, Mr. C. D. Melville, officer in charge of the survey work, in his summary states:

1. The question of railroads is of paramount importance.

May I, Sir, read that over as having a direct bearing on the present discussion. In the first statement in his summary of his investigations Mr. Melville states that the question of railroads is of paramount importance. To proceed:

With transportation provided for there can be little doubt that the white fish fishery will prove to be one of the greatest in Canada and with its development the other fisheries will become of immense value.

In a footnote he states that it had proved profitable to send fish to Winnipeg, Chicago, and other points in central Canada and the United States from Prince Rupert, the headquarters of the northern Pacific fisheries, which is 1,745 miles from Winnipeg. And by actual mileage, Port Nelson would not be over one-half of that distance from these centres. I might further point out that if the Ontario government goes ahead with the project it has in view at this time, of connecting the south of James bay with a direct railway to Toronto, it would place these fisheries practically at the doors of the greater cities of eastern Canada. The second expedition—the Burleigh expedition—which investigated the western shore, reports as follows through the officer in charge:

As will be seen the season was an abnormally late one which left me a very short time for work. I regret this very much as I am sure that the south eastern shore would have proved to be of greater value in fisheries than the western portion although the latter is very promising. It would take one full season to investigate this properly.

In regard to the third expedition further south into the bay, I take one paragraph from the summary by Mr. A. R. M. Lower, who states:

It is not too much to predict that some time in the future the supply of fish that comes from the salt water of the north will be as constant and plentiful as that which at present is yielded by our great inland lakes.

His qualification as to "some time in the future" was apparently, in his mind, based upon the necessity for quick transportation. Water transportation is not expeditious enough to bring fish fresh to the inland markets; it requires fast train service. The fisheries I claim are of vast importance and are worth developing; and the railroad, I believe, would be justified if for no other reason than that it would develop this industry. But we have had pointed out to us already the vast water-powers that are available on the Hudson bay slope; and the minerals have been referred to. The argument has been advanced that the expense of developing these water powers at the sites located on the Nelson river would make the undertaking prohibitive. I think there would be a great demand for the power that could be developed there; and with that point in view, and because of certain inquiries I have had regarding the available power, not of course amounting to thousands or millions of horsepower, I went to the department to secure the results of a survey made on a tributary to the Nelson and which parallels the railroad for many miles. I want to place before the House the results of a survey made in 1917 of that particular tributary, the Grass river, and the power available thereon. The Grass river runs almost parallel with the present line of the Hudson Bay railway, and at no point are the sites where power could be developed on the Grass river more than 20 miles from railway stations or sidings. There were five sites surveyed, none of them tremendous, but all large enough to be of commercial value, especially to those requiring power that could be developed cheaply. The first site is sixteen miles from the railway, and the power estimated, at 80 per cent efficiency, is 1,640 horse-power. The second site is twenty miles from the railway and the estimated power, on the same percentage basis, is 2,450 horse power. The third site is seven miles from the railway, and the power that can be developed on the 80 per cent efficiency basis is given at 2,180 horsepower. The fourth site, seven miles from the railroad, is capable of a development, on the same basis of efficiency, of 4,860 horse-power. and the fifth site, ten miles from the railroad, has power possibilities of 4,250 horse-power.

I stated that I had asked for the result of the surveys because of a certain letter that I had received from an improvement and production supply company asking for figures as to the power available and the possibilities of securing a charter to develop power to run a flour mill there to mill grain and ship the flour and other products to the European market.

Mr. WALLACE: Do those figures represent the minimum flow?

Mr. STEWART (Humboldt): I think so. One further point. In regard to agricultural land, I have an illustration to offer to the House as to the possibilties of agricultural land in that particular vicinity. I am not going to make any statement in regard to those lands that are already available as soon as transportation is provided to the district. But it has been stated, I think by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Millar), that there were at least 12,000,000 acres of land that could be drained and made available for agriculture. I believe, Sir, that those are among the best agricultural lands that we have in western Canada once they are properly drained. That may seem to be looking into the future, but it is not looking so very far ahead. I went to the Reclamation branch of the Department of the Interior and secured certain figures in this connection. They have made surveys and have a project before them at the present time which taps this very district. It is an area known as the Moose range and Carrot river triangle. The apex of this triangle points right to The Pas, the town where the railroad starts. In this territory there are 125,000 square miles of land which at the present time is not suitable for agricultural purposes because of lack of drainage. The reports of the surveys which have been very carefully carried out show that this land can be reclaimed and will make the very richest agricultural soil. I do not need to emphasize to western members at least that the Carrot river lands are the very best in all western Canada, in fact I do not think that anywhere in Canada or probably in the world is there such a deep black loam as in the Carrot river country. This triangle of 125,000 square miles can, according to the figures of our own Reclamation branch, be reclaimed

10 p.m.

and made fit for agricultural purposes at a cost of approximately $2.50 per acre.

Mr. CAHILL: Does the Hudson Bay railway run through this land?

Mr. STEWART (Humboldt): It touches it at The Pas.

Mr. CAHILL: Is not this triangle west of the Hudson Bay railway?

Mr. STEWART (Humboldt): Yes. I was not referring to this as land that the Hudson Bay railway would particularly serve; I was simply citing it as an illustration. Farther north there is land similar to this, referred to by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Millar), containing about 12,000,000 acres, which require drainage. I was offering this as something not theoretical but regarding which we have definite data. It is so definite, Sir, that although the Department of the Interior after securing those figures did not deem it advisable to go ahead with the work, the province of Saskatchewan accepted the figures and have, I believe, reached an agreement with the department to proceed, either this year or at no distant date, on their surveys and drain at least a part of that Carrot river triangle in order to make it suitable for farming operations.

I think, then, it will be readily admitted from the statement which I read, and which I heartily concur in, that the natural resources themselves justify the building of this road. If they justified the building of this road many years ago when it was undertaken and $20,000,000 expended, certainly they justify a further expendture now of another $4,000,000 or $5,000,000 to complete that road and so make profitable the capital investment.

I hinted some few moments ago that there were suspicions in the minds of a great many people in the West as to the reasons why this road was not being completed. I have in my hand a letter which appeared in the correspondence columns of the Saskatoon Daily Star of February 21st, in which the writer airs his suspicions that sectional or political interests are holding up and delaying the completion of this road. Now, Sir, I do not endorse the statements made by this correspondent, but I wish to bring it particularly to the attention of the government that these suspicions do exist and that it is necessary for the satisfaction of the people of western Canada that they should be dispelled. I am delighted with the sentiments that have been expressed in this debate, and I am sure that when the speeches are read by the people of western Canada those suspicions will in a very large measure be dispelled. But to show how this particular correspondent feels in regard to this matter let me quote a passage from his letter. He says:

> We know the East is against the completion of the Hudson bay road.

I am very glad that certain eastern members have expressed themselves plainly and emphatically to the contrary but I should like to add a word to the point emphasized by the hon. member for Nelson (Mr. Bird) when he spoke of the psychological effect of the completion of this road to the bay. The people of western Canada feel that its completion is their due. They are not so provincial as not to watch with careful eyes the voting of public moneys in the present session as well as in past sessions, and they are aware that in the past week, for example, we have voted estimates running into millions of dollars to provide transportation ways and means for farming communities located along our lakes and rivers in eastern Canada. We in this section of the House, Sir, could not very well try to hinder the placing of harbours, wharves, breakwaters and other necessary accommodation for the farming people of Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island because we realize that such accommodation is indeed essential, and I think it was very noticeable that the members of this group did not raise any serious objection to these votes. But I would remind the government that the people of western Canada, as I said a moment ago, fully realize that these means of transportation are being provided year by year, and that next year other requirements of a similar nature will probably have to be provided for, and therefore they feel that they too should have absolutely necessary wharves and harbours supplied to them. I was amazed, Sir, when I turned to the appropriations for Manitoba for harbours and rivers not to see its greatest port mentioned —Port Nelson. I thought possibly that a special vote might be found somewhere in the estimates, but I could not find anything for that important harbour. Such omissions are not having a good effect upon the people of western Canada.

I have based my arguments very, very largely upon statements that have already been made in this House, but I doubt, Sir, if sounder statements can be found anywhere on this subject, and I want to make one further quotation to sum up my attitude. It is contained in a speech made by Sir Wilfrid Laurier when criticism was advanced early in the history of this project. He stated

> The future of Canada is too great for any one part of its territory to be hurt by the development of the routes of commerce of any other part.

We need to rise to that viewpoint at this present time and realize that we are not hurting any other part of Canada, but only giving its just due to that part which possesses this great outlet. I think it is a significant fact of history that the man, Sir Henry Hudson, who gave his name to the great bay on which the port of Nelson lies also gave his name to the river in the republic to the south of us, which has the second greatest city in the world and one of the greatest ports of the world, and I, Sir, am one of those like the hon. member for Strathcona (Mr. Warner) who preceded me in this debate, who having read our great explorer Stefansson have become enthused with some of his sentiments, and I endorse his statement that the trend of Empire is northward, and if already a great city and a great port is on the river bearing the name of Hudson, there also will be, and I hope in my time and your time, Mr. Speaker, a great city and a great port on the bay which also bears his name.

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Acting Minister of Railways and Canals): I really do not know that I can add anything to this debate, no matter on which side of it I talk. One of the difficulties with which we are confronted is that our numbers are so few and our needs so many. We are heavily taxed—at least, we say we are, though I submit that we have a good deal to learn about taxation compared with many other countries.

Let me approach this question not from the east or from the west, but by keeping in the middle of the road. As a matter of fact, we will never get anywhere as a nation if we cannot get close enough together to talk about Canada as a whole, and not of one particular part of it. Sometimes it is difficult to adhere to that plan of argument, but we ought to let it go through the world that we are united for the welfare of the whole country, and that whatever is best for all Canada is what we are after. I will go further than that and say that generally speaking, although there may be exceptions, what is good for any part is good for the whole.

This resolution of my hon. friend (Mr. Knox) calls for two things:

> That in the opinion of this House, the government of Canada give further consideration to the report of the Senate committee on the Hudson bay railway with a view to safeguarding the investment of public moneys made in the construction of that portion of the work completed to date—

And secondly:

> —that the government recognize the priority of this undertaking with reference to other transportation projects started subsequent to the Hudson bay railway.

I do not know to what projects my hon. friend would refer, but this I do know, that hon. gentlemen who insist that this situation has not anything to do with branch line construction have my sympathy, because we are discussing the Hudson bay route without any reference to branch line policy. The only connection there can be between the two is this, that it takes money to build either or both. In securing grants from our Finance Minister we can go to a certain limit and no further, and we all agree that we are going a long way towards getting at our own pockets in our taxation.

It is a difficult situation with which we are confronted, and particularly do I find it a difficult one. I am asked for the time being at least, to sponsor in this House the Canadian National Railways. The majority of parliament at least are in favour of giving the Canadian National Railways a chance. Now, with no special reference to the Hudson bay project, some things are suggested to me that will not help give the Canadian National Railways a fair chance. Our whole question of transportation is a bit difficult so far as expansion is concerned, and just at this point let me give expression to an opinion of my own. It is this, that in inaugurating transportation projects, two things might be kept in view, and in some cases only one. The government of a country owes it to the people of that country to supply them so far as possible with the means of making their calling a success. It cannot do it altogether, because there are some people you cannot make successful. Providence did not start them out right, or if so, they spoiled themselves. But so far as a government can, it ought to use its best endeavours to make a success of their occupations. That might mean, and I want to call the attention of the House as representing all Canada to this, that the government would be called on to construct railways that would not and could not pay their way for years, but it might at the same time be in the interest of all Canada that certain parts of the country should be developed and certain people given an opportunity to make a livelihood. In that connection the opinion I want to express is this, that parliament ought not to ask the Canadian National Railways to accept the responsibility for deficits that must ensue for years, but if we know that certain projects are necessary and wise and in the interests of all Canada, then the parliament of all Canada ought to accept the responsibility for the construction of those projects and the meeting of their deficits, and not

have the Canadian National Railways Board charged with them.

I think that the debate to-day has covered more territory and has been as instructive, to put it mildly, as any previous debate we have ever had on this subject. The members who have spoken have shown that they have read a good deal. They have been in the Library quite frequently, I can see that. They have done their utmost to secure the data which would assist them in placing the case as they saw it before this House.

I am not going to argue with any person, but I would like to make a reference to the Welland canal as that has been mentioned by one or two members. I plead guilty to several things, if guilt there be attached, and one of these is the beginning of the surveys for the enlarging of the Welland canal. I did so not for eastern Canada but for western Canada and at the request and after urgent petitions and deputations of men engaged on the plains in grain growing that we should enlarge the Welland canal so as to reduce if possible the rate of transportation from the head of the Great Lakes to the seaboard. The Welland canal is not for the East; it is not for the West; it is for all Canada, and that is the way I think hon. gentlemen ought to accept that expenditure. Had it not been for our great West, what would we have had to induce us to enlarge the Welland canal? It was the wheat, the product of the western prairies, that first impelled the government to begin the enlargement of the Welland canal, and when that is finished I believe that it will afford some relief even if the St. Lawrence be not deepened for some little time, by allowing the larger cargoes to go many miles further east before being trans-shipped to smaller vessels and canalized to the city of Montreal.

It has been said that lands were appropriated for the Hudson Bay railway. I always hesitate to deal with a statute, not being of the legal brotherhood myself, but I want to present this to the House as I see it, so that we shall be clear as to what took place. In the statute of 1906 the following appears as subsection C of section 6:

Make a free grant of land, not exceeding in extent six thousand four hundred acres for each mile of railway within Manitoba, and not exceeding in extent twelve thousand eight hundred acres for each mile beyond the limits of Manitoba, in aid of the construction of a railway from some point on the Canadian Pacific railway to Hudson bay;

Mr. MEIGHEN: Would the minister read the first part of the section?

Mr. GRAHAM: Oh, yes.

[Mr. Graham.]

The Governor in Council may make a free grant of land, etc.

That covers the point which I think I wish to make. It provides in this statute that the Governor in Council can make a free grant of land for the construction of the Hudson bay project from a point on the Canadian Pacific railway. That was in 1906. So it is very manifest that the Governor in Council, in 1906, was given power, at least, to appropriate large areas of land for the construction of a railway from somewhere on the Canadian Pacific to Hudson bay. Now if we look at the statute passed in 1908—known as the Dominion Lands Act—we find that under section 27 the right was given for a homesteader to purchase a pre-emption, and while nothing is said about the Hudson Bay railway, or any portion of it, the debates in the House would indicate that the government had in mind at that time the idea of selling these pre-emptions and taking the money—or a portion of it at least—for the construction of the Hudson Bay railway, rather than granting such a company, or any company a free grant of land for that purpose. Consequently this act of 1908, as I understand it, repeals the act of 1906 so far as the Hudson Bay railway is concerned.

One hon. gentleman opposite—referring to the remarks of Mr. Oliver, who was in 1908 a member of the government—I think I need not repeat those remarks—has made it clear in the discussion of the matter by Mr. Oliver that it was the intention of the government first to allow the Governor in Council to make a land grant in 1906 to any company to build a railway to Hudson bay; but that in 1908 that act was repealed, in so far as it referred to the land grant, and provided for the sale of pre-emptions, with the explanation of Mr. Oliver particularly, as reported in Hansard, that the money from those pre-emptions might well be taken for the construction of the Hudson Bay railway. Now Sir, I think there could be no question that there was in the mind of parliament—at least the idea was expressed as fairly as it could be without putting the words in the statute—that certain lands might be sold and the money received from those lands as pre-emptions used to construct the Hudson Bay railway.

I am not going at all into the question of the feasibility of the navigation of the straits, or the question of the proper port, except to say this, that during the time that I had the honour of being a member of the Laurier administration I thought we had that question fairly well investigated; and I have yet to find an engineer who will accept the responsibility

of saying to the government or to the department, or at least has said, that Churchill is preferable to Nelson. I think the government that followed us found the same situation and selected Nelson, largely on the data I had procured and the reports made to me when I was Minister of Railways. In addition to that, other investigations took place. I think my successor, the Hon. Mr. Cochrane, went to Hudson bay himself and was firmly convinced that Nelson was the proper port, and for this reason: If a great amount of traffic were to be developed, Nelson provides greater facilities and greater opportunity for the development of a large harbour than does Churchill. As I am informed, Churchill at the present time might provide a harbour for small traffic, but could not be developed without very great expense into a larger harbour. But Nelson provides all the opportunities for developing a harbour—I would not say to an unlimited extent but to a much greater degree than Churchill.

Now it has been argued, and I will just dwell a moment on this point, that deep water could not be obtained at Nelson. There is deep water at Nelson a few yards from shore and, under the plans that were adopted by the government, an artificial island has been under construction having connection with the shore. This will provide for the construction of a dock that, with the carrying out of a comparatvely small amount of dredging, will permit vessels drawing 26 feet of water to come alongside.

As to the railway itself the history of the whole project is fresh in the minds of most hon. members. Just here I may say that when I was at home yesterday I came across a relic that reminded me that I had turned the first sod for the Hudson bay project—that is beyond The Pas; I found the spade in my library with which I had done it. It is many years since the Hudson bay project was first mooted.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Before the minister gets to the history of the railway will he mind answering this if he can—I would like the information: If the road were completed now to Port Nelson could tests be made of the feasibility of the route without a very large expenditure being first made in the harbour? That is to say, is the harbour in such a condition now that a small amount of traffic could take place, if boats could be found to take care of shipments at Port Nelson?

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not think it would be feasible for grain, for example, without quite a large expenditure. I am of the opinion it would take quite a large expenditure before any real test could be made—I mean in the harbour at the wharf.

Mr. MEIGHEN: How much?

Mr. GRAHAM: I have not made an estimate of that. It would take about nine millions and some odd dollars more to complete the harbour without the elevator according to the plan; but as ships come in—and ships have come and gone—possibly a test may be made with less expenditure than that. The sum mentioned would be for complete facilities, excepting the elevator which, of course, is necessary for the shipping of grain. Now to return to the point upon which I had entered, I think it is Hugh Sutherland's name that I find first connected with the Hudson Bay railway. Later a line was built from Hudson bay junction to Pas Mission, and was extended towards the Saskatchewan river. The first thing to be done on the line was to build a bridge across the Saskatchewan river. I think it was in 1911 that the contract was let for the first 187 miles. Now, as in the case of the Welland canal, I must plead guilty, if guilt there be, to having signed that contract. Up to date there have been constructed 332 miles. The line to mile 214 has been operated during the past year. From mile 214 to mile 332 has not been operated for some time. At mile 355 at Split lake we come to the point where the route either to Nelson or to Churchill could be established. In the surveys as made that was the point of divergence taken and the difference in distance from The Pas to Churchill and from The Pas to Nelson was some 60 miles, if I remember correctly. Now the addition of that 60 miles was estimated by the engineers to cost $4,000,000. In addition to the construction would be the continuous operation and upkeep of that extra 60 miles. But it has been stated recently that the line running down towards Port Nelson might be used, and then branch off and go to Churchill, instead of making the divergence at Split lake. As to that I am not in a position to say. All the estimates made by the engineers dealt with the line from mile 355. The line has been constructed to Nelson river. A bridge has been constructed across what is known as, I think, Kettle river. Further on there is no steel. About 30 miles down is the head of navigation on the Nelson river. Some have suggested that the road might be constructed down the 30 miles, so that the benefits of navigation up and down the Nelson might be obtained first. That suggestion is worthy of investigation.

The present situation is this: The government has no idea of abandoning the Hudson Bay railway, but we have to go slowly—perhaps I should not use that word after the addresses we have heard to-night—but we have to go carefully and with caution. The position of the second 118 miles at the present time is almost as if it had never been constructed. I believe—and I propose to make this recommendation—that we ought to proceed to put that second 118 miles in such shape that it could be operated, and to rescue some million dollars worth of material —I do not mean to take it out, but to rescue it—and put into workable shape, that 118 miles of line. Now you will ask why we wanted to take the rails out. Well there was a report made by the board prior to the coming of Sir Henry Thornton suggesting that these 80 pound rails might be taken out for the present and used for branch lines that were being hardly pressed for, but on his arrival Sir Henry Thornton made the suggestion that we had better have more investigation before we removed that material, because, to begin with, in order to get the line in condition to move that material over it, a good many thousand dollars would have to be expended; so that at the present time Sir Henry Thornton's advice is—and I have discussed it with him—that we proceed to expend an amount of money to begin the work of putting that 118 miles, which is now practically out of business, into respectable operating condition to-day. To put it in first class condition would take a great deal of money, but I am going to ask my colleagues to allow me to bring down an item for the purpose of beginning the work at least of putting that 118 miles in condition, so that, along the line where there are poles, nuts, ties and fish-plates and all that kind of thing, we can save all this material, level up and re-align the rails, and straighten up the trestles and bridges that have become warped for lack of care for the last three or four years. Of course that will take some time and some money, but when that is done we will be in position to discuss what is the next step to take.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): How many miles would that give of continuous line?

Mr. GRAHAM: If it were all in operation it would make 332 miles. I think the first duty of the government to the country is to place that 118 miles in repair again. When that is completed we can decide what the next step will be.

In the meantime I assure the House that so far as the government is concerned they have never suggested, so far as I have any knowledge, the abandonment of the Hudson Bay project.

Mr. M. N. CAMPBELL (Mackenzie): In discussing the question before the House it should not be necessary at all to deal with the feasibility of the Hudson bay route as that was established long ago to the satisfaction of two different governments and of two different political parties. However, because certain influences seem to be at work to discredit the scheme and sow suspicion in the minds of the people of the country, I crave the indulgence of the House for a few minutes while I deal with some of the reasons which persuaded the Laurier government in 1907 to undertake the construction of the Hudson Bay railway, and the reasons which convinced the Borden government, in 1912, to continue the work started by their predecessors in office. The saving in distance from Saskatoon to Liverpool by Hudson bay over the Montreal route would be no less than 1,218 miles. It would place the western prairies as near tide water as their competitors the Argentine, Australia and southern Russia. A few days ago this House voted a sum of five million dollars to increase the grain facilities at Vancouver. Let me point out that from Edmonton to Vancouver the distance is 770 miles, Edmonton to Port Nelson is 1,057. With higher freight rates for the mountain it would cost about the same rate to Vancouver as to Nelson. The distance from Nelson to Liverpool is 2,966 miles, from Vancouver to Liverpool it is 8,530. This means a saving by the Hudson bay of 5,564 miles. In addition, there are the canal tolls to pay via the Panama route, and I believe the danger to the grain from excessive heat is at least equal to the danger from navigation difficulties on the northern route.

I would not have my hon. friends from British Columbia think that I am in any way opposing that route; on the contrary I am delighted to see it opened and I feel that we need every available channel to get our grain out in proper time. I do not look on the Hudson bay as a competitor to existing routes. Indeed, I believe the day would come when it would be a valuable feeder to existing transportation systems. During the navigable season of 1921 85,000,000 bushels of our grain passed out through the United States. During the past season, 1922, no less than 129,000,000 bushels of Canadian wheat went to Europe through the United States ports. This is sufficient to prove that the present routes are not able to handle our crop. There is another reason why we are anxious that as little as possible of our wheat

should go out through American channels. We are afraid, indeed we are very suspicious, that in transit through the United States our wheat is being mixed and its high quality lost and we are, therefore, anxious to preserve the identity of our Canadian wheat on account of its undoubted high quality.

Furthermore, I believe that by developing every available Canadian route, we can in the future not only prevent our Canadian wheat going to Europe through American ports, but we can secure for our Canadian ports a very considerable quantity of American wheat. It is nearly twenty years ago that J. J. Hill told a delegation of North Dakota farmers that the day might come when their wheat would go to Europe through Hudson bay, and in examining the mileage it looks quite probable. The distance from Grand Forks to Liverpool via New York is 4,802 miles; from Grand Forks to Liverpool via Hudson bay, 3,632 miles, a saving of 1,170 miles. From Havre, Montana to Liverpool via New York the distance is 5,418 miles; from Havre, Montana to Liverpool via Hudson bay 4,268 miles, a saving of 1,150 miles. Port Nelson is 58 miles nearer Liverpool than New York. One of the arguments used against the northern route is the lack of return cargo. The western states import a large amount of goods from Europe and I believe if this northern route were developed, a considerable quantity of these goods would come in via Hudson bay.

The British embargo against cattle has recently been removed, but transportation costs are so high that the British market is of no use to us. The opening of the Hudson bay route, which would be available during the very season that our cattle are being marketed, would be a great boost to the cattle industry. From the point of view of the cattle industry alone it would pay to develop this route, even if no grain were shipped by it. At present the cattle industry is—well, I was going to say, in a deplorable state, but it is worse than that—non est, so far as western Canada is concerned. Whether or not we shall be able to build up in that country a cattle industry depends on whether we can get an outlet to Hudson bay. Cattle and grain can be very conveniently combined in one cargo and thus can be handled very cheaply.

Those who are opposing the completion of the Hudson Bay railway are largely in the same class with those who said that the Canadian Pacific Railway would never earn its axle grease; with those who thirty or forty years ago said that wheat could never be successfully raised on the prairies; with those who thought that the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway was doomed to failure—a railway which opened up one of the richest and most productive mining districts on the continent, if not in the world; with those who only two years ago said that the Vancouver route could never be a success. Men of vision, however, have long believed in it. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, in a speech delivered at Niagara Falls in September, 1908, said:

> We have undertaken the construction of another railway. The Hudson Bay railway concerns more the people of the West, but I say to you, gentlemen of Ontario, and you will agree with me, that what concerns one portion of the community concerns any part of the community.

A few days ago, Sir, we passed a vote in this House for $25,000 for the erection of a monument to the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier. It seems to me that one of the most fitting monuments to the memory of that great departed statesman would be the fulfilment of one of his own promises. The government could contribute a great deal by carrying out what Sir Wilfrid Laurier had in mind at that time.

Mr. Turgeon, speaking in this House in 1916 said:

> I have always favoured the construction of the Hudson bay railway.

Perhaps it is superfluous to quote the hon. Minister of National Defence (Mr. Graham), but I see he is on record in 1916 as saying:

> I have not varied for a moment in my belief that the Hudson bay project will be a success, notwithstanding the difficulties that have arisen. For my part, I have faith in the western country to believe that it will be large enough and productive enough to give business for all the routes in the years to come. I believe it will pay to build that railway, even if we have no imports by way of Hudson bay.

The Hon. Frank Cochrane, after he had made a trip to Nelson by land and home by water, said:

> I have every faith in the scheme, and I will push the Hudson bay road for all it is worth.

Lately some doubts appear to have arisen in the public mind regarding the suitability of the port of Nelson. No doubt Churchill is a better harbour in many respects, but the longer distance by rail and the limited size of the port were reasons that actuated both governments in deciding on Nelson. The latter port, as appears from the reports I have gone through, is apparently quite safe. It can accommodate any amount of shipping; it is open longer and experiences less severe cold than does Churchill. In respect to one of the arguments made in commenting on Nelson, I give this in answer to the hon. member for

Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) the main channel is only about half a mile wide at the docks, and several of the engineers state that outside the channel on the flats the water is so shallow that the waves do not rise higher than three feet, and that there would be very little interference with the ships lying at anchor off the docks. The channel never freezes to any extent, on account of the swift current and the heavy rise and fall of the tide. Engineer, R. B. Fry, who was sent in there by the Laurier government in 1905, stated that with a light ice-breaker Nelson could easily be kept open all winter. The port of Archangel in northern Russia has handled a large trade for several hundred years, though it is situated 400 miles further north than Nelson and the most northerly point in the track of the ships to and from that port is over 200 miles north of Hudson strait; yet it has been demonstrated that with the assistance of ice-breakers the Archangel route can be kept open practically all winter.

The bay is open all year, and notwithstanding some of the statements we have heard here I am convinced that the straits are open most of the year. There are no difficulties in the way of navigation in the bay itself; in the straits it is evidently the ice flows that interfere with navigation in the fall and the early spring. All navigators whose reports I have gone into agree that with wireless stations and planes to advise vessels regarding the location of ice, the period of navigation can be greatly extended and much delay saved at all times.

An engineer, Mr. J. W. Tyrrell, was sent up there by the government to make observations. He occupied a position in the rocks from which he could view the straits; there he spent the whole winter. He stated that there was no time during the whole winter that the ice was not constantly on the move, and that there were open spaces through which a vessel could pass in all except two months of the year, January and February. In 1903 Mr. A. P. Low was sent into the bay in charge of the steamship Neptune. He wintered inside the straits and came out in the spring. After observing the ice conditions for the season he stated in his report:

> There is little doubt that a specially constructed ship for ice navigation might pass through Hudson strait at any season, but the voyage would be long and the difficulties and dangers would be great.

I do not suggest that it would be advisable to try to make a winter route of the Hudson bay, but there is some ground for believing that that is within the bounds of possibility. Sir George Foster, speaking in the House of Commons in 1913 said:

> We know from personal observation that we have found greater obstacles in the straits of Belle Isle and north of Belle Isle than we found going through the Hudson straits on our trip last year; and from which I gained a most favourable opinion as to the feasibility of that route.

Captain Bernier gave testimony before the Senate committee of 1920—and I would commend this report to the hon. member for Lunenburg, because I do not think there is an hon. gentleman in this House who will question the words of Captain Bernier. He is an old navigator; he has spent months around those northern waters and should be in a better position to speak on the subject than almost anyone else. He said:

> The average season is four months, with wireless I would say four and a half. Aeroplanes would be an immense advantage to get a bird's eye view and report location of ice.

The Senate report of 1907 stated:

> All witnesses agree that under ordinary circumstances the minimum period of navigation would be four months and the maximum would not likely exceed five.

This report also states:

> The consensus of opinion of witnesses is that Hudson bay remains open all year, strait also open all or nearly all year and would be open all the time except for drift ice from the channel. Aids to navigation would greatly facilitate and extend length of season.

But, Sir, I am one of those who believe that the Hudson Bay railway will eventually develop local traffic sufficient to make it profitable, and the development of the resources of that great north country would mean added trade for the industries of eastern Canada as well. The country surrounding the bay is, on the whole, not heavily timbered, but according to reports this is due largely to frequent heavy fires, very often set by the Indians. These fires have kept the forests depleted. Along the Nelson, the Churchill, and other northern rivers there are large forests of spruce and various other woods, and over large tracts of land south and west of the bay there is an immense quantity of wood suitable for pulp. Pulp manufacturing is an industry that should have a great future in that country. Some hon. gentlemen have already dealt with the water-power resources. Along both the Churchill, the Nelson and several other northern streams there is a vast amount of water-power waiting to be developed. Mr. McInnes, an explorer who spent some time in this territory in 1896 and again in 1905 and 1906, stated that along the Nelson were some of the most magnificent power sites in the world capable, he said, of untold development. The country adjacent to the Hudson Bay railway is not usually considered in connection with agriculture. There is little doubt, how-

ever, that at some future time it will support a large farming and ranching population as well as fishing and mining. Mr. McInnes states in his official report published in 1900:

> Much of the land is well adapted for agriculture. I saw fine gardens and crops at Nelson house. Wheat ripens well at Norway house. This district contains abundance of timber and grass and has unlimited water-power. Split lake country which is about 250 miles north of Le Pas, to Churchill especially suitable for agriculture. Immense forest belt west of Nelson river. Vegetation is almost tropical.

Mr. McInnes estimated the amount of arable land in the district to be 10,000 square miles fit for settlement, and he described it as being very much in the nature of the Dauphin district. He kept a record of the temperature from the time he arrived at Split lake on the 19th of June, to the 29th of September, and he states that there was no frost to affect the tenderest vegetation. He was convinced that the country was quite suitable for agriculture. In comparing abstracts of summer temperatures with those at Minnedosa, Stoney Mountain and Brandon, he concluded that the country along the proposed railway is conspicuously warmer during the summer months than 400 miles further south. Mr. J. W. Tyrrell, mining engineer, confirms this in his report and states that 42 degrees below was the coldest he experienced it during a winter's stay at the bay. He had found it colder at Winnipeg.

Mr. J. A. J. McKenna, in his report on the Hudson Bay road states:

> The cold at Nelson house is no more intense than that of a winter in northern Manitoba, partly on account of the much lower altitude, and vegetables of all kinds are raised in abundance, growth almost tropical. This is attributed to the long periods of sunlight and the streams of living water everywhere.

Coal is found in abundance in Melville island as well as in several other islands in the northern part of the bay.

Mr. Stefansson reported seeing coal on nearly every island in the north and his party coaled their ships at Melville island. The coal was similar to Ladysmith coal. Capt. Bernier has also mined this coal and reported it as good as Sydney coal.

As this mining can be carried on all winter, I predict that when the railway is completed to James bay the provinces of Ontario and Quebec will be no longer dependent upon the tender mercies of the United States fuel controller. At present we are spending from $50,000,000 to $125,000,000 per year in the United States for coal, most of which will be saved to Canada when the northern railway is completed. In 1920, we bought from the United States, 11,552,000 tons of coal, and in 1921, 15,407,000 tons, and we would have purchased much more had we been allowed to get it.

The finest of beautiful building stone is found along the Hudson Bay line; also immense quantities of commercial limestone. Marble of high grade is found on Marble island. The islands and shores of the bay are rich in gold, copper, iron and many other minerals, and with cheap power and easy transportation this will eventually provide much of the material for our manufacturing industries.

The rivers and lakes draining into the bay and the bay itself teem with fish and valuable marine animals, and the opening of the road will mean the establishing of a lucrative industry in this line. It must not be forgotten that cold water fish are of a very superior quality to those caught in warmer waters. The American fishermen and whalers are at the present time doing a large trade in the bay and I am credibly informed that a large part of their product would be loaded at Nelson and shipped by rail to central markets in the United States.

As an indication of what this would mean to the Canadian National Railways I may quote the following figures from the port of Prince Rupert: In 1921, there were 1,351 American vessel loads of fish totalling 18,642,721 pounds unloaded at that port and shipped in bond over the Canadian National railway to central points in the United States. In 1922, there were 1,274 American vessel loads, totalling 17,183,163 pounds of fish, and I understand that scores of these American vessels were unable to unload there on account of the shortage of refrigerator cars on the Canadian National railways. They were therefore compelled to continue down the coast and take the fish to Seattle. This would have meant a very large amount of traffic for the Canadian National railways. The ivory alone that is being secured yearly by these Americans is an industry in itself and is worth a great deal of money.

Mr. Stefansson, the distinguished explorer, giving evidence before the Senate committee in 1920, stated that the so-called "barren lands" of the north adjoining the bay, on its western shore, were capable of supporting fifty million reindeer and ten million musk ox and the cost of handling these animals would be slight in comparison with the profit to be made. He states the musk ox is the most valuable animal in the world. If domesticated he needs no hay and no barns; he cannot be killed by blizzard and hardly by wolves. He produces three times as much meat as the domestic sheep and three times as much wool. The musk ox will produce about fifty pounds

of wool each year of an exceptionally high grade.

The Dominion Lands Act of 1882 provided for the building of this road by private enterprise, the cost to be defrayed by land grants. In 1908 an amendment to the Lands Act provided for a grant of 6,800 acres per mile to the Saskatchewan river and 12,800 acres per mile for the balance of 2,523,008 acres were given to the Winnipeg and Great Northern railway for construction work to the river.

Some time ago I put a question on the order paper regarding this and the answer appeared in Hansard of February 15. It is as follows:

Mr. Campbell:

1. What is the total number of acres of land sold as authorized by statute of 1908 for the purpose of Hudson bay railway construction?

2. What is the total amount for which this land has been sold?

3. How many acres of land are still held in western Canada on account of the above legislation?

Hon. Mr. Stewart:

1. There was no specific authority under the Dominion Lands Act, 1908, for the sale of land for the purpose of Hudson bay railway construction, but pre-emptions and purchased homesteads were sold under the provisions of the said act as follows:—

2. Total acreage of pre-emptions and purchased homesteads sold under the statute of 1908,—8,050,720 acres approximate. Total amount for which pre-emptions and purchased homesteads have been sold $24,-152,160, approximate.

The minister was quite right in stating that the act itself does not specifically provide for the sale of land for the purpose of the Hudson Bay railway construction. But I submit that this was the distinct and specific object in the passing of this act. If hon. gentlemen have doubts about the matter I would refer them to Hansard of June 23, 1908. I will not weary the House with long quotations, but at page 1153 they will find the following from a speech of the Hon. Mr. Frank Oliver.

We propose to allow the purchase by actual settlers, on settlement conditions, of say 5,000,000 acres of land, realizing thereby, out of a fixed and moderate price per acre, sufficient money to meet the requirements of the government in respect of the railway.

I note on that particular occasion the Hon. R. L. Borden made the following observations:

Even if we do not sell an acre of that land, or no matter how much we sell within the next four or five years, the Hudson bay railway project stands by itself endorsed and approved by this House.

Further on he said:

I trust and am led to believe that the Hudson bay railway project will still go on in the meantime and without delay.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What year was that?

Mr. CAMPBELL: In 1908, June 23rd. Now, Sir, in view of the fact that the railway will have to be paid for out of the sale of these lands and by the grain and cattle to be produced by the men who purchased these lands, I want to say that we are not here to-day as humble suppliants asking this parliament for favours; we are here demanding our right. This railway is ours, and I maintain that no other part of the Dominion has contributed anything towards its building. The grading has all been done, the bridges are all in, and only 92 miles of steel remain to be laid to complete this road. The then Minister of Railways when asked the question in the year 1920 as to the estimated cost of laying this steel gave the figure of $1,750,-000. But as material and labour costs have decreased since that time, I presume the work could now be done for less. I understand of course that a great deal of the road already built has been allowed to fall into disrepair, and that a considerable amount of money will be required to put it again into proper shape, but the least we can expect is that this railway should be completed to the bay and put in running shape and local traffic allowed to develop—the traffic from fishing, mining and lumbering industries. In that way we would get a very fair chance to try out the project and convince those who are still doubtful that it is quite feasible.

I should like to observe that the townsite at Fort Churchill has unfortunately been allowed to pass into private hands. The townsite at Port Nelson is still in the possession of the government, and I trust that the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart) will see that it is retained until such time as it is needed for actual use instead of being allowed to pass into the hands of speculators.

The hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) asked one hon. member on this side of the House what would become of the Canadian National Railways if the Hudson Bay railway were completed and in operation. Now, Sir, that question carried with it the implication that the scheme was feasible, and I was almost pleased to hear the hon. gentleman make the inquiry. It appears to me that those opposing this project are divided into two classes: those who think it is feasible and oppose it because it is feasible—I do not imply of course that the hon. member for Bonaventure is opposing the resolution; he did not say so—and those who, perhaps honestly, think the project is not feasible.

In going over the estimates that we have been dealing with recently perhaps I may be allowed to observe, without appearing sectional in any way, that after carefully elim-

inating all the items that could in any way be considered national, and dealing only with those that I could class as gifts or bonuses or subsidies to the provinces, I find the figures are as follows:

Ontario and Quebec	$2,775,000
British Columbia	2,295,000
Maritime provinces	1,921,000

Of this amount I might observe that Prince Edward Island gets only the small portion of $33,700 and the prairie provinces—Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta—only $305,377, the total being $7,298,062.

To this total I might add the steamship subsidies, because in looking over them I do not find any of really national benefit. They serve the small ports, and therefore are only of provincial account. The large trans-Atlantic steamship systems that handle our grain and other products are made to pay their way by the freight charges they collect from our grain and cattle. These steamship subsidies amount to $1,128,275, giving us a total of $8,426,337. In looking at those items one may perhaps be pardoned for observing that the prairie provinces with approximately 25 per cent of the population of the Dominion receive only about 3½ per cent of that total. This is a further reason why the government should give favourable consideration to the completion of the Hudson Bay railway.

In conclusion, I might refer to the fact that we are approaching a by-election in the constituency of Moose Jaw. I predict that the Liberal candidate will be promising the people that if he is elected the government will complete the Hudson Bay railroad. Therefore I hope the government will express themselves a litttle more frankly on this project, because it is certainly going to be an issue in the Moose Jaw election, and I do not want to see the Liberal candidate making any pledges unless he has the government behind him.

As for the criticisms and the doubts levelled at this project, we are quite prepared to meet them. In fact we have been meeting them for the last forty years. Doubtless there are and always will be such scoffers and doubters, and had it not been that men of vision overruled the skeptics the great country west of the Lakes would still be a fur preserve, the Canadian Pacific railway would never have been built. Indeed, we may go back a few hundred years and say that America would never have been discovered. And as we now criticise those who opposed or supported in their day, these other great projects so posterity will judge us for our decisions here to-day.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): Before the vote is taken, Mr. Speaker, I wish to declare my position on this resolution. The resolution has not the definiteness and meaningfulness that one would like. Its first demand is that the government consider a report of a Senate committee for the purpose of saving an investment in the Hudson Bay railway.

11 p.m. It would be a strange government in the Hudson Bay railway. solution to that extent. There is no commitment involved; the government accepting it is just where it was before.

The second part of the resolution has more meaning. It calls upon the government to recognize the priority of the undertaking with reference to other transportation projects started subsequent to the Hudson Bay railway. The meaning of that as well could stand further explanation. It may go beyond what the ordinary man would interpret it as conveying. I take it to mean that the completion of the Hudson Bay railway should be a charge upon this country prior to the prosecution of other transportation projects of a similar or larger character. That is to say, the road should be completed before we put through any similar project whether in the East or West; but not that its completion should be held to be a charge prior to the completion of minor, local, auxiliary and subsidiary projects of a transportation character, many of which are under way or should be in various parts of the Dominion.

Now assuming that I have not misinterpreted the resolution, I will make very clear where I stand myself. I hope in that regard I shall have more success than did the Acting-Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) in his address a short time ago. I will try to imitate his brevity, but I will try very seriously to excel his clearness and finality.

In the first place I favour the Hudson Bay railway. It goes without saying that this would be my position. I do not purpose to canvass the merits of the undertaking, as one would be compelled to do if the whole project were in the future. I do not propose to discuss at all the feasibilty of the route. I know there are many still who doubt that feasibility. I know there are some who doubt it whose opinions from a practical standpoint would be better than mine. On that phase I only say this: The matter has been debated and investigated, investigated and debated, not for a few years but for many years, for a whole generation. For forty years it has been the subject of dispute, and in that forty years, four decades, this country has come to

the conclusion in so far as a country can express a conclusion, and come to it more than once and at the hands of both great parties.

The Senate of Canada has rendered a special service in this connection. Committees of that body have deliberated, listened to evidence, listened to professional opinion, have delved to the very heart of the question on more occasions than one. I think the most thorough inquiry was at the hands of the Senate committee of 1920. There were those of the Upper House who viewed most pessimistically the feasibility of the navigation of the Hudson straits and who doubtless sought to bring before that committee the weightiest evidence that could be adduced against the practicability of that transportation route. Notwithstanding this, notwithstanding every effort, after very patient and prolonged inquiry the Senate committee reported favourably, and so far as the report shows, it was unanimous.

The Senate committee may be wrong. I know it is impossible lightly to pass aside much that is now brought forward and has been all through these years tending to establish very considerable peril and to lay in the mind doubt as to whether, after all, there may not possibly be failure. Consequently, I would not base my support wholly on the certainty with which any person or any bodies can arrive at a decision on that phase of the question. I think the weight of evidence, the weight of the verdicts that have been given by competent bodies, is in favour of the route.

Then what else is there to be said? On the question of the utility of the road, outside of its utility as an export and import transportation means, there is testimony of a convincing character. I do not say that if it totally fails as a transcontinental means of transport, if it totally fails in its primary purpose, its usefulness for these other purposes would justify its construction were we at the point of determining whether we would undertake it or not but its usefulness for these auxiliary purposes is a real factor and is established beyond all question. The mineral development has been great. The mineral development has so far exceeded all reasonable expectations. That it will increase, there can be no question. In gold, in copper, in ivory, in many lines of minerals there is undoubtedly going to be great production in that region. As well there is prospect, indeed there is certainty, of substantial agricultural development, though by no means is that prospect as bright as it is for mineral development. There is also the exploration of the whole fishery resources of Hudson bay. That these will amount to something there can be no reasonable question. What it will amount to is problematical as yet. As well for the transport of western coal into the heart of Ontario, there is sound reason, not fantastical at all, to hope that a feasible and a practicable route will be found along the Hudson bay. The extension of the Ontario government road up to Moose Factory will form a means of connection by which there can be transport from Nelson to Moose Factory by water over Hudson bay, and over these government roads by land, very much shorter and undoubtedly cheaper than in any present means of transport. Of course there will be ice difficulties there, but by no means of the character or moment of similar difficulties to the north through the straits.

On account of these other services that the road renders, a second very powerful argument can be adduced in support of the project. But I do not rest on these two arguments at all. Indeed, I can quite understand the mind that resting on these two alone would feel that at this time we should not undertake such a venture. I base my position upon other ground upon which I place more importance than on anything I have said so far. We are not at the commencement of the venture. We are well on toward the conclusion of the venture. This country is committed to the project. This country has been committed to the project for at least fifteen years. This country has made a contract with many citizens that the road will be built, and it is a matter of good faith with a large portion of our population that the covenant of the Dominion be kept.

The history of the undertaking is long; the history of the subject is very long, but passing over the early period when perhaps it was the sport of political adventurers, and coming up to 1908, the Conservative party at that time became committed to putting through the Hudson Bay railway. The Liberal party about the same time—I am not certain about the priority of dates, but I know that both parties made it a portion of their platforms about that year. I know that prior to the election of 1911 the government of the day made a contract with a firm for the construction of a large section of the mileage, I think 187 miles. I do not think any practical work was done. I think the hon. gentleman who just sat down did them credit overmuch in this respect. I fancy that if the Minister of Railways turned the first sod, he turned about the last sod too under Liberal administration, but upon the change of government the contract was for the time being suspended in

order that the matter might be looked into from a practical standpoint, with a view to determining chiefly what the best port was, and with a view to ascertaining the merits of the contract in every way. That done the contract was gone on with. That done the covenant of the Conservative party was implemented, and that mileage, and as well a further considerable mileage, was constructed, I think, totaling 332 miles. As well the grade was laid for the balance, or for almost all the balance; I believe I am right in saying that the entire balance of mileage was constructed, as far as the laying down and the grade was concerned.

Then the war came, and by unanimous consent—for I do not think there was any objection; I believe western Canada knowing, or believing, at least, that it was serious for that part of the country, quite acquiesced—it was determined that the project could not be gone on with at all during the continuance of the struggle. The war lasted until the close of 1918. But the burden of the conflict was heavier financially when the war was over than during its continuance. The burdens incident to taking care of the returned men, and all the other problems that followed in the wake of the war, made it impossible to pursue the project further for some time.

During the period that succeeded the war, pressure was brought to bear upon the government of that time to devote moneys to the construction of the road. The government did not see its way to accede to such pressure. Parenthetically let me say that the determination of the building or the taking up of rails and all else is a matter for this government and this parliament. It is a matter solely for our decision; it is not a matter for the decision of the directors of the National Railways at all. It has been a government project from the beginning, it is a capital undertaking, consequently it is an undertaking for which this government and this parliament are responsible, and in respect of which neither can shelter itself behind the Board of Directors of the National Railways.

I said that the late government did not feel that it could justify acceding to the pressure to continue the building of the road during its term of office. We were subjected to considerable abuse for taking that course. The then member for Nelson (Mr. J. A. Campbell), I recall was most insistent—and not only most insistent but I am sure hon. members who have spoken in a totally different vein in this debate will agree most unreasonable—in his attitude toward the late administration on this subject. During those years, because of the fact that we had to rehabilitate the Canadian National system, we had to overtake years and years of deferred betterments and years and years of deferred equipment, we had to build branch lines without the completion of which almost indescribable hardship would have existed—during those periods when money by the hundreds of millions had to be applied to make our railway system that we now own the system that it is to-day, a system that we are proud of, pressure was determined and unrelenting upon the late government, at the same time, to complete the Hudson Bay railway. The situation is rather different to-day. I am not saying that even yet the time has come—I observe this resolution does not say that even yet the time has come—when the capital moneys necessary to immediately complete this railway, should be provided. The situation is however wholly different to what it was some three years ago. Now the moneys that are necessary for our Canadian National Railways—because of the position they have been brought to, because of the patronage they are receiving on account of the service they are able to give—those moneys are much less—less by scores of millions than they were in those other times; and now this House is evidently of the opinion, if this resolution is to express its view, that the time is even not yet at hand when further capital should be expended on extending this route.

I have given a history of the subject up to the present time. We find ourselves now within about eighty miles of the completion of the laying down of the rails to Port Nelson. We find ourselves fairly well agreed that the right port has been selected as the terminus at Hudson bay. Very much doubt existed as to that, but I fancy from the tone of this debate, that it is generally conceded that Nelson is the correct port. We find, as well, that even though the money necessary—some four or five millions—to finish the construction and complete the terminals at Hudson bay has been expended, even after that is done, to put the harbour in shape as originally contemplated will take some nine millions more. That totals about fourteen or fifteen million dollars, and in addition the building of a terminal elevator will be essential in order to provide facilities for the export of wheat. These are not small figures; they are large.

And here let me make this observation: It would seem to me, and it has seemed to me for some time, that it ought to be possible with completion of the railway mileage to provide—perhaps not on the scale originally contemplated but on some less pretentious

scale, perhaps some less permanent scale—facilities by which the route can be tested, the feasibility of the navigation of the straits as a commercial venture can be tested, and all these obstacles be tried out. There should be some way by which—with a less expenditure, on a less extensive, possibly, let me say, a less permanent scale,—the whole plant could be put to trial.

Now, assuming so much let me say that it should have priority in my judgment, over other national ventures of a major kind. I do not think good faith will be kept with western Canada unless that is recognized by this House. Men have gone in there, families have gone in, settlers have gone in, on the faith of the determination of this parliament that the road would be built. Whatever may be the average judgment of a member here to-day, there is no disputing the fact at all that the three prairie provinces of the West are a unit, virtually a unit—behind the feasibility of this scheme. They to-day look to the Hudson Bay railway with the same enthusiasm, with the same confidence, that they displayed at the time they were able to persuade this parliament to undertake the venture. Settlers have gone in; large sections are to-day more populated than they would have been had the word of parliament not been given in this regard. Not only have settlers gone in but those already there—farmers of western Canada—relying upon the policy to which parliament was committed have extended their operations, have made investments and commitments on the face of the project. Of that there can be no question at all. This is the case over a large area of land; it applies to many tens and hundreds of thousands of our population. When we get that far we have not the option of turning back. It is the duty of this parliament to go on with the project and complete it, and parliament cannot say "We will do so in the long distant future, we will do so when we feel good and ready at some indefinite time." Such a course would not be keeping faith with western Canada. Parliament, of course, is justified in saying "We cannot do this now. We cannot commit ourselves to similar ventures now; the state of our finances will not permit." Such was the attitude assumed by the late administration. Such an attitude on the part of this government is less defensible because at the present time our railway commitments are by no means what they were, more time has elapsed and longer delay has occurred. While it may be defensible for a while, it would not do for this government and parliament to say "We leave ourselves free to launch on any venture whatsoever; we leave ourselves free to assume large national undertakings of a transportation kind, and let the Hudson Bay railway, to which we have been committed for 20 years, stand indefinitely in abeyance." I do not think such a course would be justified, and I think a negative to this resolution would virtually be a statement by this House that it left itself open to adopt such a course. Consequently, it does not seem to me a negative should be given. With the reservation, that I stated at first, that the completion of branch lines or local undertakings, proved essential in any part of Canada, is not necessarily affected by the passing of the resolution—with that reservation, I support the affirmative.

I believe, aside from all I have said, that every portion of our country is entitled, just as soon as the financial strength of the country justifies it, to the shortest, the best, the cheapest, let me say in one word, the most efficient lines for the transport of its surplus that can be procured, subject only to this qualification, that transport through Canadian ports west, north or east, should always have priority over transport through the ports of another country. With that reservation, I say the farmers of the far West have a right to reasonable facilities for the best transportation of their produce, namely, through the Pacific. Farmers through the central part of the West have the right to the best transport on the shortest line that can be provided for them. Canada has determined that this route furnishes that requirement for at least a considerable section of the country. Consequently Canada must comply with her undertaking in this respect. The same thing applies to eastern Canada. That is the general principle which is followed. In pursuance of this principle, relying mainly on the engagement this country has entered into, relying on the fact that we must keep faith, or respect for parliament will be lost, I support the resolution.

Let me express my regret that the minister has gone no further than to state that the government is not purposing to abandon the route. If I fully understood his remarks, he did not go beyond that assertion. I do not think such an assertion on the part of the government is sufficient. I think the House has a right to expect something more definite from the administration. Does the administration accede to the resolution or does it not? As far as I am concerned, there can be no mistaking where I stand, and it is not too

much to ask members of the government to tell us where they stand.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): I very much regret that engagements elsewhere prevented my having the pleasure of being present this afternoon, and consequently I have not heard the debate. I have no doubt it was very instructive and interesting. But with very much that the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) has said I cordially agree. I think it is too late to discuss the merits of the scheme. I am not so enthusiastic in my belief as to its value as a grain carrying route as some others, but this matter has been threshed out in years gone by, and rightly or wrongly this House, under various governments, has consented to the building of the Hudson Bay railway and the government of which I was a member began the construction of the railway. I think if one looks at the map of western Canada it is not difficult to find a reason why the western country should seek an outlet to the nearest and most attractive tidewater. If I lived in the West I should feel that we should have access to that route. Both parties have accepted the responsibility of it, and have done something in the way of building it, and both parties should see to it that it is one of the things we must undertake and in a reasonable time complete. I would hesitate to vote against it, because there is the danger that if one should vote against the resolution it would seem to imply a denial of the commitment of the past. I do not wish to be put in that position. In the resolution a clause has been inserted about priority over other projects. I am not sure what are the other engagements over which this is to have priority, but there are really commitments all over the Dominion, and it is the duty of the government to consider them all. I am anxious that the Hudson Bay railway should be undertaken but my right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) made some reservation, and I should like to make a reservation. We must have some regard to the financial condition of the country, and I ask the House to keep that reservation in mind. I am going to support the resolution, because to vote against it would seem to me to be an indication that we were denying responsibility for the Hudson Bay railway. I do not want to deny it. I want to accept it, and the only reservation I make is that which applies to all large enterprises in Canada, namely that you must have regard to the financial situation of the country.

Mr. O. R. GOULD (Assiniboia): Since the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) has made a few remarks, I feel much better than I did before. I was about to rise to remark that there would not be very many people in the West who would throw their hats in the air when they read the remarks of the Acting Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham). Hon. members representing the northern part of the western provinces have addressed the House and laid the facts well before the House; in fact there has been considerable repetition, but I do not rise for the purpose of repeating any facts which have been presented to show the feasibility of the route. I firmly believe in it. It has been a part of my teaching in the West. I believe in it and see the need of it. But speaking as one who comes from near the international boundary, I might state that we in the West know no party politics. Politics have no connection with the question; neither is it Progressive, Conservative, or Liberal. Each and all believe in the feasibility and propriety of the route. I have before me a resolution passed by the Estevan Board of Trade, that being the largest commercial centre in the electoral district of Assiniboia. I wish to read a few notes from a letter from the secretary of the Board of Trade, which accompanied the resolution. He says:

> We feel strongly that this is a matter that should have the hearty support of every western member, and trust that some action may be taken by the government to ensure the completion of this project at an early date.

That is a sentiment we have had in common for a long time. I believe in the immediate completion of that road. I believe in the immediate completion of the facilities whereby at least a real good test of that route may be had. Further than that I am not going to ask the government to commit themselves to-night, but it seems to me that the 118 miles that it is proposed by the Acting Minister of Railways to have repaired does not go far enough to satisfy the needs of the country or the wishes of the people there, or to fulfil the promises that have been given to the people in the past. Now, I must protest to-night that it is not a fair thing to the people in that western country. They have a right to expect and do expect more, and I do hope the government may see in their wisdom ways and means whereby they can make provision for the road to Port Nelson this year. As I said before the ground has been well covered, and no arguments, I think, have been adduced to counter those which have been advanced in favour of the project.

Mr. ANDREW KNOX (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to delay the

House much longer on this question. The debate, I think, has covered the ground very fully, and in fact has been illuminating in many regards. I believe some benefit has been derived from this discussion and although I have made some notes in regard to some remarks that have been made I will be very brief in dealing with them.

Practically the only opposition to the motion was offered by the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff). He assured us that he was with us on the tariff. Well, I must say that sympathy on the tariff is of very little use unless something else goes with it. He gave us to understand that he was opposed to us on the question of the Hudson bay project; possibly his opposition there will be about the same as his sympathy on the other question. Speaking of the tariff, it does seem too bad if we are restricted both in our buying and in our selling; because I am convinced that the restriction in our selling is brought about by the restriction in our buying. And along with these two restrictions, we shall suffer a further handicap if we are restricted in our outlets.

The hon. member for Lunenburg made reference to Captain Anderson's report on his trip in 1914, and emphasized the difficulty Captain Anderson had experienced in connection with getting stuck in the ice. Well that does not establish the impossibility of navigating Hudson straits. We know that many sea captains have got stuck in ice on the Atlantic. I am not a seafaring man, but I have had a little experience in that regard myself; I was on a vessel which was stuck two days and two nights in ice and fog on the Atlantic.

I might go further into this report, but I think it would be better to close the debate. I was disappointed that the Acting Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) did not go further than he did. We were to glad to know that the government had no intention of abandoning the project and that the 332 miles would be brought up to standard. But when we get that far we are no further ahead than we were in 1918, and I would like to see some indication that something further is to be done in that regard.

Mr. GRAHAM: You will be a good deal further ahead than you are now—118 miles ahead that otherwise would be gone.

Mr. KNOX: There will be some delegations down here shortly from the West asking for something more than what is embodied in the minister's statement, and I hope the government will accede to their request.

[Mr. Knox.]

In looking over this resolution I cannot see anything in it that the government cannot accept, having in mind the remarks made by the Acting Minister of Railways as well as by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding). I do not think, therefore, that it is too much to ask that the resolution be adopted.

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

Mr. MARLER: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member may not speak at this stage without the unanimous consent of the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go ahead.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Question.

Motion (Mr. Knox) agreed to, on division.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King, the House adjourned at 11.40 p.m.

Tuesday, March 13, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

REPORTS PRESENTED

Third report of the select standing committee on Banking and Commerce.—Mr. Maclean (Halifax).

First report of the select standing committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph lines.—Mr. Cahill.

BANKING AND COMMERCE

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN (Halifax) moved:

That the third report of the select standing committee on Banking and Commerce be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

MARINE AND FISHERIES

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) moved:

That the fifty-fifth annual report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries for the fiscal year 1921-22 be referred to the select standing committee on Marine and Fisheries.

Motion agreed to.

ADMIRALTY ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. Sir LOMER GOUIN (Minister of Justice) moved: That the House do tomorrow go into Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed resolution:

That it is expedient to amend the Admiralty Act, chapter one hundred and forty-one of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, and to provide that the Governor in Council may, from time to time, appoint for any admiralty district one or more deputy local

judges, and revoke such appointments; appoint for any district or registry division of any district a deputy registrar; and when the local judge of the Quebec Admiralty district resides in Montreal, the deputy local judge residing in Quebec shall be paid the salary which he would have received if he were the local judge of the district; and when the local judge resides at Quebec, the deputy local judge residing at Montreal shall receive the salary which he would have received if he were the local judge of the district; but not more than one deputy local judge in any district shall receive a salary.

He said: His Excellency the Governor General has been informed of the subject matter of this resolution, and has been pleased to recommend the same to the consideration of the House.

Motion agreed to.

PORTFOLIO OF RAILWAYS

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): Will the Prime Minister be good enough to tell us now when we may expect an end of the present makeshift arrangement as to the Department of Railways and Canals?

Mr. GRAHAM: Order.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The present arrangement is a very good one.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think the House has a right to a better answer than that. I used the term "makeshift" because it was the name the Prime Minister himself applied a few years ago to a similar arrangement. I think the Prime Minister owes it to the House to say what his intentions are as to time in this regard—how long he expects it will be before there will be a regularly constituted minister in charge of this department. The House is in session and the need of a regularly constituted minister is much greater than if the House were not in session.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do not think the House has been embarrassed in any way, in view of the arrangement at the present time. My hon. friend will appreciate that, in the matter of filling a cabinet vacancy, the Prime Minister must be allowed sufficient time. I do not think it is imperative to fill the vacancy at the present time.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I know the Prime Minister must be allowed sufficient time, but all I am asking is, not that he be not allowed the time, but that he advise the House as nearly as he can what time he considers necessary.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am not in a position to give my right hon. friend a definite answer.

HANSARD—MISSING PAGES

On the Orders of the Day.

Mr. DONALD SUTHERLAND (South Oxford): I would like to direct the attention of the House to a matter which occurred on 6th March when the estimates of the Defence department were before the committee. I asked a question with reference to an item and was told that the information I desired was contained in Hansard of last year. I sent to my room for the bound copy of Hansard which had been supplied to me. Afterwards I made further reference to the matter, but was informed by the chairman of the committee that I was out of order in doing so. The Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) asked me a question, and, instead of answering him, I sent across the floor of the House the bound volume which I had obtained. He is reported in Hansard to have said:

In the copy of Hansard which my hon. friend has just handed me it looks as though those pages had been cut out.

I did not take notice of it at the time, but I have observed since that several references have been made to it in the press, and the impression is being given, or the insinuation made, that some person was a party to cutting these leaves out of Hansard. I called up Mr. Cook, who, I thought, was still connected with the Bureau. A few days ago I handed him the volume and he took it to the Librarian of Parliament. I interviewed the librarian, and from him I have obtained the following statement which, with your permission and the consent of the House, I would like to have placed on Hansard:

OTTAWA, 8th March, 1923.

DONALD SUTHERLAND, Esq., M.P.,
House of Commons,
Ottawa.

Dear sir,—I beg to confirm what I mentioned to you this morning: Mr. Fred Cook brought to the library, this morning, a copy of the House of Commons Hansard, vol. 3, 1922, out of which after page 2082, a whole signature was missing. Being asked if there was any trace of this signature having been either torn from the book or otherwise separated from it, I carefully examined the appearance of the volume, and found no sign of cut thread, or remnant of the sewing thread. I concluded and answered that this was evidently a case of the gatherer at the printing bureau having omitted to insert the missing signature in its proper place, or having wrongly placed it elsewhere. I brought the volume to our expert binder, Mr. Brown, and asked him what he thought of the appearance, and he fully confirmed my impression.

Yours very truly,

J. de L. TACHÉ,
General Librarian.

If there is any suspicion in the mind of any hon. member with regard to the matter, I would ask as a personal favour that a committee of the House be appointed to examine this volume and report.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I do not know whether my hon. friend wants a word from me, but if he thinks I intended to cast any reflection on him personally, I am very sorry he gathered that impression; I had not the slightest intention of so doing. The volume I had in my hand, which he sent over to me, had a distinct cleavage in it at the place the pages were missing, and it did look to me as though these pages had been taken out, and I so expressed myself. I would be glad to have any member of the House examine the volume, but I did not mean to say my hon. friend had taken the pages out. He made a great deal of the missing pages. I did not make any reflection whatever.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: The statement of the Prime Minister has made it more apparent than ever that it would be advisable to have a committee appointed to examine the volume.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): I looked at the copy and saw the pages were missing—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order, order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the incident is closed. The Prime Minister says he did not cast any reflection.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I must respectfully object to any insinuation as to any cutting being done. The expert evidence is altogether to the contrary.

SUPPLY

IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION

The House in Committee of Supply. Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

Immigration—outside service, salaries, $700,000.

Mr. MANION: I would like to ask the minister for a statement in regard to the whole immigration policy in general. I understood we were to have such a statement.

Hon. CHARLES STEWART (Acting Minister of Immigration and Colonization): Immigration is probably one of the most discussed subjects in Canada, and in a brief way I hope this afternoon to cover some of the important points, at least so far as I am able to see them, and the recommendations that have been made to the government with respect to this very important matter.

[Mr. Sutherland.]

I think, Mr. Chairman, that one can best begin a discussion of this subject by giving a review of opinion in our own country. I have heard a great many different views expressed during the past summer with respect to this question. Some people are of the opinion that we should take steps to bring a huge tide of immigration to Canada; and not only that, but that we should follow some method such as that adopted for the settlement of our returned soldiers,—borrowing large sums of money for the purpose of settling upon our vacant lands people who will come to us from the various parts of the world. Others oppose that idea, and many Canadian agriculturists feel—and they have so expressed their feeling to me—that it is our first business to make the people already on the land prosperous before bringing more upon the land and placing them in a similar condition.

I want to take the middle course between the two extremes. I think I may preface my remarks by saying that with the problem that Canada has to face, with the financial obligations that the people of Canada now have to shoulder, it is imperative that we get more people to assist with this burden that is bearing rather heavily upon our shoulders to-day. Sometimes, one cannot help comparing today's conditions with those of eight, ten or fifteen years ago when we had, perhaps not so large a flow of immigration, as is sometimes stated, but a flow annually that would be regarded as reasonable. While I adopt the middle position, I am not unmindful of the fact, as I said before, that it is imperative to add to the population of Canada; but that addition should be made with care, with a view to the assimilation of the people who will come amongst us and the making of a Canadian citizenship that we shall be proud of. That leads one to this point, and I will not enlarge very greatly upon it. Having all these things in mind, what class of people can we take into Canada and absorb most readily to-day, and who are the most desirable people to come amongst us? After a survey of conditions in Canada, one is led to the conclusion that there is not a great need of immigrants in our cities, particularly in the larger centres. The records of the past year or two have shown that we have had unemployment and that additions to the urban population of very large numbers would create a situation that would not be well for Canada. Not only that, but we must admit that for the past year or two, from the urban centres of Canada a very considerable number of people have left us and gone across the line to the United States. That

movement has been accelerated by the fact that the American government have seen fit to place in their Immigration Act a clause providing that from outside countries, with the exception of Canada, three per cent is the maximum number that will be permitted to land in the United States during any one calendar year. Canada alone is the exception; from Canada immigrants may flow freely into the United States, and this has created in the United States, particularly in the urban centres, a scarcity of labour that is being supplied from the urban centres of Canada, and to some extent from our rural sections as well.

Let me say, in passing, that I doubt if we shall ever reach the time when we shall not have an efflux of Canadians into the United States. I have looked carefully over the records of the past fifteen years, and I find that it is somewhat surprising that during all those years there has been a fairly steady movement in that direction. The movement has varied a little, some years more some less, some years not quite counteracted by the movement from the United States to Canada; but during all those years that exodus seems to have kept up, and probably it will continue for some time. Therefore, we are restricted in the industrial field, particularly in the urban centres, although that is not quite so apparent to-day as it was three months ago, and we are limited to the rural field for settlement of people whom we shall bring to Canada.

This brings me to the point where I wish to discuss for a few moments conditions as we find them in rural localities in Canada. I know that hon. gentlemen opposite will say that there are two or three outstanding reasons why agriculture is to-day in its present financial condition. Perhaps, the tariff has a great deal to do with the matter; perhaps a reason may be that transportation costs are high, or interest charges are unreaonable; and I am going to admit, in a reasonable way, because I do not want to be unreasonable, that many of these things are factors in producing present-day conditions, coupled with the sudden depression in prices of products of the farms of Canada and with no corresponding reduction in the price of commodities that the agriculturists must use in their business. But let us be fair. There are other influences that, perhaps have had some effect. Is it not a fact that inflated values as a result of the war—and I speak as one of those who are affected because I have no other business than that of agricuture and I know somewhat of those conditions—led us into difficulties in connection with purchasing land and with reaching out maybe a little further than we should have gone. I am not unmindful of the fact that some will say that we were encouraged to do so; that we were asked to produce in a way that we had never produced before in order that the world's supplies of food might be kept up to the necessities of that period. I am not unmindful of all those things; but perhaps over-reaching has also contributed somewhat to the difficulties in which we find ourselves to-day. All these factors—and I have not time to deal with them now — have left agriculture, from one end of Canada to the other, in a somewhat depressed condition.

But again, I think we can get some encouragement by looking backward I know there are in this House to-day many hon. members who will remember that period of the early nineties. I was farming in Ontario at that time—and perhaps many here were engaged in the same occupation—and agricultural conditions then in my opinion, were worse than they are to-day in Canada. Looking back upon that period, I remember that wheat, cattle, hogs, dairy products were lower in price than they have been during the past two years. I will say this, that the commodities which we had to purchase in order to carry on our business were also 25 or 30 per cent lower, and in that respect, perhaps, the situation is almost evened up. We did not recover rapidly from that condition of affairs during that period. True, we did begin to recover in 1894, 1895 and 1896, and I suppose my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) will tell me that the real era of prosperity began in 1896. Perhaps, our recovery in the present case will be found to have begun from the year 1921.

An hon. MEMBER: Pretty slow.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Oh, oh.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I see my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Finance, thinks that is rather a joke.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Hear, hear.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Well, I never claimed to be an optimist, but in this respect, in the face of conditions as they are to-day, I think I can say, and say with full assurance that perhaps we have struck the bottom in the matter of depression. There must be a corresponding reduction, which I see approaching rapidly, in the commodities that are to be utilized by the farmers of Canada, and that must come about before we have a complete reaction.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Is the minister not aware that Mr. Roger Babson recently reported a steady rise in commodity prices next year, but no corresponding rise in agricultural products?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I think I can see evidences that we may be justified in differing from Mr. Roger Babson.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Do the official records of the government show a declining curve in commodity values?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Not appreciably at the moment, no.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Hear, hear.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Let me refer my hon. friends again to history. Has the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) ever known, or can he name, a period in history when there was a continued rise in the commodities manufactured for use by the agriculturists of a country like Canada, and when there was no corresponding increase in agricultural products?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think myself that cycles occur and that time will do its work. But with the government in office I despair of everything else except time.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): If my hon. friend will forget about the government in office for a moment and deal with the subject in hand we shall get on.

Mr. IRVINE: On what ground does the minister base his optimism with regard to the contemplated decline in prices?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): On the old and well known ground, as I have just stated to the leader of the Opposition, that in countries such as Canada agriculture cannot long continue in a depressed state. I will admit to my hon. friend that there are conditions to-day to be met with that have not had to be faced in the past, conditions in connection with the various articles that go to make up cost, that have not had to be coped with in the past in the same manner as they will have to be met to-day. But there must come a levelling-up between the amount the farmer receives for his labour and that received by labour in other walks of life. That inevitably must come about. And just as sure as there is in the American states to-day an unprecedented era of prosperity in the urban communities, perhaps previously unknown in the history of that country, there is a corresponding depression in agriculture. I shall deal with that point for a moment or two this afternoon and recite some of my experiences in that connection. But let me observe in passing that I am not suggesting, as someone is sure to imply in a moment, that labour should take less for that which it is so frequently represented as selling. Someone is sure to ask, are they to take less?. I am not suggesting that. I am suggesting that labour will be enabled to purchase more of the necessities of life and that there will be a reduction in the natural commodities that pass between one class of the community and the other. I am not unmindful of conditions as they are, but with them I cannot at present deal for any considerable length of time. I will touch them again perhaps a little more fully when I come to consider the question as to the class of people whom we hope to encourage to come to Canada.

Conditions to-day, however, are changing very rapidly in Canada; they change month by month. Three months ago we could not have held out encouragement to labourers to come to Canada to secure employment unless they were agricultural labourers; and I think that one of the problems that has to be faced to-day, in contrast with days gone by in connection with immigration, is the fact that we must necessarily be exercised about the question where the labourer is going to locate and what vocation he is going to be engaged in. Heretofore not very much attention has been paid to that aspect of immigration; rather we have been bringing immigrants into Canada and letting them shift very largely for themselves. Let me deal for a moment or two with where we hope to bring our settlers from and how we propose to settle them. We propose to bring settlers in as large a way as possible from Great Britain, and to encourage as many as will come from there to settle in Canada.

Mr. SPENCER: Is it true that of the advertising being carried on for settlers, some $3,000 has been spent in Great Britain as against $90,000 elsewhere?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Ninety-two thousand dollars.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): That was given in a return asked for by my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton), and for the first time the advertising branch of the Department of Immigration began to segregate its accounts. It is not true that $3,000 represents the whole sum spent in Great Britain; it represents simply the amount spent in newspaper advertising. My secretary gave a supplementary return

which will be found in the Revised Hansard, and my hon. friend was given the return.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: No.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I am sorry about that.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: There was nothing to my knowledge that was supplementary, and the return stands uncorrected, so far as I have been instructed.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): At any rate, I will give at a later period the complete amounts expended during the past fiscal year in advertising in Great Britain and the United States.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the $90,000 odd include anything except newspaper advertising?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes; I will deal with that when the estimates are being considered in detail. Now, we hope to encourage all settlers who will come to Canada from Great Britain, Scandinavia, Holland, Belgium, France and Finland. This fact must be borne in mind, however, that from a rather close investigation of the areas from which we hope to draw our settlers, there do not appear to be a very large number of people who are in a position to purchase land and establish themselves upon their arrival in Canada. So that the bulk of our immigration, or at least a large proportion of it, will naturally be of the class who will be seeking employment. And that is not confined to Great Britain alone; that condition seems to be prevalent in every country in which we have made investigations and from which we hope to encourage settlers to come here. War conditions appear to have left the people of the Old Land, one would perhaps not say in an impoverished state, but at least in such circumstances that they have not a great deal of capital that is not invested and which they can withdraw from the businesses in which it is tied up. I should say that somewhere between twenty-five and thirty-five per cent of the total number of immigrants we expect will be able to establish themselves and that means one thing: we must take steps to assist these people in the work of colonization. With that end in view I have sought the co-operation of the provincial governments throughout Canada. In some respects I take the province of Ontario as an illustration. The authorities there are engaged in immigration work of their own. They are proceeding much the same as the federal government hope to, and prefer to carry on their own work in their London office. It is an altogether different problem with the province of Quebec. The government of that province are anxious to repatriate a large number of their citizens who have gone into the New England states. One of the striking features in connection with the migration from Quebec and the Maritime provinces to the United States, most of which comes from the rural parts, is that those people do not engage in agriculture across the line but find employment mainly in the textile industries of the New England states. The purpose of our propaganda is to induce these people to return to Canada, and with that in view we have employed Mr. Arthur Lemont to take charge of this important work.

Mr. LADNER: Has the minister approximate figures showing the exodus of our people to the United States within the last year? And is that exodus ceasing, or to what extent is it still draining this country of its best type of citizens?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No. In looking over the figures for some years past one is a little surprised to find that on the whole there is little variation; the number may be a little higher one year, a little lower the next year, and vice versa. I have the figures for the past few months. One of the difficulties in dealing with the figures of migration to the United States is that, if, six months after their entry, our people have not returned to Canada, they are then regarded as permanent residents of the United States and are so entered in their returns. Consequently there is a vast difference between the number of Canadians migrating to the United States and the actual number who become permanent residents. I shall go into that more fully when dealing with the United States situation.

Mr. SPENCER: What inducement is being offered to Canadian citizens in the United States to return to Canada?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): In conjunction with the provincial governments we are trying to get those people to come back and take up agricultural land in the province of Quebec. In the northern portions of that province the provincial government are opening up new country along the line of the transcontinental railway. I take it that we are all interested in the success of that undertaking, and it is there that we hope to establish settlement. The provincial government are offering settlers free grants of land with the addition of some improvements

thereon, because the land is all wooded and some development work is needed in order to give the settler a start. Of course, perhaps, the one thing that he will hope to make a livelihood out of for the first few years will be the pulpwood which he will take off his land.

Mr. LEWIS: Is this an offer to all Canadians who have gone to the United States?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): What is the acreage under this scheme?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): One hundred acres to each settler.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): All wooded land?

Mr. MEIGHEN: What did Mr. Lemont do before he went over to the United States to take charge of the minister's repatriation programme?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): He was a newspaper man.

Mr. MEIGHEN: On what newspaper?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I cannot tell you.

An hon. MEMBER: Le Canada.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I suppose he is in a better position now than he formerly occupied? Anyway he is doing more good.

Mr. JACOBS: Out of order.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I do not know the gentleman personally. He was recommended as a man who could carry on this work with success.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Was he appointed by the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No. That is still to be accomplished.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The government appoints him first and then tries to get the accomplishment through the commission.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Let us get on with immigration. Don't quibble.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): There is some difficulty in getting appointments for immigration purposes passed by the Civil Service Commission. We asked the Civil Service Commission some time last October to fill two positions in the Old Country, one at Carlisle and the other at Southampton. On the 8th of last month applications were closed, but the appointments are not yet made. In view of these difficulties I have this gentleman engaged on this work for the time being in the hope that he may ultimately be appointed by the commission;—he may not be,—in the meantime we are having some active work carried on.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: With what result?

Mr. HANSON: What is the policy of the government of New Brunswick in reference to this immigration?—if they have any policy, which I doubt.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): For the benefit of my hon. friend I will deal with New Brunswick and Nova Scotia in a moment or two; for the present I should like to finish with Quebec. Immigration to Quebec is not being confined simply to Canadians living in the New England states. There are enterprises in the northern portions of Quebec that will require the influx of a considerable amount of labour, and I doubt if such labour will be found in Canada. I am free to say that we are looking for it in the Old Land and want as much of it as we can absorb. This also applies to the northern portions of Ontario. We are carrying on propaganda in an endeavour to secure settlers of the type and character that will assimilate with our people, and are providing places for them to settle on. That is what we are endeavouring to do in this scheme. I have not any brand new striking policy to offer because between two extremes I have decided to adopt the middle course, and in pursuing that course I am trying to get value for the money we expend on bringing people to Canada by keeping them here when we get them. I take it that no hon. gentleman will quarrel with the attitude of my department in that regard.

With respect to the Maritime provinces, their governments were invited to send delegates to discuss this matter with us. To-day we have in England a representative who has intimate knowledge of local conditions in New Brunswick and is working in the interests of that province. The same thing applies to Nova Scotia.

Mr. HANSON: Who is that gentleman?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Mr. W. R. Bowder. The same thing applies to Nova Scotia. The officer in charge of this work in Boston is a native of Nova Scotia and, as I understand it, has been working in the interests of the Maritime provinces in an endeavour to bring from the States settlers for New Brunswick and Nova Scotia.

With respect to western Canada, we have not been successful in getting such complete co-

operation of the provincial governments there as we have in the East. They took the ground—and I have no quarrel with it, because I took it myself when I was in charge of affairs in Alberta—that immigration is the problem of the federal government and that no expenditure under that head should be required on the part of provincial governments. I felt I was on fair ground in taking that stand when premier of Alberta, and I have no quarrel, I say, with my western friends in that respect. As in 1908—as, indeed, in the period prior to 1908, in fact, ever since the Canadian Pacific railway was built across the plains—the western provinces have been the great fertile fields for increased population so far as agriculture in Canada is concerned. I am not unmindful of the fact that it is possible in eastern Canada, especially in the northern portion of it, to establish a great many people on the land, but they would have to be selected with a view to their adaptability to the conditions existing there. For the next decade at least the western provinces offer the most fertile field for immigration, and I want to deal with the question for a moment or two from that point of view.

Because of the conditions I have mentioned, the people on the land to-day are feeling the pinch rather severely, and I do not wonder that they sometimes question the wisdom of expenditure on the part of the government for the purpose of bringing new settlers into western Canada, where so many people at present find it difficult to carry on. Well, if we are to sit down and fold our hands; if we are to stop immigration entirely; if we are to say that our present population is to carry the obligations connected with our railways—which, we all admit, are over-built—if we are to leave the vacant lands of western Canada as they are to-day, I think we shall be following an unwise policy. We must take steps to settle up those vacant areas. We must take steps to bring in sufficient labour to enable the farmer to carry on in western Canada. I believe that the productivity of the area that is already broken in western Canada could, by the application of sufficient labour, be increased by at least thirty or forty per cent. But that is not the scheme I have to present to the newcomer. It will be suggested to him that he can make a success of agriculture in the West or in other parts of Canada if he avoids some of the pitfalls that we have encountered in the past. If we are honest with ourselves we will admit that one of the most serious of those pitfalls has been our endeavour to own too much land. When we went westward, 160 acres looked like a very large farm; we were not in western Canada very long when a half section did not seem to be too large; then we set about to acquire a section; and when we had done that we wanted more. The advice I propose to give to the new settler is this: not to acquire more land than he can cultivate—I do not suggest that he might cultivate 160 acres during his first year. It is a fact that in the West to-day good agricultural land along the lines of the Canadian National railway, untilled, can be purchased at from $15 to $25 an acre, or at an average of, say, $18 to $20 an acre. If a man buys a quarter-section his overhead will not be as heavy as it will if he goes on the principle of acquiring large areas.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Is it not true that a few years ago the prospective settler could get that land, not for $15 to $25 an acre, but free, and thus clear of any overhead at all?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): That is another serious problem that we have to face to-day, in addition to the problems connected with increased transportation costs.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): What proportion of free lands suitable for settlement still remains in the three prairie provinces?

Mr. STEWART (Argentueil): The most popular figure given is 20,000,000 acres lying along the Canadian National railway line. Put it at 15,000,000 acres, within 15 miles of railway facilities.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I mean homestead lands?

Mr. LOVIE: Does the minister think from his own experience that a man can make a living and raise a family on 160 acres in western Canada? That is, to have pasture land and everything else on it, in a thickly settled country where there are no vacant lands?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): My hon. friend is better with 160 acres to start with; his overhead and interest charges are less. When he is capable of purchasing more he can do so. My experience in western Canada leads me to believe that this very thing has perhaps contributed more than anything else to the difficulty experienced by the western farmer in time of stress, having regard to the conditions of hail, frost and so on that he has to contend with from time to time. If we are to succeed it seems to me that we must confine ourselves to smaller areas and cultivate more, perhaps, with the help that we have. I am not suggesting that our wives and children should work in the fields or elsewhere, but the point is that we should not in years of stress accumulate

4 p.m.

an overhead that in years of prosperity we are not able to wipe off. I do not mean to say that that is an answer to all the difficulties. I am speaking of the man who comes to Canada as a settler, without any accumulated obligations of the past.

The question will be asked, why do you invite people to come here, in the face of what is taking place to-day? Well, I am simply trying to discuss the conditions that have come about as a result, first, of over-purchase of land, and, second, of circumstances over which most of us have no control. But, I repeat that, to start with, 160 acres will not require the investment in implements and live stock that will be necessary if a larger area is taken up.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Surely the minister, himself a western man, understands as well an any agriculturist in this House that the equipment for 160 acres will farm 320 acres without any additional outlay.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Having had sixteen years' experience in western Canada, I believe that you do not need a full equipment to carry on from the start. The men who made successes in the early days did not try to purchase a full equipment of farm implements right from the beginning; there was rather more of the spirit of co-operation, one with the other. That is one of the difficulties to-day in western Canada.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): That is not answering the question.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I am trying to demonstrate how we can invite people to come to Canada with some show of their making a success. I am convinced that if a man purchases more land at the outset than he can work, there is danger that his overhead will swamp him. And then he has to consider the possible consequences if he purchases live stock as we were induced to purchase live stock to an unprecedented degree during the years of the war—and I take full responsibility for having advocated that programme. Nevertheless we found that in the period of drought we were not troubled again. But having in mind the experience of the past it seems to me that it is wise to ask: Is there no proposition, in western Canada or elsewhere, calculated to put people on the land with a decent chance of success that will appeal to hon. gentlemen?

Now let me come to the next question. One of the most serious difficulties we have to encounter in western Canada is that of interest rates. We have always been penalized, to a greater or less degree, as against the East, in this respect; and one of the things that I am endeavouring to do is, if possible, to secure the purchase of land at a 6-per-cent rate. I am not unmindful of the fact that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company sold their holdings at that rate of interest, but they sold them on shorter terms of payment. What we propose offering to the settler to-day is land on a thirty-two-year annual payment scheme with interest at 6 per cent. We did not have to come to the government of Canada to secure money for this purpose; and let me say, in passing, that in western Canada we must get our money on short loans from the chartered banks of Canada at about the same rate of interest as that previaling in the East. It is not that we require unlimited credit; that is not the point, in many instances we have had too much credit, in many instances loans have been made too freely, and we are suffering in consequence to-day. What we want is credit to a reasonable point at the same rate of interest as prevails in the East. In my opinion that is absolutely necessary if we are to make a success of land settlement in western Canada.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Would the minister change the period of these loans? That seems to be a marked feature of the credit system of the West, that the banks give loans for short periods; whereas in the United States they have introduced a system of, say, two-year loans secured on the farm—on the crop and on the cattle.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I do not want to be drawn into a discussion of the Bank Act or the suggested amendments to it; I desire to get away from it; I will have something to say with respect to the Bank Act when that proposed legislation is up for consideration. What I am doing now is simply depicting what I think are advantages that can be offered to the newcomer to-day that we did not enjoy. That is what I want to point out to the members of this House this afternoon.

Mr. GOULD: May I suggest to the minister that another remedy would be the consideration of a reduction of the interest charges on payments by men who are unable to meet their obligation. For instance on the sale of government lands when the interest has been raised to 7 per cent, that may very well be reduced to 6 per cent.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I do not wish to get into a discussion of the conditions that

exist there at the moment. I am trying to depict the conditions under which, I think, a man can succeed if he gets a reasonable chance.

Now, I have said to you that you cannot expect to get people with a large amount of capital or that such people will come in any number. And I do not think we need worry about it; what we want is the establishment of the men with small capital, and that is why, let me say in this connection, I have been attracted to the Canada Colonization scheme of land selling. They have been able to list these lands for a period of thirty-two years with 6 per cent interest. Sometimes I think we have not played quite fair with the vendor, or the owner, of unused lands in western Canada because in many of our provinces we have put a super-tax upon him in respect to the ownership of these very lands. Let me say, however, that I am not quarreling with the idea; I was a party to doing that believing it would hasten the settlement of our country. Because the one thing that we did need, in order to carry our railway burden, was new settlement in western Canada, and that the settler be put upon these lands with a reasonable chance of achieving success. Now, I think I am safe in making this assertion: That with respect to all the lands that are there for purchase in the hands of private owners, very few of those owners will not be willing to sell those lands at a reasonable rate to a newcomer, or anyone else that will purchase them and put them under cultivation. That, briefly, is the hope that I entertain—that a man will be able to obtain land at a reasonable rate with a fair prospect of securing success. He will also have the advantage of whatever assistance will come in the shape of amendments to any loaning scheme or any scheme for the betterment of conditions throughout Canada generally. I do not think such plans should be confined to western Canada particularly, but at the moment we are dealing especially with that part of the country. In addition the new settler will get the same treatment that every other settler that is already in the country will receive in that particular respect.

I would not suggest that these men go a long distance from the railway, but that they be located as nearly as possible along the railway lines in western Canada and that they be given, as I propose to give them, the full advantage of the experience of the men who are field supervisors for the Soldier Settlement Board for at least the next two years. In dealing with this question let me say this: I do not intend, nor propose, supervision longer than is absolutely necessary. I will deal with the matter of the Soldier Settlement Board when the estimates for that department are up. Suffice it for the moment to say that I think for this year, and next year, we will have to maintain that force of men, because I believe they have been the greatest contributing factor to the success of the scheme so far. Since dealing with the matter last year,—and I will give you the figures later on,—the proportion of success has been considerably greater. In spite of the fact that throughout Canada we have had, I fear, a more or less unsatisfactory year in agriculture, the need for salvaging of the soldiers who were placed on the land has perhaps reached the lowest point notwithstanding the discouragements experienced. That, perhaps, is not true of the province of Alberta where a very severe drought was experienced last year throughout the northern portion, where so many of our soldiers were settled. But these field supervisors will be available. They are at Calgary, travelling in that vicinity; they are at Edmonton, at Regina, at Saskatoon, and at Winnipeg. And we are advertising in the Old Country and elsewhere, through our agencies, the fact that the settler can come and get expert advice from these men with respect to where he shall locate, with respect to the value of the land, and with respect to how he shall take advantage of the conditions that he finds confronting him.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: When were those advertisements first inserted?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): About the first of December, I think, on the return of Mr. Smith from the Old Country.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: After the 31st, was it not?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): There are a great many details to remember in connection with this subject, I cannot recall the exact date.

Mr. HOEY: Will the minister tell us whether the governments of the western provinces are co-operating, or propose to co-operate, in this scheme, and were they represented at the conference to which the minister has already referred?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes, all of them with the exception of the province of Saskatchewan, and that province was represented by Mr. Gardiner a day or two later.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: May I ask the minister, before he leaves this point, whether he has any estimate as to the amount of capital

that is necessary for a prospective settler to have in order to buy the land, and equip it with machinery and stock, in order to start in the modest way which he has outlined?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I should say that he should have at least between fifteen hundred and two thousand dollars.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: With that amount he would carry on?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I do not think the minister has answered my question. What I wanted to know was whether he could make a statement as to what quantity of free land—that is land available for homesteading—still existed in the northwest.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I did not catch the question. There are in the province of Alberta surveyed and ready for settlement about 4,000,000 acres of free land. In Saskatchewan there are about 5,000,000. All of that land would not be adaptable for homesteading, but that is the amount in those two provinces. I cannot give the figures for Manitoba.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): How far from the railway?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I should say from 18 to 30 miles.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Would that land be adapted to growing wheat profitably?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I would say the bulk of this land would not be adapted to wheat growing, but rather to mixed farming.

Mr. KELLNER: The minister made a reference to the services of the field men of the Soldier Settlement Board. Would the services of these officials be at the disposal of the Western Colonization people?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I have endeavoured to keep the services separate. The Canada Colonization people are dealing purely and simply with people who have money to purchase land. They have agents of their own in the United States, who are canvassing for that purpose, and intend later, if the scheme is successful, to do so in the Old Land, but at the moment they are confining their activities to the United States. Our agents of the Soldier Settlement Board are simply advertising the fact that reliable trained advice can be had from the supervisors or the field men of the Soldier Settlement Board, and that advice, of course, cannot be utilized for the purpose of purchasing land.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Would the minister explain in greater detail this arrangement he has made about the supervisory services of the Soldier Settlement Board? First, to what extent are the services at the disposal of the Western Canada Colonization Company? Are they at their disposal to the same extent that they have rendered them in connection with soldier settlement? Secondly, what are the terms of the arrangement?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I do not understand my right hon. friend. He has asked me: Are these services at their disposal to the same extent as they were in connection with the soldier settlement?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The Canada Colonization Company did not touch the soldier settlement.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I understood the minister to say he had made an arrangement whereby the functions of the supervisors of the Soldier Settlement Board could be utilized by the Western Canada Colonization Company.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): If I said that I did not intend to.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Well, by their settlers, by those who come and settle under them, and that he had authorized his agents to advertise for settlers to come in under the auspices of that company, and to have their services for certain purposes. Is that correct? If so, for what purpose? And secondly, to what extent do the company's settlers pay for these services?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): They are two distinct services. Probably I had better explain how they work out. I have thought that it would be impossible for the government to assume the responsibility through paid officials of the government—because the supervisors of the Soldier Settlement Board are paid officials of the government—to negotiate sales, to take a newcomer and act as the agent between the vendor and the purchaser. Under the soldier settlement scheme, of course, the purchase was made outright, the money paid in full and the land became the property of the government of Canada. Under this scheme there will be an agreement of sale, running over a period of 32 years, and in many cases the Canada Colonization Company, a company doing business as agents between the vendor and purchaser, will be acting as agent for the vendor for a considerable number of years. That is one

of the services they propose rendering the vendor. The absentee vendor, for example, may list his land with the understanding that the payments will be transmitted through their office annually for a period, at least until the time comes when it can be computed and a mortgage taken, which they have promised under their scheme, but in the meantime they act as agents, the same as other agents who act between the vendor and the purchaser of land. For that reason, Mr. Chairman, we have felt there are two distinct services to be rendered. One is the service of listing the land through an agent for sale, for a period of 32 years, at the rate of 6 per cent, and in addition they are finding as many purchasers as possible for the land, but selling to all who may approach them for the purpose of purchasing land. That is the service they will perform. The services the soldier settlement supervisor will render will be that he, in a larger way, will be available to the settler coming from the Old Land, because a settler will come to him, He is the paid official of the government. A vast amount of information about the whole country is at their disposal in the offices, and the settler may go there. He may also obtain advice from that supervisor as to the minimum and maximum amount he should pay for land in any given locality. But the real service in my opinion starts when the settler is placed upon the land, no matter what agency places him there. He is a newcomer and can have from these men the advice that is so important in the initial stages of the settlement of a newcomer upon the land. I anticipate that practically all the settlers coming from the Old Country will utilize the services of the Soldier Settlement Board.

Mr. MEIGHEN: As I understand the scheme, the company acts as the agent of sale and acts as a collector afterwards. The company gets a commission after that on a non-profit basis, but the purchaser, farmer, or the immigrant coming in has the privilege of going to the supervisor first for his advice as to purchase. The minister was careful to say he would give his advice in this form, "In this district I fix a minimum of so much an acre and a maximum of so much an acre." Then the second part of the advice is as to farming afterwards. With all deference, I suggest this to the minister's mind. He is just giving his officers sufficient authority to get the government of the country into trouble, and not sufficient authority to be the least service to the purchaser. He puts a minimum and a maximum in a district. Now there will be one farm worth twice as much as the adjoining one in the same district. Unless the department is prepared, as we did in the soldier settlement scheme, to exercise control over every purchase, it had better keep its hand out of the matter of valuations altogether.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The report I got from the agents of the government, in the United States was that the return of at least 15 per cent of prospective settlers who did not settle in the West in the last ten years was due to the fact that they had received conflicting information. Further we do not propose to restrict that information in a general way, although it is fair for my right hon. friend to take that inference I think. We intend to give that advice in a real way, particularly to Old Country settlers. If a man chooses a certain parcel of land, it may not be listed by the Canada Colonization Company; it may be listed by a private individual, and in almost nine cases out of ten, if the individual approaches him in that way, he will be asked eight per cent interest and, perhaps, a higher rate per acre than the land would be listed for with the Canada Colonization Company or some other corporation of that sort. But if you get your soldier supervisor as agent between vendor and purchaser, then in my opinion, you are going to have a great deal of trouble. If it were possible to purchase outright as has been the case in the past, there would be difficulty. The greatest service the supervisor has rendered—and I am not unmindful of that—is that his business was to purchase the land as cheaply as he possibly could, and purchasing it outright in that way, he invariaby got rock-bottom prices. But that does not prevail in this case.

Mr. MORRISON: Supposing a settler purchased a piece of land and it was discovered later that he had been absolutely defrauded; is there any redress for him? Soldier supervisors have a very large territory to go over. When the Union government appointed those supervisors in the first place, one of them told me that he no sooner got his appointment than men came to him and offered to bribe him to sell their lands to soldiers for double what the land was worth. The leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) touched the right point when he said that one farm lying alongside another will be worth twice as much. I have known them worth five times as much. Newcomers should be protected, and if a glaring fraud is perpetrated, there should be some supervisor who could annul the whole transaction, so that those men might not pick

up and go out of the country, cursing the country and bringing the whole thing into disrepute.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): That is just the service that I hope they will render. I am not unmindful of the fact that individuals will come in who will make mistakes in purchasing. The very thing mentioned by my hon. friend, that the supervisor may be offered a consideration for the purpose of assisting the vendor, would be bound to be prevalent, and to a much greater degree than if he were purchasing outright, spot cash, for the government, and, becoming the actual owner of the land for the purpose of selling it to another party. I do not think it wise that we should ask the supervisors to go into that particular service; but as regards advice—and I do not want to cover the ground again—supervisors have had some years of experience; they know the country; they have valued land in the vicinity; they ought to have a fair idea of the value of every quarter section within the agricultural district through which they travel. It is not unfair to expect that and that they could give a pretty fair value for any quarter section of land upon which their opinion might be asked.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I agree with that; but the matter is so important, and I am so confident of my position that I want to impress it again. If the minister gives them any authority, let it be complete. Do not let the minister's officials come in and give any advice unless full responsibility is taken and the most thorough investigation given individually to the land, not merely to the man. If the minister does not do that, he is going to land in this position, and I will give him warning in time. He will find afterwards that there will be throughout Canada settlers who will claim that being promised the supervision and assistance of the officers of the Dominion government, they came in and they were defrauded notwithstanding. They could easily be, under the loose system the minister has in mind; they will be back on this government and this country, and they will have a claim that will be very difficult to answer.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I do not know how far my right hon. friend would go, unless he went the length of making the supervisor the actual agent between vendor and purchaser.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I go to the length in every case we go in the soldier settlement work. There the government is responsible absolutely for the fairness of every purchase. The government supervises each and all in which it lends any money. Unless you are prepared to go that length in cases where you do not lend any money do not go any length at all.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I must confess that personally I did try to have this responsibility taken by the provinces, but they refused.

Mr. BEAUBIEN: The western provinces refused to go into this co-operation with the federal government; am I right?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Mr. BEAUBIEN: Did they give reasons?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Mr. BEAUBIEN: That was because the federal government had not given them their natural resources.

Mr. SPENCER: I understand the government is working in co-operation with the Canada Colonization Company. Is the government subsidizing that company, and if so, how much per month?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes, the government proposes, at least, if parliament gives its sanction, to give them $10,000 a month.

Mr. KENNEDY (West Edmonton): Will the government have any supervision over the salaries of officers of that company?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No, not any more than as regards the Salvation Army to whom we have been giving grants for a number of years.

Mr. KELLNER: Who comprise the Canada Colonization Company? What is the association between them and the government?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): If my hon. friend will wait, I would rather give the information when the question comes up in the estimates.

Mr. KELLNER: Yes.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I have not the information before me in my notes. I can give the name of the manager of the organization with whom I have done business; that is Mr. Everett.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Is there any connection between the present company and the old, defunct North Atlantic Trading Company?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I have never heard of any.

Mr. JACOBS: Who is the present president of the Canada Colonization Association?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): There is none at present.

Mr. JACOBS: It is without a head?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Could the minister tell us whether it is true, as reported in the press, that the retiring president has recommended that the whole of this activity be handed over to the Salvation Army?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I had not seen that. In answer to my hon. friend (Mr. Beaubien) as to why the provinces did not assist, I may say that they are quite in sympathy with the settlement of these lands; but for the reason that they did not have the natural resources, they did not feel they were called upon to make any expenditure in this connection. What I hope will be of the greatest service to the settler through the Soldier Settlement Board is the advice that will be given to the settler during the first two or three years that he is upon the land. I have announced to the committee that the advice, so far as it will go, will be not to venture into too heavy investments in land, but that he will make his start in a modest way and, as he progresses, that he will purchase, if needs be, further lands in order that he may carry on. In connection with the American field, at a meeting of the agents held some months ago in Chicago, I found that while agricultural conditions in western Canada were in rather bad shape, the inflation during the war had stricken the American farmer to a worse degree than it had affected our own agriculturists throughout Canada, and that inflation in farm values across the border had gone to such an extent that the farmers could no longer carry on. Indeed, I was approached by very many American farmers with splendid equipment who were desirous of moving out of the central and western states and coming to western Canada, but who found themselves in such straits that they had not even the means to pay their railway transportation. That is the difficulty one encounters everywhere. But I am hopeful despite that fact that a great many of these men will come to western Canada. With that thought in view we offered a scheme of leased lands to encourage them to move out of the United States and settle here.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the minister seriously contend that the reason our farmers go there instead of the farmers of the United States come here is that ours are better off and are able to travel?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): So far as I have been able to ascertain I do not know that there are so many Canadian farmers who have gone to the United States to farm. I made that statement before.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They are going by thousands.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: They are going for the high tariff over there.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Possibly the high tariff is an inducement for them to go there, but the people that are going are locating in the urban centres; they are not going to farm, I can assure my hon. friends of that fact. And more than that, the statistics will show that a great many of those who have gone to the United States are only temporarily there; out of four or five thousand there are only one thousand who have entered as permanent residents of the United States. They are not going, at all events at the moment, with the intention of remaining over there. But I do not fancy that I am stating a new fact; I think that has always been the condition with regard to immigration to the United States.

Mr. GOOD: What does the minister mean by permanent residents?

Mr. MANION: Has the minister the figures regarding the exodus from Canada to the United States for a period, say, of six months?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I cannot lay my hands on them just at the moment.

Mr. FORKE: I can give the figures to the end of June, 1922.

Mr. MANION: Perhaps the minister can give the approximate figures; I do not want an exact statement.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The press gives an average of 10,000 a month; perhaps that is right.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No, that is not correct. I have the correct figures here. The movements from Canada to the United States, according to the United States annual reports, were as follows:

In 1917-18	71,000
1918-19	96,000
1919-20	143,000
1920-21	72,000
1921-22	46,000

Mr. MEIGHEN: Up to the 31st March, 1922?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes, I think that is correct.

Mr. LADNER: What have been the figures since March, 1922, to date?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I have them somewhere but I cannot lay my hands on them now. I will give them at a later period. They have been prepared up to last month, and they show a fair average.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They show a large increase over the year before.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes, that is true. But looking back over a period of years they fluctuate considerably. I know that from the city of Toronto there has been a very serious efflux to the United States.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: This year?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes. Unquestionably a great many tradesmen have left Canada for the United States; and I am not overlooking the fact that a fairly large number of people went out of western Canada even off the land to the United States.

Mr. MERCIER: Can the minister give the figures by provinces?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No, we have not got them by provinces. What I want to point out, however, is that from the United States and Great Britain we shall get about the same percentage of people who can establish themselves on the land. I do not expect that we shall have a large population for the year 1922-23, because immigration has reached one of its low points in Canadian history. I may give some of the figures with respect to immigration since 1881, when we had 47,000 coming into Canada, down to 1900 when it was 44,000. The next year it was 23,000 and in 1905 and 1906 we had 128,000 and 130,000. In 1910 we had 208,000; in 1911, 311,000; in 1912, 354,000 and 1913, 402,000. Then it began to drop until in 1916 we had 48,000; in 1917, 75,000; and in 1919, 57,000. In 1921-22, it was 89,000. I mention these figures to show the fluctuation there has been over that long period of years. What I have been trying to show this afternoon is that we shall undoubtedly get from the United States a fairly large number of desirable settlers who will go on the lands of western Canada, and we shall also get from Great Britain and the Scandinavian countries pepole who will ultimately become settlers in the West. We have established on the Continent of Europe agencies for two purposes; because from the Continent, owing to war conditions, there are areas from which perhaps we would not get people whom we could assimilate or absorb into the population just yet. Nevertheless there is a very large population on the Continent from which we can draw desirable settlers for northern and western Canada. Let me say, too, that the governments are becoming interested in this question. They have over-population in their countries. I know it may be said that that is one of the reasons why Great Britain wants to get rid of some of her people who are not of a very desirable type, but I shall deal with that feature when I come to the subject of assisted passages. I think it is safe to say that we are on sane ground when we claim the right to designate who may come into Canada and so afford reasonable protection to our citizens. At the continental ports we are not seeking to hold back desirable immigrants but rather to encourage them. From Bohemia we hope to obtain a very desirable class of settlers; also from Poland, Hungary and other continental countries. One peculiar outstanding fact I should mention in passing, namely, that from Hungary there promises to come a larger proportion of people in a position to establish themselves here than perhaps from any of the other countries from which we hope to draw a considerable number of immigrants.

Mr. JACOBS: Under our law no Hungarian is permitted to come into this country. He is regarded as an alien enemy.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Hungarians have been coming in for some considerable time by permission of the minister.

Mr. JACOBS: By permission of the minister?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The order in council has not been cancelled as against Hungary and other enemy countries.

Mr. JACOBS: Does that apply to Germany also?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes. Notwithstanding that we have been letting in a few Germans for whom application has been made by their friends. I am hopeful that in the near future the order in council against nationals from those countries may be brought to an end.

Mr. JACOBS: If those nationals are permitted to come in by order of the minister, why should not the order in council be cancelled forthwith?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I see no particular reason why it should not be cancelled. But I take it that no desirable individual is being handicapped as a result. Immigration seems to be rather a touchy subject in this House. I did not know there

were so many tender spots that one might tread upon in dealing with the question.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is immigration from other countries a matter of pull too?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No, I would not say that.

Mr. BOYS: The minister, I understand, predicts increased immigration of a desirable class of farmers from the United States during this year, and I also understand that he predicts a decrease in the movement of our farmers to the United States. What, if any, new policy or change in policy is likely to produce the result he has predicted?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I think it is safe to say that in crises of all sorts you reach the peak sooner or later, that there comes a day for liquidation. I think that day has come. I may refer to my own locality, which I know fairly well. Perhaps 15 per cent of the people there have been forced out of business, nothing could save them, they had to go; there are 15 to 20 per cent in rather serious difficulties; a fair percentage of the balance is not by any means on Easy street, but there is no doubt that they are going to remain and continue in agriculture. I think my hon. friend will agree with me that the same condition of affairs applies in a business way.

Mr. BOYS: Then I understand that the minister's prediction is based on the fact that the peak both ways has been reached, and is not due to any new policy or change in policy? In a word, it is merely an accident, so to speak. We on this side want to do everything we can to assist the minister in bringing about the most desirable conditions, but if his prediction is based on what is only an accident, surely it is time that some policy was evolved whereby the improvement should be the result of that policy and not a mere accident.

Mr STEWART (Argenteuil): I think in the past too much credit has been taken by governments for policies that would change conditions. That they have some effect I will not deny, but not to the extent of completely changing conditions of depression or inflation. I am not announcing a policy for the government or for the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), I am dealing with the question of immigration solely and am describing some of the chances of success which I think I have, or in regard to which I am optimistic to suggest to the agents of the government in the Old Country and elsewhere that they have, for inducing settlers to come to Canada. Possibly the Minister of Finance will have something to say about the policy of the government.

Mr. MacKELVIE: The minister has taken us as far as the prairies. Will he tell us if there is any prospect of co-operation with the province of British Columbia in respect to immigration?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I shall have a word or two to say about that if my hon. friend will permit me to get through with my remarks on the Old Land and other sources of immigration.

Mr. BOYS: I, too, have a few questions to ask, and if the minister would prefer to finish his address and deal with them when his estimates are up, I shall be very pleased to wait.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I do not object to any questions now except that they lead me away from what I am proposing to say. We have had a visit from the representative of the Swedish government which is undertaking to supervise emigration in a systematic way. He has gone as far as Winnipeg at the expense of the Canadian government. I suggested that he go as far as Vancouver in order to get a first hand idea of the opportunities awaiting settlers throughout Canada. He has come back enthusiastically in favour of recommending his government to send out settlers. Indeed, he is to bring over the first contingent of two or three hundred. The same thing applies to Holland. We were visited by the representative of that country and he went as far as Vancouver. He has gone back to recommend to his government that settlers be sent out to the number of 1500 as an experiment this year. These men have not very much cash to invest, and it is a matter of finding employment for them at the outset. But in a real way we have been trying to bring to the attention of the governments of the countries from which we hope to attract settlers the opportunities we have to offer homeseekers.

In respect to Scotland, a country that has done more for the settlement of Canada than perhaps any other country of its size in the world, we have been endeavouring to interest people in the northern part of that country to settle here. If I had time I could read to the committee letters from our agent, Mr. Murphy, who has gone through the northern portions of Scotland, where he says there are hundreds of men anxious to come to Canada.

Mr. FORKE: What was Murphy doing in Scotland?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Well, he appears to be getting along very well with our Scottish friends there. At least, he is having splendid success in interesting those people in Canada. We hope to induce a large number of people to come from Scotland, who will be fully as able to establish themselves as those who come from England. We have not been so successful as far as Scandinavia is concerned; only in Denmark have we had an agent up to the present. In Sweden the possibilities of the settlement of their people in other countries than their own is commencing to be realized, and we hope to go into that country with our agents and propagandize for the purpose of encouraging emigration to Canada. Then, we expect to get people from Iceland and other countries where the climate is similar to that of Canada—people who will be readily assimilated here.

Mr. LADNER: What about Belgium?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): We have an agent at Antwerp, but there is no immediate prospect of inducing many Belgian people to come to Canada. So far as British Columbia is concerned, we have had the premier of that province here. He has a very active officer in the person of Mr. Pattullo, who sent an agent to India to induce officers retired from the Indian army to come to Canada. An officer of the Soldier Settlement Board was sent there by the federal government with the same object in view. I cannot say what success they are having, but we hope that a large number will be induced to take up residence in western Canada, particularly in British Columbia, because we feel that these people would adapt themselves more readily to the conditions in that province than in the others.

Mr. LADNER: Has the government of British Columbia made a definite offer to join with the federal government in an aggressive policy of immigration in conjunction with the British government under the Empire settlement scheme? Has not British Columbia also concluded or partly concluded arrangements with the British government contingent upon the consent of the Dominion government?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I know that negotiations were being carried on, but I cannot say whether or not they have reached a conclusion. Ontario has carried its negotiation to a conclusion respecting immigration into that province from the Old Land. I know Mr. Pattullo was carrying on negotiations of the same sort.

[Mr. Forke.]

Mr. LADNER. The point of my question is that the British government and the provincial governments are apparently agreed upon some sort of action. Is the Dominion government willing to co-operate in that scheme or does its policy exclude the possibility of such co-operation?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No, the British government will deal with private corporations, with municipalities, with provincial governments, or with federal governments. Indeed, in the case of Australia there are dealings with the states as well as with the Commonwealth government. Such arrangements are, of course, always subject to the approval of the federal authorities.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I wonder if the minister can say now whether or not the figures I gave the other day were correct. I pointed out that under that scheme, Canada, having taken no interest in it, got
5 p.m. only 130 immigrants as against upwards of 11,000 in the case of Australia and New Zealand. I think the minister said he was going to send the deputy minister to find out something about it; perhaps he knows now.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): As I recall it, what my hon. friend asked the other day was whether or not we were too late in making application for the joint action. I had no recollection of any figures being mentioned, because we have no intention of entering into a similar agreement to that made between the British government and the government of Australia, namely, for the settlement of land as well as for assisted passages. Ours extended only to the point of assisted passages.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Was the deputy sent over?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: When?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): He should be in England now.

Mr. LADNER: Is there a definite arrangement between the government of British Columbia and this government respecting immigration, and if so would the minister be good enough to give us some intimation of what it involves?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): There is no definite arrangement between the two governments at the moment.

Mr. LADNER: But is there any working arrangement under which immigration will be going to British Columbia just as it will be going to the prairie provinces? The reason I ask this is that according to the press the Attorney General of British Columbia has intimated that there will be a considerable demand for labour in that province this year. He says:

> While not anticipating such a labour shortage as that—

Referring to a statement made by a large employer of labour.

> —there is every indication that the demand for labour will be at least equal to if not considerably more than the available supply, and that there will be no justification for any man being idle.

The article goes on to show considerable activity in British Columbia. I understand the provincial government is desirous of having an early immigration policy there, not only for agricultural settlers but also for men engaged in such other business as mining, lumbering and fishing. The matter is of considerable interest to British Columbia, therefore, and we would like to have some information from the minister on the subject.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): So far as that demand is concerned, we have no recent communication. As in the case of Ontario, British Columbia maintained an office in the Old Country and carried on a considerable amount of propaganda work on their own part, and they may be carrying it on now without my knowledge. We have been co-operating very fully with British Columbia, and we are prepared to carry on in the same way. I speak only of the demands for labour from the areas from which we have received them; I have no knowledge of any communication from British Columbia stating that they required labour of that character.

Mr. LADNER: I do not wish to be too persistent, but will the minister be good enough to disclose the nature of the co-operation? Mr. Pattullo, Minister of Lands for that province, in an address delivered to the Board of Trade before I left Vancouver, intimated that he then had negotiations under way with the Dominion government under which a definite scheme would be worked out to bring immigrants to the province, and that the Dominion would be a party to that scheme. If such a scheme has been arranged for, it is of importance to the province to know what it is, just as the minister has outlined a scheme of co-operation—or non-co-operation, as it appears—with the prairie provinces.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Well, everything I have said with respect to the prairie provinces would apply to British Columbia, with the exception that British Columbia, through Mr. Pattullo, is taking a very much more active interest in immigration than the governments of the prairie provinces. The reason is a good one: British Columbia owns its natural resources and is setting aside land for the purposes of settlement, particularly along the Grand Trunk Pacific. I know that they are extremely anxious to promote settlement and have asked us to co-operate in bringing these localities to the attention of prospective settlers, they on their part agreeing to take care of them upon arrival. Beyond that we have no definite scheme of co-operation, except in a general way; we shall, of course, give to British Columbia or any of the other provinces any support or assistance that we can.

Mr. LADNER: What is that support or assistance? That is the point.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): In bringing to the attention of prospective settlers the advantages of British Columbia, in the circulation of any advertising matter that they may provide, and so on—in a general way; because we cannot pick any particular province in that respect. Our business is to try to induce people to come to Canada, and to that end, in a fair way, to present the advantages of all the provinces to prospective settlers.

Mr. MANION: So far as that point is concerned, is it not a fact that the Department of Immigration—under this government as under other governments—generally recommends the prairie provinces to settlers? I ask that because it is my understanding that they do. Like British Columbia, of which my hon. friend speaks, northern Ontario, from which I come, is a very fine farming section, although it has bush lands just as British Columbia has. Yet it has always been my impression that the Department of Immigration recommends the prairie provinces to the detriment of the other sections referred to. I should like a little enlightenment on that point from the minister if he can give it?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I think my hon. friend's objection, if he puts it that way, is well taken; I think there is no doubt about it. In former days the lands were free on the prairies, but they were not free elsewhere. There was a charge made, if I remember correctly for lands in the province of Ontario as well as in British Columbia—not very much it is true, nevertheless a small charge

was made for land. These provinces owned their natural resources. They were exploiting them and trying to settle the lands in their own interest, whereas in other cases the lands belonged to the federal government and that government was trying to settle them primarily in the interest of the Dominion.

Mr. LADNER: Does the minister's scheme involve granting financial assistance to the settlers? Take a concrete case. Supposing John Smith from England wanted to come out here and select a piece of property in Alberta. Does the minister's scheme involve a measure of financial assistance repayable over a period of years, and does that rest upon the province, carrying the same illustration to the province of British Columbia?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Well, I would not like to be drawn into a discussion of what Mr. Pattullo has in mind for British Columbia. So far as regards the federal government, I would say "no" to every one of his queries. We have not a scheme of placing people on the land and assisting them with money. I will deal with the subject of assisted passages later on.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: In reference to the minister's last remark, is it not a fact that the control of immigration belongs to the federal government and not to the provinces? Consequently, the fact that a province might control its own lands should not debar that province from the benefit of the operations of the federal authorities in regard to immigration. Just along that line, may I ask—because I notice that the minister has dealt very fully with the Maritime provinces, the province of Quebec, the prairie provinces and British Columbia—did I understand him aright, at the outset of his remarks, to state that in so far as the province of Ontario is concerned they were going to do nothing?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Oh no, what I said at the outset was that the government of the province of Ontario were carrying on a propaganda in the Old Land on their own account; they were bringing in, for example, domestic servants, they were making advances for them, they were trying to induce settlers to come to that province; but I hope, that I did not in any way mislead my hon. friend into thinking that the federal government had no responsibility. I say we are doing just the same for Ontario that we are doing for every other province; trying to induce people to come in. We are willing to distribute literature for Ontario and willing to hold up the advantages of that province as well as those of the other provinces of Canada. My hon. friend is perfectly right; the responsibilty for inducing people to come to the country primarily devolves upon the federal authorities. In the past, the responsibilty of the colonization end of it has rested very frequently upon anybody, but primarily upon the provinces themselves.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: They were forced to assume the responsibility. The minister has stated in his remarks this afternoon that the prairie provinces offered the most fertile field for immigration. He paid but scant attention to the requirements of the rural districts of old Ontario where I will venture to state—in view of the doleful tale we have heard from the representatives of western Canada—there is no field so fertile to-day, and no demand so pressing.

Mr. LEWIS: Is it not true, in spite of the emphasis laid on the three prairie provinces and the fact that the Dominion government owns the land, that if we look over the statistics for the last twenty years we find that more people have settled in Ontario than in the other provinces referred to?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): In reply to my hon. friend let me say that I have brought to the attention of intending settlers the portions of northern Ontario that are being opened up to-day. I cannot say how much of this has been done in the past, my hon. friend, perhaps, will know better than I. However, it is our intention to have a policy of propaganda that will bring to the attention of the settler the chances that are available throughout the whole of Canada. That is one of the things I think it is the duty of the department to do, not to concentrate absolutely on one particular part of Canada, because there are advantages in every province. There are advantages, perhaps, in one province that will appeal to the individual, and that will hold him in Canada, that he will not find in the other provinces. We cannot say that any particular province is better than the other, but we can say that there are advantages to be obtained in all of them.

I do not know that I should detain the House any longer with the matter of immigration or where it shall come from. But let me emphasize this one thing before I have done: On several occasions, in speaking upon this question, I have emphasized the necessity of reasonable and careful selection; and I hope that in dealing with the matter of assisted passages it will not be inferred, as it has been said to me on some other occasions, that when we embark in an undertaking of this kind we will not, perhaps, get as desir-

able a class of settler. I do not think it should be inferred from the mere fact that some people make application for assistance to come to the country that they are not desirable settlers. I think that the evidence we have in the Old Land fully goes to prove that very many desirable people are anxious to move from their present homes, anxious to come to some new country in the British Empire to make a fresh start, but perhaps, have not sufficient means to enable them to do so. However, to that particular class our scheme does not apply. It rather is more restricted in character than that. Here let me say that one of the greatest schemes in connection with immigration that has appealed to me most is that of child emigration to Canada. In my younger days I knew somewhat of the success of the Barnardo scheme. I know that in some respects this work has been criticized, but there are organizations in the Old Land who have been doing a splendid work in this respect and the record of the Barnardo Boys Home, having regard to enlistment during the war and the success of the boys who did enlist, is a splendid record and one that will bear comparison with the record of any of the young men who enlisted in the Canadian army. From Ontario and eastern Canada—but it will apply, perhaps, to my hon. friend's province more than to any of the others and it has been the case for several years so far as I can discover from the records of the department—applications have come in excess of those that the various organizations engaged in this work are able to fill. For example, a year ago there were about 15,000 applications for boys and girls from people who were willing to take them into their homes and adopt them, and about 1,500 were placed. That gives you an idea of how close we are to the point at which we aim in connection with this work.

Now let me, for a moment, deal with the matter from a close personal standpoint. In the province of Alberta we have had for a number of years what is known as the Delinquent Children's department. That is a very poor name for it. It should never have been called by that name. It was rather a department organized for the purpose of caring for children who were unfortunate, through no fault of theirs, and very frequently through no fault of the parents, and we find, strange to say, that in the new provinces in the West, which are said to be settled by bachelors, there are always more applications for children than we are able to satisfy. Indeed, the only children in the hands of the government to-day, or a year ago, so far as I know, were those who were slightly mentally deficient. The robust, physically fit child was adopted into a foster home as soon as he was able to go there. There is in Ontario and eastern Canada a great field for this work, and there are in the Old Country children of deceased soldiers by the thousands, children of respectable parents by the thousands, who will make splendid settlers and citizens of Canada if we can bring them here. This work has been very largely philanthropic, so far as I can ascertain, assisted by contributions of people interested in the work. Very little assistance has been given to the organizations by the government of the Old Country or the government of any country, and the recent increase in transportation rates has made it difficult for these organizations to carry on. I therefore propose to offer a grant for those who can be carefuly selected and absorbed in decent homes in Ontario, and in this work we are enjoying the full co-operation of the officials of the Ontario government who have been dealing with this phase of the question in placing these children in foster homes. The government is asking parliament to give us a reasonable sum for this work, up to $200,000, which we hope will be supplemented by the British government through their Overseas Settlement Board. I want to emphasize first the selection of the child; secondly, the selection of the home and the desirability of getting these young people into our Canadian homes. Strange to say there has been throughout Canada for the past few years a very serious lack of domestic help in the household. The Ontario government and the Saskatchewan government have been doing something during the past two or three years in connection with bringing out those girls for domestic service. Again we find the same difficulty in regard to assistance. So far as the province of Saskatchewan is concerned they have been collecting from various individuals and have been putting up some money themselves, sending over and bringing girls out. I made careful inquiry of Mr. Gardiner when he was here discussing the question of immigration as to the success of their scheme, and I was assured that they were meeting with splendid success and that there was very little loss in connection with the proposition. Miss Biden, an official of our department, paid partly by the Department of Immigration and partly by the Saskatchewan government, has been an inspectional officer and has made the selections. We propose to carry out this work to a greater degree, trying to supplement the demand for domestic servants by asking for a vote of $200,000 for this purpose, which will be further supplemented by the Overseas Settlement Board.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Is that an additional $200,000 to be asked for in the case of children?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes. That however is a grant that will not be returned. In the case of domestic servants we hope that 90 per cent of the money will be returned to the federal government. So far as the child is concerned, it is absolutely a grant in toto for the passage.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Would the minister not consider the advancement of assistance to that extent to competent farm labourers who are vouched for by the provincial authorities?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Referring to the farm labourer, we have not ventured into that field. Perhaps my hon. friend will agree with me that I am somewhat of a careful individual with respect to the expenditure of public money. At least I know that this vote will not meet the ideals of a great many of my hon. friends in this House. They will say I should have gone a great deal further. So far as I am concerned, I propose to go slowly. I hope we shall get settlement. I feel that we shall get settlement and the evidence of that is that the steamship companies are having splendid success in their booking so far with people who will come as labourers to Canada.

Dealing with the other class to whom my hon. friend referred, we have no scheme for the bringing out of farm labourers. It is rather a difficult proposition to deal with, owing to the fact that you have no assurance, or perhaps not as much assurance of holding the farm labourer or the mill labourer as is desirable, in order to secure the return of the money. But what we are doing is this: in regard to the individual who has come to Canada and has not been able so far to obtain the necessary funds to bring his family or his children, or the individual who is desirous of bringing a friend whom he knows, either from an urban centre or from a rural district and who will settle upon the land, we have set aside $200,000 for assistance, as an experiment. We provide that he shall pay 25 per cent of the cost of the passage of his family, or the family whom he may nominate, and give a guarantee for the return of the money. In order that it may work smoothly and easily, we are dealing with the local banks in this respect, taking security from two of his neighbours, because my experience since coming here is that on hundreds of different occasions we have been appealed to by men already in the country for assistance in order to bring out their families and establish them here. We thought it would be proper to provide for the furnishing of 25 per cent, either by the individual who nominated the family, or by someone else. We provide for the return of the money in a certain period. If it is the wife alone, or if it is a family consisting of the husband and wife, a repayment inside of one year of the full amount, or if there are children within two years, without interest, according to the size of the family is required.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Is this in addition to the $400,000 already referred to?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes, making $600,000 in all.

Mr. LADNER: Is there a class of assisted immigrants other than those to which the minister has referred? A little while ago he referred to assisted immigrants. Does the class he has referred to include all of them?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No, it is simply assisted passages from the Old Land, with respect to which we have the co-operation of the Overseas Settlement Board. There is no programme of assisted passages from any country except Great Britain.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Does the Old Land mean Great Britain and Ireland, or what does it mean?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): It covers the area to which assistance is given by the Overseas Settlement Board of the British government. That applies to Great Britain.

Mr. SPENCER: In regard to the people who are being brought out from various parts of Europe, is the government guarding against these various people settling in colonies to the detriment of western Canada, as has happened in the past? Is an effort being made to assimilate them with the people of the country?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I might say personally that I do not favour colony settlement as we understand it in western Canada. It is a deterrent to assimilation; but we must bear in mind that on the part of many people there will be a desire to settle in communities, and indeed, this desire comes from the Old Land. One of the great attractions of the Australian scheme is that they are going to settle in communities where convenient for them. Our experience in western Canada has been that people assimilate much more readily if there is a reasonable amount of distribution of those people, rather than if

there are close colonies of people of one nationality.

I think I have covered the ground fairly well. I anticipate I shall have innumerable questions with respect to this matter, but what I have in mind is a careful selection of the people who shall come to Canada a follow-up policy that will assist the settler, not in the expenditure of money particularly, but by advice that, we think, will be valuable to him. Not only that, but we propose to bring, as fast as labour conditions will warrant, labour into Canada. We have to-day, in both the Canadian Pacific and the Canadian National Railway offices advertisements asking the farmers to make application for the men that they can employ annually very largely upon their farms. Those men will be carefully selected and brought out to fill the requirements. In fact, we have not missed any agencies, because I take it that we are to have first carefully selected settlers, and second, when we get them into the country, some organization that can perform a service to a certain point; but above and beyond all, we must have the hearty co-operation of all the people and all organizations, churches and otherwise, in connection with this problem

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Would the minister go on and finish the relation of his scheme of land leasing? He touched on that, but I do not think he finished it.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I did not intend to deal with it at any particular length, except that I would say this, that strange to say, in spite of the fact that the information we got was that a great deal of land that had been cultivated was being abandoned and that it was going back into the hands of owners, non-resident or otherwise who would not cultivate it, in Manitoba alone, the only province in which we were able to secure any considerable number of farms for the purpose of leasing, after correspondence with secretary-treasurers of municipalities, the men who ought to know best, and after a careful canvass of the whole province, all that we were able to get was 75 farms. Some of those were not, on inspection, found to be in condition to offer to any tenant, without at least one year's summer fallow. That is not a desirable proposition to offer to a newcomer to the country unless you are prepared to pay him for that operation. Our investigation in that respect did not go very far. In spite of the fact that we are told so frequently that so many of those farms will be settled but will not be occupied and worked next year, I think that is a hopeful sign and evidence in itself that things are not just as bad as we sometimes think they are. I am optimistic enough to think that we have at least reached the peak of the depression, and that our farmers from now on will make progress, although I am not suggesting, of course, that they are going to be inordinately prosperous.

The removal of the British embargo has had this effect. Hon. members from western Canada know what difficulty was experienced in disposing of live stock at 2 1-2 cents per pound. True, perhaps, a good deal of it, was not in a condition to market, but drought conditions sometimes forced the farmer to sell whether he was desirous of doing so or not. To-day, I am informed by Mr. Pat Burns, who is a reliable authority, that they are prepared to pay for stall-fed cattle, even as far as Innisfail, in Alberta, 7½ cents per pound. This argues, in my opinion, that we can depend upon that price for export to the Old Country, and paying transportation charges from Calgary to Liverpool or Glasgow or whatever other ports these cattle are required at. This means a considerable change from the condition that formerly prevailed with respect to our live stock.

I agree with what many of my hon. friends have said in the past, that some change will have to take place in connection with the price of wheat; but there can be no serious complaint as regards dairy products. Wheat alone probably does not show any sign of advance, and any prosperity will have to come rather by way of reduction in the price of commodities the farmer must buy, and by way of reduction of freight rates upon the commodities upon which we have to pay transportation charges.

I have tried in a general way to cover this question. In some respects, it has been a great pleasure to study and discuss this question. There are as many different ideas as to what should be done with respect to immigration, I sometimes think, as there are people in Canada, and my view is, just as I said at the outset, that we must not adopt the extreme opinion of either party, on the one hand that there is no solution; that we should stop this thing outright; or on the other, that we should embark upon a programme of large expenditure of public money to purchase privately-owned land upon which to place settlers and perhaps, have a very undesirable result when such a scheme is worked out. My recommendation is that we should adopt a middle course. That is the recommendation I have made to the government of the day, and my recommendations have been accepted by the government. I hope they will bring about the desired re-

sults. I do not believe that it would be desirable to have a huge influx of immigrants; but I hope this scheme will bring about an increase this year over last year and that, in the end, we shall get back to the state of affairs of 1913 and 1914, because we can, under reasonable conditions, absorb in Canada quite acceptably three or four hundred thousand people a year.

Let me say in conclusion, that it is my desire, so long as I have charge of this department, to administer it so that the benefits of immigration and incoming settlers will be available to all the provinces of Canada. I dwelt upon the western provinces merely because our railway mileage there has in its vicinity a large acreage of desirable untilled land that, I believe for the time being, offers, perhaps, the best opportunity or one of the best opportunities to be had throughout Canada.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I think the minister led the committee to expect from him a statement with regard to the personnel and status of the Canada Colonization Land Corporation, as this company is apparently to act as a medium between the speculator or land holder and the settler.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The Canada Colonization Company, as I understand the matter, has had rather a stormy career in endeavouring to carry out a land settlement scheme that was projected by Mr. M. A. Brown, of Medicine Hat, who went throughout Canada and induced a large number of men of influence and financial means to back him in this scheme of settling, in the first instance, the privately-owned lands of western Canada. I well remember when they came to interview the government of the province of Alberta, they were accompanied by General McRae, who was then manager of the company. They had a scheme for the compulsory listing of lands for a period of two years. This would require legislation by the provincial governments and was rejected; and upon that scheme they spent about a year. I know it is a most difficult thing for an organization of this kind to obtain a satisfactory arrangement under which to carry on its work. But we do need some sort of organization such as this to take the place of the individual who has made a business of land selling for profit. That such a need exists there is not the slightest doubt in my mind, particularly as conditions exist to-day. We have not free lands to offer people within reasonable distance of the railways; all the lands that are desirable are held by private owners. It is difficult when you reject a scheme of purchasing these lands outright and re-selling them to find some other plan which the government can embark upon with any protection to its officials, as outlined by the leader of the Opposition this afternoon. I quite realize that, and I have repeatedly gone over the matter trying to devise a scheme that would keep the government out of difficulty. Now, this organization adopted a scheme of charging a certain percentage of the sales for the service they rendered the private individual.

An hon. MEMBER: What is the percentage?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Ten per cent. I cannot see any objection to a scheme of that kind. These men do not propose to make any profit out of this undertaking; nor do I see how they could make a profit. On the basis of paying to the agent what he legitimately gets for bringing people into the country it will cost them at least a dollar per acre. They have in the United States to-day, I am credibly informed, sixty agents who are operating on a commission basis, who receive for their service something like ten per cent per acre. Hon. gentlemen can figure that out. On a basis of $18 per acre for land, they will get $1.80 per acre for the handling of the land. On the other hand they have the responsibility of going to the vendors, getting the listings of these lands and acting as the agent of the vendor for a period of six or seven years at least,—I am now speaking of the non-resident vendor—thus rendering a service not only to the vendor but to the people of Canada; because to bring in a settler who is located properly, with a decent chance of paying his interest and of having his payments extended when they are due, is certainly rendering a service to the people of Canada that is of some value. Now, a certain proportion of the balance of that money will go to the local individual who assists the agent in that respect. True, if they do not interest the prospective settler from the United States or elsewhere and the settler comes in and purchases without an effort on their part, that dollar will be saved. But that does not happen in a very great number of cases. I am informed that there are at the moment nearly 900,000 acres of western land listed which they can sell on the terms I have outlined, namely, over 32 years and at a rate of 6 per cent. And they propose to spend all the money that they get on that 10 per cent basis in an endeavour to bring people into the country. The arrangement

I have made with them is that they shall settle on the land as a minimum 200 heads of families this year. That is the minimum which I think we should require. I am trying this purely and simply as an experiment, hoping to establish people permanently in that way with a decent chance of getting on.

Mr. SPENCER: Can they settle anywhere?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Allow me to finish, please. If we do not adopt some plan of that kind, what will happen? You will simply put the prospective settler again at the mercy of the private landowner or his agent, and I need not ask any hon. gentleman from western Canada what that means. We all know that the settler will be asked 8 per cent, the prevailing rate in western Canada. And as I have experienced on many occasions, the moment you go to purchase from the private owner, if you appear anxious to have the property he owns you invariably find the price increased ,particularly if you are a newcomer. The same experience is reported by the immigration agents in the United States. They are asking for an organization to which they can send men with the assurance that they will get a fair deal and that they will not come back dissatisfied because of conflicting reports they hear from various points they visit in western Canada. I hope that we shall save some money ultimately in connection with this attempt on our part to carry out the colonization end of the scheme in a definite way for the settlement of people in western Canada. The manager of the company is Mr. Everett. He is the man in whom I stake my confidence for the success of the scheme. As regards Mr. M. A. Brown, he was the originator of this scheme and is again about to raise money. He has met with difficulties and I am not prepared to criticize him. I know that he has been criticized very severely in many quarters, and many of the individuals who backed him at the start say he changed the programme, that another scheme was attempted, and that they were not consulted and are not prepared to put up money. On the other hand, there are still behind him a number of ardent supporters who are putting up their money in order that the scheme may continue. So much for him. But the man on whom I depend to make a success of the undertaking is Mr. Howard Everett, who has had many years experience in land settlement in western Canada. He is an American and was at one time manager of the Luse Land Company who settled a great many people throughout central Saskatchewan and central Alberta. This company did a tremendous business in the early days, as the people of Saskatchewan may remember. This gentleman thoroughly understands the business in which he is engaged, and he thinks he can make a success of it. I hope he can. I hope he will make a huge success of it, because it means that he is bringing in and settling people on the land and giving them an opportunity which they would not otherwise get if it were not for this private corporation which is not taking profits out of the enterprise.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Before the minister entirely concludes, I want to correct something I said this afternoon in connection with the question of advertising. I said that the amount spent outside of Great Britain was $92,000; it is only $90,000. But I want to draw the minister's attention to this fact. I have Hansard before me and I find at page 540 the statement that the amount spent in advertising carried on in Great Britain was $3,089.82, and in other countries $90,595.81. The minister says this return was amended. I turn to the next day's Hansard but I find that the correction has absolutely nothing to do with that question. I have been unable to find it amended anywhere else and these figures are not correct. The minister should tell us where the correction is to be found and how it was made. The House has a right to rely upon the answers given by ministers in the ordinary way, and I want to be entirely fair to my hon. friend. The day that answer was given, and he realized the frightful discrepancy in the figures, he came over to me and said that there must be some error. If there is an error we must have it corrected quickly. I have heard nothing since from the minister. I can well imagine his astonishment at the figures.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): My hon. friend's statement is hardly in accordance with what happened. After a note reached me from my secretary saying that a mistake had been made with respect to the advertising in Great Britain, and that instead of giving the full amount it merely referred to the newspaper advertising, which was $3,000, I went over to my hon. friend and told him that I would get a correction of the statement for him the following day. The correction was prepared by Mr. Stead's department and left in the hands of my secretary. The only reason I can conceive for the delay is that he was taken ill and possibly did not forward the statement.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Mr. Chairman, evidently the secretary is sick this time. The

hon. minister did not tell me anything about that before. If the statement is wrong, cannot we get the facts now as to how much money was spent? How many more shuffles are we to have?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I understood the figures were corrected in Hansard. I will undertake to get the figures to my hon. friend and also to place them on the Table without further delay.

Mr. FORTIER: Are the various provinces which are co-operating with the government ready to grant free land to settlers? Is it not a fact that the province of Quebec has extensive areas of land upon which improvements have been made in the way of the erection of houses and barns ready for intending settlers? And is it not also a fact that the Department of Colonization of Quebec is ready to sell these lands to settlers under very favourable conditions?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes, I think I mentioned that early in the afternoon. We are co-operating very closely with the government of Quebec through the Deputy Minister of Colonization.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Am I correct in inferring from the minister's remarks that this land corporation are to receive 10 per cent on the purchase price of the lands they dispose of and also about $10,000 per month from the government, and that they on their part, according to the arrangements made, are to bring out at least 200 families? In other words, are they to receive $600 per family as a bonus?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I merely say that that is the minimum. It is hoped they will exceed that very substantially.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: They get $120,000 if they bring out 200 families?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No. They get $100,000. It is not $10,000 per month for twelve months, but for ten months.

Mr. BOYS: Supposing the company fail to live up to the conditions laid down, what penalty is provided?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The only penalty one can provide in such a case is to stop further payment. That is one of the reasons why we have a provision for payment by the month. Largely the settlement will be made before the month of August.

Mr. BOYS: I presume there is an agreement signed between the department and the company?

[Sir Henry Drayton.]

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): That is the proposed agreement. It is not signed.

Mr. BOYS: I would take it for granted that there would be a written agreement for such an important matter?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Mr. BOYS: And I also would assume that the agreement would cover a term of years?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No.

Mr. BOYS: If that is so there is not the same necessity for a penalty. But I would suggest to the minister, if it is the intention of the department to enter into an agreement with the company for a period of years, that it should contain a forfeiture clause in case the company fail to make good; in other words, the agreement should then come to an end.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Month by month they are to report to the government the actual settlement accomplished, and if there is no reasonable prospect of their reaching the minimum we are to cease to do business with them. That is the proposed agreement which is not signed.

Mr. BOYS: I may be wrong, Mr. Chairman, but I am of opinion that a company putting up a large sum of money to engage in this undertaking would want an agreement from the department for a certain term of years.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): They have not asked for that. The agreement is for one year.

Mr. BOYS: If the agreement has not been completed there is plenty of time yet for them to ask for that.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Mr. BOYS: In that event I would certainly recommend to the minister the insertion of such a clause, otherwise we will be committed to obligations without a satisfactory way of reaching the company if they fail to make good.

Mr. MacKELVIE: Is it in contemplation to relax the general regulations regarding labour other than farm labour?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Wherever there appears to be necessity for labour we are prepared to pass it into Canada.

Mr. MacKELVIE: Skilled or unskilled?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Although there is a prospect, I am told, in the building

trades in the eastern cities particularly, of a shortage of skilled labour, it has not appeared yet.

Mr. SHAW: In view of the fact that $40,000 has already been paid to this company, according to the return laid on the Table the other day, I presume that some results have been achieved in bringing families to Canada?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I do not know that any families have been brought forward to date. Indeed, it would be rather a mistake to do so at this season. Arrangements are being made for parties to come out. I can only speak authoritatively of two such parties, namely, a number of Polish farmers who are coming with a view to purchasing land for themselves and interested compatriots, and a number of Danish farmers. From Iowa agents are coming forward with parties as soon as weather conditions will permit of inspection of land.

Mr. GOOD: The minister has stated that there is a large quantity of land fairly near the railroads owned by absentee parties. Has he considered the propriety of instituting some system of taxing that land into use so it may be rendered cheaper for those who want it?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): If my hon. friend lived out west he would realize that unimproved land is being severely taxed. The taxes in many cases are 25 per cent higher on unimproved land than on improved land. So the absentee owner is being taxed.

Mr. GOOD: Is there a prospect then of the land returning to the Dominion shortly so that free grants may be made to settlers?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I cannot answer that.

Mr. LEWIS: Presuming that the returns brought down are correct with regard to the $3,000 spent on newspaper advertising in Great Britain, does it not seem a very large amount of money for the desperate efforts that are being made to get British settlers over here at the present time?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): There is very little reduction in the number of people coming from the Old Land over last year or the preceding year. Taking the figures as a whole, they would not indicate any very serious falling off. Indeed, the serious falling off is from the United States; in that case the figures dropped to about 19,000 last year.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is my hon. friend quite right there? My recollection is to the contrary.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): If I have quoted the figures wrongly, I shall be glad to be corrected.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Perhaps the minister will give us the figures now. My recollection is—and I think we had it up before—that the year before last, British immigration and foreign immigration were in the ratio of 5 to 1, and that last year that dropped down to something less than 2 to 1.

Mr. MANION: I have the figures under my hand. They are divided into English, Irish, Scotch and Welsh, but the totals show that in 1920 there were about 60,000, in 1921 about the same number, and in 1922 abont 34,000; so that they were practically cut in two.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): What period in 1922 does that cover?

Mr. MANION: The figures are furnished by the Bureau of Statistics. The years are given, 1913, 1914 and so on up to 1922, without any indication of what period is covered.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Then the figure for 1922 would cover the nine months to December 31.

Mr. FORKE: I think it is about time I made a little explanation. I hold in my hand a memorandum from the Western Canada Colonization Association on which my name appears as one of its directors. I am fairly familiar with all the circumstances connected with the organization of that association. Two or three years ago—I am not sure of the date—when the organization was first formed I took an active part in it. I attended three or four meetings, but I never received any remuneration for my services, and I never asked for any, so that I have no pecuniary interest of any kind in the organization. I am familiar with the scheme that the association outlined, and with its operations. The only criticism I have to offer would be that the percentage going back to meet the cost of operation of the scheme might be considered a little too large. The weakness I saw in it from the beginning was this: I did not think much privately-owned land would be bought by the association. The average private owner of land does not care very much to sell it on the basis of repayment in thirty-two annual instalments.

At six o'clock the Speaker resumed the chair and the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILL

SECOND READING

Bill No. 53, respecting Canadian Press Limited.—Mr. Ryckman.

SUPPLY

The House again in Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

Mr. FORKE: When the House took recess I was making some little explanation in connection with my relations with the Western Canada Colonization Association. I do not suppose the House is very much interested in the matter. However, when I noticed my name on the letter head of the association I thought, perhaps, some other member might have a sheet of the same kind and make an allusion to it in the expectation that they were throwing a bombshell by announcing that I was one of the directors of that association. That is my reason for making this explanation. I may say however that I have no apologies to offer for any connection I have had with this association. Looking into the scheme which it is promoting I believe it has some merit and deserves a fair trial. It is better, perhaps, than the old system of the land colonization companies that got large tracts of land and sold them at the highest price they could possibly get. In this case we know the percentage of profit that is going to the colonization association. I understand that the association has been promised approximately $1,200,000 of subscriptions towards its scheme, and I think that about $150,000 has already been paid in in cash—that is outside of any assistance they have received from the government. I never had time to attend any of their meetings, except one or two when the association was first formed. The only objection that I had to the scheme at that time was, that there were several officers connected with the association that were drawing larger salaries than, I think, their services entitled them to. However, since that time those gentlemen have severed their connection with the association.

In the province of Manitoba I have a comparatively busy time, being associated in a semi-public way with quite a number of organizations, and I never found time to attend any of the meetings of this association. Consequently I made up my mind that when I was not familiar with the inner workings of the association I did not want to share any responsibility. During last session, after being elected a member of the House, I sent in my resignation to the secretary of the association and understood it had been accepted. In looking at the paper I have before me I notice the letters "M.P." are omitted from my name so I suppose that the letter head on it is the old one. I am not making this explanation as an apology. I have nothing against the association. I believe its work merits a fair trial. Upon the face of it the scheme has merit. But I would like to say this: If any member of the House, if any of the hon. members behind me, have any criticisms to make let them do so because if there is anything wrong with this scheme we want to know it. Let the criticism offered, if any is made, be fair criticism, and when the item comes to be voted we will know exactly what to do.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I look upon the subject before the committee, that of immigration, as one of the most important of the session. To a large extent my sympathies were with the minister this afternoon. I am not here to criticize, I am rather here to assist, and I hope that that will be the attitude of hon. members, in this part of the chamber anyway. If they have any criticism to offer by all means let us have it if it is helpful and calculated to assist in the solution of this problem. That kind of criticism, I think, is what we will get. The minister has a difficult problem to solve and he is perfectly aware of the situation. He knows all the circumstances that attend immigration, the difficulties of getting the immigrant and properly settling him on the land once we induce him to come to the country.

I heard a good deal this afternoon about the claims of the different provinces in connection with this matter. That brings to my mind just how many difficulties surround the carrying on of the government of this Dominion. Each province sets up its claim for some attention. It is perfectly proper that it should do so; but I think the explanation why the prairie provinces got more attention in the years gone by with respect to immigration is perfectly evident if we once look at the matter impartially. We had out west great stretches of free land, the best agricultural land, perhaps, that you could find anywhere, land easily broken up. This offered great attractions to incoming settlers, the consequent influx of settlement helping to pay the obligations of Canada and also furnishing a large market for eastern manufactures; and although available lands in other provinces merited attention it was quite natural, altogether apart from the fact of the Dominion government owning the land in the West, that special attention should be paid to peopling the lands that

were so eminently fitted for early occupation.

I would like to say a word here in connection with the land in the northern part of the provinces of Ontario and Manitoba, and perhaps in Saskatchewan also. A large amount of that land is bush land, requiring a great deal of work to clear. I do not know how hon. members may feel on the subject, but I think that to settle that land would require a different type of settler; we require a man who will go in there and live what you may call the simple life. I may be wrong in my belief, but I think the only way to get those lands settled will be by inducing people to go in there and clear an acre or two, raise some vegetables and grain, keep a few cattle, and perhaps, work out in the summer and resort to lumbering in the winter. I may be wrong because I am not very well acquainted with northern Ontario. I do know, however, the character of the land in northern Manitoba; and I am perfectly sure that to get the right class of settlers you will have to go to Europe and induce some of those people who are hardy and eminently fitted for clearing up land of this description to go in there and settle. In the case of the lands that we are dealing more immediately with at the present time, it is, perhaps, a different problem altogether.

I now want to say a few words about the condition of agriculture. I would not have mentioned agriculture at all in this debate had the Minister of the Interior not made frequent reference to it this afternoon. The intimation has been made that perhaps the members in this part of the chamber dwell a little too much upon the ills of agriculture at the present time. I am convinced, however, that a little examination of the subject would enable hon. members to see that the condition of agriculture is a very vital question, and one that affects the welfare of the whole Dominion. No matter what our interests may be, we must feed ourselves, and we must withal have something with which to clothe ourselves. Agriculture is the greatest of all industries and one of the most essential to humanity, and even to-day, in this wonderful country of ours, we recognize the fact that if agriculture is not prosperous all suffer alike. I mention that because I want hon. members to realize that while we dwell upon the drawbacks or ills from which agriculture suffers at the present time, we are quite aware that other industries are suffering and other people have difficulties that seem perhaps as large to them as the difficulties of the agriculturist seem to him. We realize however that agriculture is a basic industry and must be made profitable, and when it is prosperous other industries begin to prosper.

Then, the question immediately arises: Why are you asking immigrants to come here when you find agriculture in the condition in which it stands to-day? We can answer this question. I hear from the Old Land sometimes that agriculture is in a deplorable condition over there, and I do not think we need be at all afraid to ask the people to come from the British Isles and throw in their lot with us in Canada. I think the very best brains of the country are needed to solve the problems of agriculture. It seems to me we are in a very difficult position. I quoted the words of Lord Shaw, who was a visitor here, when he referred to the conditions in Canada, and said that it was a crime that 9,000,000 people should be in possession of half the continent and unable to develop the resources. It is no use talking all the time about the great latent wealth of our country in natural resources.

It is about time we quit talking in this strain and started to do something to develop those resources. We have latent wealth, but a section of land uncultivated is no use to us except to grow grass and prairie flowers, and the mines and minerals under the soil are no use unless they are mined. Consequently, if we are going to get the benefit of the natural wealth of our country we must have men and money. These are two essentials to the development of the country. We know our economic conditions. We have a great land. We have provided facilities for a very much larger population than we have to-day, and if we had that larger population the overhead expenses—that is the expenses for the government of the country, the railways and other matters—would not be increased, but the number of people who bore these expenses would be greatly increased, and the burden would be made much lighter for all.

As I said before, agriculture is depressed everywhere, and the conditions here are no worse than they are anywhere, perhaps, in the world to-day as regards that industry. We hear a great deal about the prosperity of the United States. There is no doubt a great industrial boom there, but I do not think the husbandman in that country is so very prosperous at the present time, notwithstanding what we might call the industrial prosperity of the United States.

Looking back, recalling my own experience, I can realize that if the agricultural population is going to be prosperous, the agriculturists will have to help themselves to a

very large extent. We are dwelling upon our economic evils. We believe a great many things can be improved and circumstances made better for those engaged in this calling. Nevertheless, I believe that the remedy is in the hands of the people themselves. I think hon. members will excuse me for dwelling more particularly on the prairie provinces, as that is the land with which I am best acquainted. It seems to me to-day that different methods will have to be adopted, if the farmer is going to succeed. We will require to have small farms, more intensive cultivation, and what might be called mixed farming. The day of wheat growing has gone by, and I am perfectly satisfied that even, under present conditions, life can be made quite pleasant on a prairie farm. I know that some people will be prepared to differ with me. I know the circumstances in the West just as well as the Minister of the Interior knows them. The one depressing fact in the prairie provinces is that farmers are loaded down with debt. Were it not so, there would be nothing disheartening in the situation, but that is in reality the position. I believe that we can only help ourselves by having more people to develop that country and to till the prairie soil.

I wish to say a few words about the class of immigrants that we ought to get in this country. We hear a great deal about selected immigrants, I am not one of those who want what you might call indiscriminate immigration. We have a pretty mixed population even at the present time. I will read a short extract describing the sort of people we have in western Canada. We have representatives of every race, creed and tongue under the sun. This extract reads:

> Here we have representatives of every race, creed and tongue under the sun. Chinese, Hindu, Japanese, German, Austrian, Hungarian, Russian, Italian, Pole, Swede, Scandinavian, et al. Fifty-three nationalities, speaking 89 languages and dialects and subscribing to 73 religions and creeds. One man of every 12 living in Saskatchewan is a Ruthenian; one in every 5 living in British Columbia is a Chinaman; 46 per cent. of the population of Saskatchewan is non-English. Winnipeg has the second and Regina the third largest foreign-born population of any cities in the Dominion of Canada.

So that we have a pretty polyglot representation in the western provinces, and perhaps to mix them too much might be rather dangerous. But I am not afraid of the hardy peasant who is willing to go on the land. I do not care very much where he comes from. Of course, the better class of immigrants for Canada will be always from the British Isles and from northern Europe.

With reference to selected immigrants, I think it is nothing more than an intolerable crime to bring, say the London citizen, who never saw the prairie land and knows nothing about prairie life, and place him in an Alberta shanty. We should only bring here people who are fit to live in our country and understand something about the conditions of rural life. We talk a great deal about our country. I am just as proud of Canada as any one, but we have here a very rigorous climate. We have quite a number of months of severe winter, and it must be borne in mind that the people who are to come here and go on the soil and develop the farms of the country must be of vigorous and virile character. To bring to Canada people who are unsuited is both a crime against them and a wrong done to the country to which they come.

Another matter that should be taken into consideration as regards bringing immigrants into this country is the channels through which they pass. I happened to be associated with immigration about twenty years ago, when there was a large flow of immigrants into this country, and I know something about the system that was adopted in Great Britain and in some parts of Europe in securing those immigrants. I should like to give this information to the minister. If he wants to get the right immigrants, he will have to get the right people on the other side to select them. This work cannot be done from this side of the water; it must be done by the people who are in control of the situation over there. The Minister of the Interior of that time, then the Hon. Clifford Sifton, had a most wonderful system of organization, perhaps the best system of getting immigrants that we have ever had in this country. I know he has been blamed for letting down the bars and admitting into Canada some immigrants who should never have been here. I question very much the truth of that assertion. I think it will be found that a good many of the undesirable immigrants that came to Canada, came at a later date rather than during his regime. I will repeat that one of the methods to get proper immigrants to this country is to employ on the other side the proper agents who understand the situation, who can sift the immigrants and see that only the right kind sail for Canada. I have no doubt there are in the Department of the Interior officials who understand something about the system and who will be willing to help as much as they can in this matter of selecting immigrants.

I speak with all due caution, as I do not want to say anything that will reflect upon the minister. I am going to tell the committee only what I have heard. I have heard

sometimes that the Department of the Interior has been a dumping ground for inefficients from other departments. I am only repeating this from what I have heard.

An hon. MEMBER: The hon. member should not believe all he hears.

Mr. FORKE: I am rather simple in some ways and, perhaps, I should not believe everything I hear.

Mr. JACOBS: Is it not a fact that these officials are appointed by the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. MEIGHEN: That does not apply apparently to editors of Liberal papers.

Mr. JACOBS: That seems to stick in the crop of the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. FORKE: I am beginning to wonder just where I come in. When I was in the Old Country and connected with the immigration service, there was in vogue a system that I did not like, namely, that of subsidizing steamship companies. I do not know whether that is done at the present time to any extent or not. We found in different towns and villages agents of steamship companies who had no regard at all for the truth. According to them, this was an Eldorado, a land of sunshine and happiness, and anyone who came to Canada was blessed. With the steamship companies, the question was one of numbers, and quality had no place in their calculations. I do not know what the system is to-day; but I would certainly be opposed to granting steamship companies a subsidy for every immigrant they brought over. I would find some other method of assisting passages.

Where should immigrants be sought? I believe to-day you can find in the British Isles many immigrants of the very best kind, young agricultural labourers, whom I could, without hesitation, advise to come to Canada, knowing conditions as I know them as they exist here to-day. We have had some pretty good immigrants come to Canada as agricultural labourers. I would refer the committee to the premier of Alberta, Premier Greenfield, the premier of British Columbia, Premier Oliver, and the premier of Saskatchewan, Premier Dunning. They all came over as immigrants, a pretty good sort, and it was a pretty good thing also for themselves that they came over.

Mr. JACOBS: Likewise the hon. gentleman himself.

Mr. FORKE: I am very modest, as hon. members know; but I have found it a pretty good thing to come to Canada.

I should like to say just a few words as regards taking care of the immigrant after he comes here. I can well recollect the feeling that I had many years ago when I bade farewell to my native land and turned my face toward this land of hope. There is a good deal of sinking of the heart and of wondering just what the future holds for one. You come across the wide ocean amongst strangers, first impressions have a great deal to do with what you are going to think of the land to which you are coming to make your home, and I should like to see these immigrants, when they set foot upon these shores, receive a very hearty welcome. I have never forgotten the first experiences that I had at Halifax. I do not think it is at all derogatory to me to say that I crossed the ocean forty years ago as a steerage passenger. I can well remember our being herded at Halifax just like so many sheep or cattle, and I can assure hon. members that the experience was not very pleasant. I have visited Quebec and Montreal since then, and I am happy to say that conditions as they exist to-day are different from those that prevailed forty years ago. I would, however, repeat that there is nothing like giving immigrants a hearty welcome. I know the hearts of the Canadian people are kind anyway, and immigrants are most likely to receive a welcome.

The immigrant should be looked after upon his landing in this country in order to see that he is not taken advantage of, because there are in Canada, as elsewhere, dishonest persons who will take advantage of innocent people. I have looked into the soldier settlement scheme, and while some other speaker to-night will, perhaps, take up that subject and enlarge upon it to a greater extent than I am going to do, I believe in the soldier settlement scheme we have the nucleus of a system that might be widened out to great advantage in dealing with other settlers who come to make their home amongst us.

Let me say a few words as regards the drift to the south. I have under my hand some statistics, but I think most of them have been mentioned this afternoon. I do not think any government is to blame for the drift of people from Canada to the south. I do not care what government or what conditions we have in Canada, there always will be, to some extent, a drift of our people to the great republic to the south of us. It will have the attraction that numbers have; that the unknown has, and young and ambitious people, no matter what Canada may be, no doubt will, at times, drift over the line and leave us for the time being. We have, undoubtedly a rigorous

climate, and older people may find it to their advantage to move to a warmer climate. I only hope older people will see their way to go over the mountains and, perhaps, find what they want in British Columbia in our own country. Almost a tragedy of the western prairies has been the fact that people have gone out to the West, have developed a farm, have made a home and become fairly comfortable, and then as old age has come on, they have felt they would like some milder climate, so they have sold their farm for a good price and moved away instead of their wealth remaining in this country to beautify and develop the original home in which they have made their money. This is something we cannot help; it will perhaps always remain so, and it to some extent explains the drift that goes over the line to the south of us.

There is another percentage of our population that goes south that we can very well do without. Perhaps there is at the present time an abnormal crossing of the line. I think I said before that there is what might be called an industrial boom in the United States to-day. I do not know if anyone can explain just how this boom is coming about. Agriculture is not what one might call in a first class condition there. If the wages are high on the other side of the line our artisans and labourers will inevitably drift there and you cannot keep them back. Most of the young men that go, although they are Canadians, experience no difficulty in making the change; their belongings can be packed into a club bag or satchel, and they can very easily cross the line, perhaps never to come back. These are the conditions that we must face. I know that some of my friends will not agree with me, but in my opinion, in seeking immigrants we must not draw the line at agriculture. If we can get labourers and artisans I believe we can find room for them here, because I think it will be found in the not distant future that there will be a shortage of labour of that kind in the Dominion if the United States continues to prosper industrially as it seems to be doing to-day. Well, it may be said, if such people come into Canada they too will drift across the border. However, that may be, I have no doubt the tide will turn some day, and not very far in the future either.

It must be perfectly evident from what I have said that I am much in favour of a vigorous immigration policy, although I do not know that many of my friends will agree with me in this respect. This is a matter of opinion, but I would be in favour of the appointment of a minister of immigration and colonization who should have charge entirely of that work. I believe the present acting minister (Mr. Stewart) is overloaded with work. While undoubtedly he is capable, I think he has more to do than he can properly attend to. I am not finding fault with him, nor criticising in any way what he has done, but I think the position is important enough and requires enough ability and energy to necessitate the appointment of a minister who shall be solely charged with the duties of this office. I am prepared to foster a vigorous immigration policy, because I do not believe that our circumstances are ever going to be improved if matters remain as they are to-day. How are we going to get along if we do not take some vigorous steps in the direction of increasing our population? We say that we have hard times and are burdened with high taxes and more railways than we need. Well, are we going to sit idly by and see our people drift south while our own population dwindles and our burdens grow heavier? Are times going to improve under such a policy of inactivity? I believe that the times can and will be improved if we double our population. If we do that, instead of making things worse it will make them better for us; and I do not believe that the people of Canada would have anything to regret in the result. Now, I think perhaps I have spoken long enough. I am willing to assist the minister in this work, in any way in order to see it carried forward successfully. Referring again to the colonization scheme, I have looked into proposals of the Western Canada Colonization Association and I think the scheme has merit. If there is any weakness in it, however, by all means let us hear about it and criticise it and, if we think it is wrong, withhold the vote.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I agree with my hon. friend in all that he has said, except one statement he made, namely, that my department is the home for the derelicts of the other departments. I should like to know where the hon. gentleman got that information. I have only one officer in the department, Mr. Lynton, who was formerly in the Department of Agriculture, who has come from any other department of government to any of the four departments of which I have charge.

Mr. FORKE: I am rather sorry the minister took it so seriously; I simply hear the statement and have no proof of it.

Mr. MANION: With the rest of the members of this House I listened this afternoon with a good deal of interest to the statement

delivered by the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Stewart), and I must confess frankly that I was somewhat disappointed, as I am afraid the people will also be, that something newer than anything he offered was not placed before the House. I know that the minister has a very difficult position to fill and I do not wish to be unfair to him in any respect; but so far as I could infer from his remarks, it seems to me that in the period of nearly a year and a half during which he has been in power he has not changed any of the policies of the previous government in regard to the work of his department. At any rate, I gleaned no sign of any change; and I gathered from some of his remarks that he had made practically no alterations in any way. That, I presume, is akin to the course that has been followed in connection with other policies which the previous government carried out, which were severely criticised at various times by hon. gentlemen when they were in opposition, but which were not changed when they had an opportunity to change them.

I agree with most of the remarks of my hon. friend who has just sat down (Mr. Forke). I think he has made a speech which will be of service in this discussion. We do need these immigrants; but unfortunately we are not getting them. The minister gave this afternoon certain figures which I think were correct. He did not quote them all and I shall give three or four that bear on my contention. In 1914, we had over 400,000 immigrants coming to this country; in 1920, 117,000; in 1921, 148,000; and last year it had dropped to 89,000; in other words, practically cut in two during the first year of my hon. friend's regime. I may observe, because I think it will be of interest to the House, that a short time ago in reading a history of this country I ran across the fact that in 1842, eighty-one years ago, we had 44,000 immigrants coming to Canada, or half as many at that time as came in the past year.

I was struck recently by an article that appeared in one of our morning papers as reproduced from the London Times, in which it was stated that Canada was not taking advantage of the opportunity which she had of bringing immigrants to this country. Let me quote a couple of paragraphs from that article:

> There is no doubt Australia is the one Dominion which has risen to its opportunity.

That is with regard to Empire settlement.

> As for Canada, her best friends hope she may soon take the very plain hint which W. G. Ormsby-Gore, Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, gave at the Canada Club dinner last week when he said that unless Canada hurried, Australia would ear-mark all the £3,000,000 which the British government was prepared to spend yearly on emigration under the Empire Settlement Act . . . .
>
> Mr. Ormsby-Gore was amply justified in appealing to the government of Canada, which has yet to respond to the invitation in the Empire Settlement Act for a greater degree of co-operation.

That perhaps is part of the reason why Canada has not been getting the British settlers whom we should like to secure, a fact which the hon. leader of the Progressive party deplores. I admire the remarks of that hon. gentleman, because he has broadly taken the stand that Canada must have immigration. I recall having read in various newspapers resolutions passed by different farmers' organizations in this country advocating that no more immigration should be permitted at the present time, and I was glad to see the leader of the Progressives take the broad-minded attitude he did on that question. It seems to me overwhelmingly obvious that in this country of such vast area we require immigration, no matter what any organization may say to the contrary, whether it be a farmers', a labour, or an industrial organization. The very fact that we have an area of three and a half million square miles—greater than the area of the United States and double the area of Europe apart from Russia—and that in that portion of Europe there is a population of 300,000,000 as against our 9,000,000, is strong proof that we require immigrants.

Mr. SPENCER: The hon. member has mentioned several organizations that want to stop immigration. Can he tell me of any people's organization that is asking for increased immigration?

Mr. MANION: I am not speaking for any organization, but I think I am voicing the opinion of the large majority of our people when I say that we do want immigration; and when my hon. friend's leader endorses that opinion, perhaps his remarks will have more weight with the hon. member than anything I may say. It seems to me to be deplorable that we should allow such an immense country as this to go to waste; and that anyone should ask such a question as my hon. friend puts to me is certainly unreasonable, to put it as mildly as I can. We have in northern Ontario, an area extending from North Bay on the east to the Manitoba boundary on the west, embracing from three hundred to three hundred and fifty thousand square miles, nearly as great as France and Germany added together, where they have considerably over 100,000,000 people, and yet in this area we have only 150,000 people. These figures are so simple to realize that they show to my mind the absolute necessity of bringing in more people.

And may I say that I regret that this government and previous governments—for I am not criticizing the present government particularly in this matter—and the provincial government of Ontario have neglected northern Ontario? It has been neglected as have northern Quebec and northern British Columbia, because they are all bush lands. I put a question to the minister this afternoon, and he very honestly answered it as other ministers in previous governments would have done, that northern Ontario, northern British Columbia and northern Quebec did not get the advertising from the Dominion government that the prairie provinces got. I understand the reasons—that the prairie lands are held by the Dominion and are more easy to cultivate. But there are throughout the northern European countries people who prefer to go into bush lands, just as I am informed the French Canadian pioneer has the same preference. Consequently I believe it should be the effort of this government, even if it has not been of past governments, to bring into northern Ontario as many of this class of settler as possible.

I mention northern Ontario particularly, and for this reason. This country unfortunately is divided into five great sections: the Maritime provinces in the East, then Ontario and Quebec, with different ambitions and different interests; then that great section of northern Ontario; then the prairie provinces, also with different ambitions and different interests; and finally British Columbia. But northern Ontario, the section from which I come, unfortunately divides into the East and the West this great country, and until that vast area is more fully populated it will continue to form a chasm separating the East from the West, and help to keep alive, and perhaps intensify, differences which I regret to say already exist to too marked a degree in this country.

We have in northern Ontario, northern Quebec and northern British Columbia millions of acres of land and, as the minister has pointed out, in the prairies we have from 15,000,000 to 20,000,000 acres of land within reasonable distance of railways. There are in Europe tens of millions of people anxious to get out of that militaristic battleground and start life anew in this country; and I believe now is the ideal time for the government to do everything possible to populate these vast areas with the best type of agricultural workers—and, as we know, these always form the best type of citizens.

Not only that, Mr. Chairman, but the increasing of our population with the proper type of immigration will help to cure the two great ills with which we are now afflicted—the railway problem and the tax problem. These two problems can be solved in only one way. We have overbuilt our railways for such a small population by twenty or thirty years, and, of course, we spent an enormous amount of money on the war. By increasing our population we shall be creating greater traffic for our railways and lessen the burden of our national debt and taxes.

Every fair-minded man admits that conditions in western Canada have been bad during the last two or three years. I think everyone who is not blindly prejudiced will admit that the farmers of the prairie provinces have had difficult conditions to contend with in that period. But I am only speaking from the standpoint of the ordinary citizen when I say that I do not think the real reasons are always given in explaining the cause of those conditions—at least not all the reasons are given. In the first place the minister mentioned this afternoon—and I think it is one of the main reasons—that one of the reasons for the bad conditions out West is that the prices of agricultural products produced in the West have been deflated to a much greater extent than the prices of other products of the country. The farmer has to sell his goods at a low price but everything which he has to buy is still very much above the pre-war level. Before the war the farmers of the prairie provinces were doing fairly well in fact a very large proportion of them were doing very well, on prices very much akin to the prices of agricultural products to-day but the prices of the things they bought were very much more reasonable than those they have to pay to-day. Then the minister also mentioned what I have had pointed out to me many times by those who have lived in the West that there has been a great deal of land speculation by those who got high prices for their grain during the war years and who forgot as many of our industrialists forgot that these prices would not prevail permanently. They speculated in land as many of us in the cities did. I know many cities west of the Great Lakes where live men who were rich are now poor. They speculated on the possibility of prices continuing high. Farmers speculated in land on the possibility of the price of grain continuing high, and to-day they find they cannot sell their products at sufficient prices to pay interest on those speculations.

But there are two other conditions that are rarely mentioned in this House. In fact I have never heard them mentioned, although no doubt they have been without my noticing

it. One of these factors is world conditions. Previous to the war a large proportion of our western grain was sold in Europe. Unfortunately owing to the chaotic conditions brought about by war the people of Europe are no longer able to buy our products in the same proportion as they did in pre-war days. That has been a very important factor in placing the farmers of the prairie provinces in a difficult position, and until these world conditions improve those farmers will probably remain in at least not as good a position as they were before the war. I notice by the press that Russia is again beginning to ship wheat to some of the European countries. Well, if Russia and Roumania come into the market to the extent they did before the war, it will be one more reason why the farmers of western Canada will have to take more of the advice offered them by the leader of the Progressives (Mr. Forke) in his speech a few minutes ago, as to mixed farming for example.

Mr. COOTE: If conditions are as the hon. member states, how is it going to help us in Canada to bring in more farmers to produce more agricultural products to get rid of?

Mr. MANION: Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to offer advice to hon. members from the West. I leave that to my hon. friend, the leader of the Progressives. He offered some suggestions which I think might well bear investigation by most of my hon. friends who surround him. But at any rate I submit that I have offered reasons why I do not believe these millions of acres of our lands should be permitted to go to waste. I think there is room for millions of people from Europe to make a living out here even if they do not sell their products in the European markets.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): What are we going to do with those products if we do not sell them in European markets?

Mr. MANION: If my hon. friend will have a little patience I may offer some suggestions and indicate what my opinions are in that respect. I was going to offer another suggestion, Mr. Chairman, in regard to a further cause of present conditions in the West. It is rarely mentioned by my hon. friends to my left. One of the main causes I think for the difficulties not only of the prairie farmers but of many farmers in other parts of the Dominion, and certainly of the farmers in my section, is that there is a practical embargo put up by the United States against the entrance of our agricultural products. I may mention in passing that the exodus to the United States is not to a free trade country, it is to a country which to-day probably has the highest protective tariff in the world.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Will the hon. gentleman not admit that the United States to-day is the largest free trade area in the world.

Mr. MANION: No, Mr. Chairman, I will not admit that the United States is a free trade area at all. It is an absolutely protected area. The United States has the highest protection to-day of any country in the world. I understand what my hon. friend is pointing out.

Mr. CAMPBELL: It has free trade within its boundaries.

Mr. MANION: But Canada has a larger area than the United States, so we have a fairly large free trade area here, if it gets down to that. But at any rate the tariff barriers on goods entering the United States are very high, and therefore I do not think anyone who wishes to be fair will argue that the United States is a free trade country. It is as Germany was before the war, a very highly protected country.

Now, Mr. Chairman, like my hon. friend, the leader of the Progressives, I have not risen with any desire to offer unfair criticisms, and I have done all the criticizing I intend to do. I wish simply to offer a few suggestions that may be of some assistance to the minister in dealing with this question.

In regard to the exodus from this country, it has been said—the minister says the figures are too great—that it amounts to something like 10,000 per month. I assume it is difficult to get accurate figures; at any rate we all admit that the exodus is very considerable. It may be of interest to the House to know that there is a very heavy exodus from the United States at the present time. Some figures I got from the Bureau of Statistics the other day show that from 1910 to 1920 the number of immigrants going into the United States was 9,000,000, while the number of emigrants going from the United States was 6,500,000, so that out of the 9,000,000 going in in that ten years, only 2,500,000 remained.

Mr. BEAUBIEN: Can my hon. friend say where the emigrants from the United States went?

Mr. MANION: I have the figures, but I have not the time to look them up.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Do the countries to which they go maintain less tariff

protection than the country whence they came?

Mr. MANION: There is only one free trade country in the world—Great Britain; and I am sure they did not go there.

Mr. SHAW: Some of them went to the war, perhaps.

Mr. MANION: Yes, and there was some exodus from Canada also on account of the war. I am certain that all those who left the United States went to protectionist countries. Certainly very few of them went back to Great Britain. I notice that there are more immigrants going into the United States from Great Britain to-day than are going into all the British dominions combined from Great Britain; so that the United States is getting quite a number from that country. I assume that most hon. members have had an opportunity of seeing the figures; it is stated that something like 75,000 are to be allowed into the United States this year from Great Britain under their rule of admission, and that that figure will be overtaken so rapidly that during the remaining eight or nine months of this year probably no more will be permitted to enter who come from Great Britain. So that the free trade of Great Britain is apparently not helping very much to hold her people within her own borders.

Mr. COOTE: Can the hon. member tell me whether the United States has sought any of this immigration from Great Britain? Is she carrying on immigration propaganda in Great Britain?

Mr. MANION: I do not believe she is. I think the United States is discouraging immigration at the present time.

Now, I was suggesting some points in connection with the exodus from this country. One suggestion I wish to offer is that we should endeavour to remedy the conditions in the prairie provinces which are unjust. Judging by the questions put by some of my hon. friends, one might get the impression that I am unfriendly to the prairie provinces. I may point out to them that the whole future of my section of the country depends on the prairie provinces, so that I have every reason to be friendly to them. I have nothing but the best wishes for them and am ready to do everything I can to assist them.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): All right; will the hon. gentleman offer to help us to secure a lower tariff.

Mr. MANION: I will deal with that question in a few moments, if my hon. friend will just be patient. I marked down on my notes the word "tariff," because I knew it would come in some time.

I was going on to say that there are many injustices from which the prairie farmers are suffering, such as high railway and shipping rates. A committee of this House is dealing with shipping rates, and another is dealing with agricultural problems and the grain trade. My home city probably handles more grain at the present time than any other city in the world. I noticed recently that Montreal was given credit for handling more grain than any other port in America; I think the figures given for Montreal were something like 125,000,000 bushels last year. But Port Arthur and Fort William, which are really one port, handled last year considerably over 200,000,000 bushels of wheat. So that this is really the greatest grain port on the North American continent—with all due respect to our good friends from Montreal.

Mr. BUREAU: Which is the better, Fort William or Port Arthur?

Mr. MANION: Modesty prevents my saying which. Despite the fact that Fort William is so largely dependent upon the grain trade, I believe that there are injustices in connection with that trade from which the prairie farmers are suffering. The injustices to any individual farmer may not be very great, but in the handling of the wheat generally for the whole of the prairie provinces, taking it by and large, it means a good deal. I shall be pleased to see any of these injustices wiped out. If the committee which is dealing with the banking affairs of this country can show how banking rates for the prairie farmers can be lowered, I shall be only too happy to back up any legislation looking to that end. The hon. minister this afternoon said that the farmers of the West were paying high rates of interest; I do not know whether it was he or somebody else who mentioned the payment of 9 to 10 per cent on occasions. Somebody expressed the view that 6 per cent should be a fair rate. Well, I know that the lowest rate allowed by the banks in Fort William on gilt edge securities is 7 per cent, and if the farmers of the West received their money at 7 per cent they would probably be fairly well satisfied. However, whatever we do respecting our banking institutions we cannot afford to put them in a precarious position. The whole House will stand back of the farmers, though, in any legislation which may be brought down designed to benefit them. I mention these things only to show—and I know I am speaking for the whole of this corner of the

9 p.m.

House—that we would do anything in our power to improve the conditions of the western farmer.

There is another way in which conditions can be improved, and that is by building up the home market.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MANION: All hon. members know that the farmers of the United States sell over 90 per cent of their products in their own markets. My hon. friends to my left may laugh at the idea of building up a home market. I quite understand that it would take some time to build up a home market in Canada big enough to absorb all the grain produced in the West, but perhaps the farmers in the vicinity of Montreal, Sherbrooke, Hamilton and Toronto would not be so ready to laugh at the suggestion that we should build up a home market. I am ready to say that tariff reductions may be made that will improve conditions for the farmers, and I will answer my hon. friend (Mr. Garland, Bow River) now: I am quite agreeable to tariff reductions being made so long as he can prove that they will improve the conditions for the farmer in the West without ruining the rest of the country. There is no doubt that free trade, which is advocated by many, would benefit the prairie provinces for a time, but it would ruin the eastern sections of the country. I cannot see that it would be advantageous to our country as a whole to ruin the East in order to benefit the West.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): What about ruining the West for the sake of the East?

Mr. MANION: Well, before the war, tariffs were not ruining the West; the West was getting along fairly well, and as soon as the conditions respecting prices, particularly of eastern products, get back where they should be, the farmers of the West will prosper; there will be no ruining of the East to help out the West or vice versa. I believe that a moderate tariff policy is what we should have in this country.

To my mind this country requires three classes of immigrants. The most important class, probably, is the farming class, consisting of men who go on the land, whether in the prairie provinces, in northern Ontario or elsewhere. I believe it would be a very good idea for this government to take into account the fact that that chasm between the East and West, extending practically from where we sit to-night to the Manitoba boundary, should be given more attention, and even if these lands are uncleared lands I believe the minister would be well advised, in the interest of Canada as a whole and in the interest of the better understanding in this country, if he would co-operate with whatever government is in power in the province of Ontario next year and do everything he can to fill up those northern lands.

In addition to agriculturists there are two other classes that I think we need in this country. First we need domestic servants. I believe that this country could stand to-day—to the good of Canada and the good of the people brought out for that purpose—quite a large inflow of domestic servants. There is one other class. Despite any resolutions passed by labour unions, I believe we require a certain group of labourers, particularly those who wield the pick and shovel. The Canadian will not do the work that used to be done by the Italian labourer, neither will the American or British immigrant. He does not wish to do that rough work. He prefers to do something a little more genteel, if I may use that expression without disrespect to the men concerned. We require in this country a certain group of immigrants who will do that work.

I have endeavoured to offer a few sugestions to the minister with the object of rendering him whatever assistance I can. I hope he may be very successful in bringing more people to this country than he has brought in the past, and that he may have success to a greater extent than he has hitherto had in preventing people from leaving this country and going to other lands.

Mr. MERCIER (Translation): Mr. Chairman, Canada is, to-day, pre-eminently a land of peace and mutual respect; it is the beacon-light towards which the European nations anxious to emigrate, now turn their troubled souls to begin life anew, an ideal life which would be as the image of their former happiness. Our country enjoys complete unity, with its two dominating races whose national aspirations are similar; it is the land of religious and constitutional freedom. Although it has nine provinces, Canada has but one flag: the Union Jack. The maple leaf and the beaver are the only emblems of our country. Its soil is fertile, its forests extensive, numerous are its natural resources, its industries most promising notwithstanding these difficult after war times. However, we fully realize that an agricultural, commercial and industrial crisis is still being felt here as in other foreign countries. Trade has not yet fully recovered: it lacks stability; workmen are even forced to remain idle two or three days per week. The farmer calls loudly for markets. In short all seem to bear witness to the fact that, at

the present time, throughout Canada, our population is able to cope with the requirements of trade and industry and so contribute to their success.

The government, in which I have absolute faith and particularly the Minister of the Interior, who is competent in such matters, seem to have drawn up a wise policy on immigration though couched in rather cautious language. Let us hope that the carrying out of these ideas will have all the good effects intended, for the welfare of our people and the success of the work which they desire to place to their credit. Let us be prudent. Let us choose our immigrants with a view not only to securing the best, but also to securing the kind most needed. If we wish for the future and forever to maintain our country great and prosperous, we should strive to preserve it such as it is to-day, respectful of its forefathers' traditions and watchful of our customs and manners. With that aim in view, Mr. Chairman, we need at least immigrants who understand our economic situation and our ways, they must have sufficient intelligence and judgment to adopt, conform and especially assimilate themselves to these conditions. I do not hesitate for a moment to state on the floor of the House that Canada is in no need, at present, of labour immigration. Our national—I want to say, so as to be better understood our Canadian artisans—have a first claim to any manual and industrial employment available. We must not, by all means, bring them in contact on our own soil with the competition of foreign labour. It would be unjust at the present moment, especially in these after war hard times, when they have to toil and make the most of every opportunity so as to enable them to procure the bare necessities for themselves and their families. If agriculture needs help let us find it only in a sound and fit immigration. Let it be strictly limited to agriculture. This step would be of a practical nature, benefiting all the people in the Dominion.

The figures cited by the hon. Minister of the Interior bearing witness to the emigration of our people towards the United States, is food for thought; it is the present generation, the hope, the living and tangible future of our country which is flowing out. A repatriation policy is necessary. We must reach them either through lectures or agents, in fact by all possible means; we must convince them that it is necessary they return to the land of their forefathers, the soil they deserted on the spur of the moment, enthused at the prospect of joining the American Republic and obtaining higher wages. If they left, naturally it is through the soliciting of others who had preceded them to that foreign land. The example was fatal. Branches were detached from the great Canadian tree; impoverished in sap the small branch found its way to the neighbouring republic, only to linger and die within a few years.

Let the Dominion government closely associate itself to the various provincial associations and adopt a common policy so that this repatriation work may bear fruit. May it bring back to our country excellent families of farmers and labourers who should never have emigrated in a passing moment of disillusion.

All the provinces suffer from the emigration of our people to the United States. The present situation resembles somewhat that of 1896. Most of the hon. members of this House will remember: uneasiness was general, trade was languishing, the smoke-stacks of mills were towering but lifeless, agriculture practically without markets and prices unstable like passing clouds. In the West, settlers shifted to the United States, even a western newspaper of the time said: "That the roads leading from Manitoba to the United States were worn and broken up by the wheels of trucks of settlers deserting the West."

Their discouragement was therefore evident; they took to the road leading to their native parish or directed their steps towards the mills over the border. The Laurier government applied a remedy to the situation and, through its efficient policy, brought back prosperity to the country. Again, in 1923, we must courageously get to work. Let us develop our natural resources and induce our workmen to further promote that object. Thus we shall again see days of abundance appear in Canada. We shall then perceive that it is not a great flood of immigration which will have rebuilt us, but our own efforts alone.

Mr. GOOD: I listened this afternoon with a great deal of interest to the remarks of the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart), but I must confess, with a good deal of disappointment. We are all anxious for immigration if we can get it, but I have some figures here I would like to submit to the House and I think they are entirely relevant to the discussion. I have a little pamphlet written by Miss Whitton, who is now, I understand, secretary to the hon. minister without portfolio (Mr. Low). The title of this pamphlet is "Some aspects of the Immigration Problem," and I gather from it that during the years 1900 to 1919 this country spent nearly $20,000,000 on immigration. What results

have we secured from that very large expenditure? Take the last census period of ten years, from 1911 to 1921, we have, according to this document—and I think the figures will stand examination—lost about two and a half million people. I would like to submit to the minister and to this House that if we are going to spend $20,000,000 in twenty years, or, say $10,000,000 in ten years—and the minister is going to ask a very much larger appropriation for the coming year—and if we are not going to be able to retain any of the immigrants we get, what is the use of spending the money?

I am anxious, and I think we are all anxious, that we should have immigrants of the proper type in this country. We have vast natural resources to develop. We have a railway system which is capable of handling the business of two or three times the present population, but I do think we ought to give some consideration to the facts which have come to our attention during the last ten or twenty years. We have spent this large amount of money. We have received, I think, during the last forty years, nearly 5,000,000 immigrants, and during the last ten years about three and a half million, but we have not kept them. We are losing our immigrants and our natural increase almost as fast as they come. Anybody who looks at the increase of population in this country during the last twenty years, or even beyond that, and figures out the natural increase and the amount of immigration that we have received, can come to only one conclusion, namely that Canada has been and is at the present time, as was mentioned the other day in this House, an immigration sieve. I dare say a great many hon. members have read that very interesting and significant article in Maclean's Magazine a few weeks ago, "Is Canada an Immigration Sieve"? We can answer that question only in the affirmative.

There is the situation that confronts us, and I want to ask the minister and this House whether there is any better prospect of getting returns from the money that it is now proposed to expend? We have not been able to retain the immigrants. We have been throwing away the money during the last 10 or 20 years. And what difference is there now? What better prospect is there at the present time of being able to retain any of the immigrants we may secure than there has been during the last 10 or 20 years? If we had any assurance that we could retain these immigrants, there would be some advantage or propriety in authorizing the expenditure, but if it is simply maintaining a large organization for securing immigrants who rapidly emigrate to the United States, I do not think it is good business.

There is another question also which we ought to consider before any considerable expenditures are authorized for immigration purposes. The minister in his address referred to a certain type of settler which, he stated, was wanted. It is quite possible we may secure from Europe—and I think we can secure from China and Japan, at all events—people who are prepared to accept the conditions in this country and probably stay here. Are we prepared to receive those people? Do we want people of that type in large numbers to come into this country? We had a debate last year on oriental immigration. There are many Europeans—and I am quite satisfied the members from British Columbia will admit that there are lots of orientals—who will be glad to secure an entrance into this country, and when here will stay here, and probably make good. Are we prepared to throw our doors wide open to these people? I think, without elaborating the idea any further, we must give some attention to the immigrant's quality and general outlook, when we are dealing with prospective immigrants. I remember last summer hearing Bishop Lloyd of Saskatchewan speak of some of the problems of assimilation which the people of Saskatchewan had to face, and I must admit it was an address which impressed upon me very much the need of going carefully in regard to getting into this country in large numbers people who do not speak our language, who are not familiar with our institutions and who can be assimilated only very gradually.

Mr. JACOBS: Will the hon. member tell me what he means by assimilation? I should like to get his definition of it in regard to the immigrants that come into this country.

Mr. GOOD: What I mean by assimilation, and what I understood Bishop Lloyd to mean, was that they should become Canadian citizens, that they should be rendered capable of taking part in our public life—in our municipal, provincial and federal life—to become good citizens. That would involve, to a very large extent, learning to speak English, the establishment of schools and so on.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Or the French language?

Mr. GOOD: The French language, certainly. I think the hon. member understands what I mean. I think, without going into the niceties of definition, that we all understand what

is meant by assimilation. I only wish to bring out the thought, which was expressed very pointedly by Bishop Lloyd last summer when I heard him, that the problem of assimilation in some of our districts is a serious one. I noted when the minister was speaking an admission that there were a number of Quebec enterprises needing labour. I took it that it was cheap labour. Now that is a very significant admission.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I never said anything of the kind. I did not make any suggestion whether it was cheap labour or dear labour. I said there was an opening for labour.

Mr. GOOD: I did not wish to insinuate that the minister said it was cheap labour. That was an inference which I drew from his remark that certain Quebec enterprises needed labour. I understood that he meant by that ordinary unskilled labour.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes, correct.

Mr. GOOD: I simply want to draw the attention of the House to this: that a good many of our social problems—problems that I have seen in one city in Ontario that I know pretty well—have arisen out of the demand of our manufacturing industries for cheap labour irrespective of everything else. I want the committee just to keep that in mind. It is not always the best kind of labour to get in. While we may desire cheap labour for performing rough work, and while our manufacturing and other large industries may desire that kind of labour, we ought to go just a little cautiously before we give in too much to that demand.

With respect to the remark which the minister made as to western farmers starting out by acquiring too much land, I want to suggest this, that there are two purposes for which a farmer may desire more land. He may desire to speculate; he may wish to pocket the unearned increment, and I dare say that throughout our western provinces particularly, that desire has led to purchasing large tracts of land, far larger than can be worked to advantage. But there is another reason. A farmer may wish to get what might be called the economic unit for the particular type of farming in which he is engaged, and it does not follow by any means that 160 acres is the economic unit. From what I know of western farming—and, perhaps, that is not very much—I judge that a very much larger area than that is the economic unit in western Canada.

I think some of us must have been very much impressed by the information which we secured this afternoon in regard to the activities of the Western Canada Colonization Association. I made a note here that it was stated that they were dealing solely with those wishing to sell or purchase land, and that they have agents throughout the United States. I presume those farmers who were mentioned as desiring to leave the high-priced lands in the United States and come to Canada are, perhaps, the unconscious victims, shall I say, of the Western Canada Colonization Association? I do not wish to deal uncharitably with this organization; but it is well known, I think, that there are a number of people in Canada and, perhaps, outside of Canada, who own large tracts of land in our western provinces, who have bought that land for speculative purposes, who are holding on to it, who, in my judgment, are parasites in this country, and who should be taxed out of their unholy or immoral earnings—earnings which they hope to get at the present time or which they have already received. I venture to suggest that it is quite possible; I do not say that it is probable—

Mr. HARRIS: Would the hon. member call a retired farmer a parasite?

Mr. GOOD: I certainly do not call a retired farmer a parasite as long as he lives on his savings. I call a man a parasite who speculates in land and who lives on other people's earnings.

Mr. HARRIS: Will the hon. member say that retired farmers who are living on the incomes they derive from the farms they have previously occupied, are not, in a manner, speculators?

Mr. GOOD: By no means. No, I would not admit that for one moment.

Mr. HARRIS: Will the hon. member permit of this suggestion, that competition is the essence of what farms are going to rent for?

Mr. GOOD: The hon. member has not understood my point at all, apparently, but I think there are a good many members present who have understood it. Just in that connection, I want to point out this. I have a note here that the Canada Colonization Association acts as agent for absentee vendors. These absentee vendors are the people in western Canada who have—what shall I say?—been the curse of this country, and they are the people we ought to get after. They should be ousted from the position which they occupy. I do not consider this

country is under any obligation to show them mercy, and I should like to see those earnings that I spoke of, what is called the unearned increment, appropriated by the state. That would soon cause many of our western lands to revert to the Dominion or to the provinces, as the case might be; in that way we would have free homesteads again, and some of the people whom we want to get into this country would have some of that cheap land. About the time the war stopped and there was a prospect of our soldiers coming back, I remember getting a circular from some land organization operating, I think, in Winnipeg, informing me and all others who received the circular that we should get in on the ground floor. The returned men were coming back, the circular said; they would soon be wanting land, and now there was a chance to purchase the land, and to hold it so that when the demand was great from those returned men, we would make a good profit on our money. That was the sort of bait held out to investors in this country, and I want to say frankly here that I cannot conceive of anything more iniquitous than propaganda or temptations of that sort which were publicly circulated in this country. This has been the curse of western Canada as it has been of other new territories.

In conclusion I want to make just one or two comments on the speech of the hon. member for Fort William and Rainy River (Mr. Manion). I was rather amused at what he said about the United States being a highly protected country. I cannot quite imagine that the hon. gentleman was serious in his description of the United States, because if there is on the face of the earth any country which shows the benefits of free trade, it is the United States.

Mr. MANION: Will the hon. member explain to the committee in what way the United States is a free trade country?

Mr. GOOD: I was about to proceed to elaborate or elucidate my point for the benefit of the hon. member. When we consider the effect of a fiscal policy upon any nation, we must consider the proportion between the internal trade and the external trade. If a country has 90 per cent external trade and 10 per cent internal trade, as some of the very small countries have, tariffs are a serious matter for that country. I think that is quite apparent without going into the matter any further. But if a country has 90 per cent internal trade and 10 per cent external trade, a tariff is a trifling matter. If a country has only 2 per cent external trade, you can have 100 per cent duties all around, and they will have very little effect on that country. That is the key to the situation in the United States; the external trade is small as compared with the internal trade.

Mr. MANION: What my hon. friend is arguing is that the tariff policy in the United States is not of great importance to the United States. I have not been arguing about that at all. Surely my hon. friend will not deny that the tariff on goods coming into the United States is a highly-protective tariff.

Mr. GOOD: Of course, I am quite prepared to admit that; but I am not prepared to admit that the United States' tariff is as important a factor in the industrial life of the United States as the Canadian tariff is in the industrial life of Canada.

Mr. MANION: Of course, I admit that. That is beside the point. The hon. member said that it amused him to have me state that the United States is a highly protective country. I should like him to give some proof—he has not given it yet unless my head is thicker than I think it is—that the United States is a free trade country.

Mr. JACOBS: I think the discussion is altogether out of order.

Mr. GOOD: Let me continue if I am in order. I took the argument of the hon. member to be that Canadians were leaving this country in order to reap the advantages to be found in a country which was highly protective.

Mr. MANION: I was pointing out that they were not going to a free trade country.

Mr. GOOD: Well, so far as the effect of the tariff is concerned, I think they are going from a country which suffers from high protection to a country which has nominally high protection but is in reality practically a free trade country, because of the very large area and the great variety of its internal resources, and because of the fact that its internal trade is large in comparison with its external trade.

The hon. member spoke also about building up the home market. I will admit that it is particularly desirable for us to build up Canada as a manufacturing country. I should like to see as great a diversification of industry in Canada as possible; and if our farmers cannot find a foreign market, as seems likely to be the case in the near if not in the distant future, for agricultural products, then we ought to have a big home market. I am prepared to admit all that; but I am not prepared to admit that the tariff, to which the hon. gentleman

attributes the industrial development of Canada, has been a good thing for this country from the manufacturing or the industrial point of view. I venture this assertion, that had there never been any tariff barrier between the United States and Canada in the last fifty or sixty years, instead of Canada having between eight and nine million people there would be a population in this country to-day of 25,000,000. And I am of opinion that without such a barrier our manufacturing industries would be ever so much larger and more important than they are at present. I believe that if we could only wipe out this tariff barrier on the North American continent we would do something which would be in the very best interest of ourselves and also of the United States. I realize that I am possibly digressing rather much in this connection; but I do not think I am going any further afield than did the hon. member whose remarks I am considering.

Before concluding I might refer to the policy—I do not know indeed whether we can call it a policy, but at all events to the remarks—which the minister gave us this afternoon. I would be prepared to support any reasonable appropriation for an immigration organization if I could see any prospect of holding the people when we got them. The only way I can see of an immigration policy being successful judging from past experience is for us to invite the Japanese and Chinese to come in. We can hold them, and I think we can increase the population of Canada if we invite the orientals including also the Hindus.

Mr. HARRIS: Could you hold them on the farms?

Mr. GOOD: Yes; and I think from the experience of British Columbia they would readily take to farming.

Mr. HARRIS: Our constituency would not have them; you are welcome to them.

Mr. GOOD: I am not advocating their admission; I am simply saying that if it is only numbers that we want that is the way we can increase our population, and I do not think we should have to spend $3,000,000 a year in order to get such people. That is all I have to say at the moment on this subject.

Mr. MARLER: It has been a great pleasure to listen to the discussion so far as it has gone. It reveals courage in many ways. The minister came forward with a frank and free expression as to what his policy was; the leader of the Progressive party (Mr. Forke) was equally courageous and I must also congratulate my fellow member from Fort William (Mr. Manion) on the manner in which he approached the situation. I am sorry that the last speaker (Mr Good) seems to think that the only kind of people whom we can keep in this country are Japanese and Chinnese. Such an attitude does seem to me to lack courage. If there was ever a time when we needed courage and vigour in connection with an immigration policy in this country, that time is the present, because if we do not put into force a bigger immigration policy and obtain more people our lifeblood will simply be drained away and we shall cease entirely to exist as a people. I offer that opinion for what it is worth, but I have no hesitation in making that statement on the floor of this House. I must admit that I am a little disappointed in the estimates; they do not go far enough. This year the estimates in this department are $1,300,000 more than they were last year, and that increase is divided under two heads, one of $600,000 in connection with the Empire Settlement Act, and the other of $700,000 for general purposes. The Empire Settlement Act I will take up at a later date. But these figures mean that the minister brings forward an increase of $700,000 for all other purposes, such as advertising, organization and matters of that description. Now, an immigration policy cannot be built up in one day. It is quite correct, as the minister states, that even if we had a perfect organization to-day we could not expect in one year or in any such short period to obtain a lot of immigrants at first hand. The organization will have to be in existence if in the future we hope to get any very large number of immigrants. For that reason I should have liked to see the minister bring down to the House a larger appropriation for this purpose, and I believe the House would have supported him in view of the urgent necessity there is for immigrants in this country. That may seem to certain hon. members to-night a peculiar statement to make; it may seem strange for me to advocate the spending of more public money in view of the finances of the country. But we should bear in mind that if this country is good it must go ahead. And it is good. It has been fought for once, and I see no reason why we should not fight for its economic existence now. And the only way I can see of fighting for that existence is to get more people to come in and produce in greater quantities from our natural resources which we have in such great abundance.

Mr. COOTE: Does the hon. gentleman want our immigration efforts to be confined to one particular occupational class, namely, farmers?

Mr. MARLER: I will come to that in a few moments, but if my hon. friend wants an immediate reply, I think it is preferable to get the farmers in. But I would not exclude others. Now, I was going on to state the necessity for immigration. I do not wish to quote figures unduly, but from the statistics with regard to our population in the past few years, it is very clear that there has not been that increase which we should have a right to expect. I will speak later as regards conditions to the south which we heard so much about.

But there is another matter which I think we should view, and view with grave concern—the financial condition of this country. I see no way of bettering that condition, of making our railways pay, unless we get more people into this country and so increase production.

Mr. KENNEDY (West Edmonton): Is the hon. gentleman under the impression that we need more immigrants to increase the tonnage for our National railways?

Mr. MARLER: Yes, I am most decidedly of that opinion.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Regardless of conditions for settlement in this country?

Mr. MARLER: I do not quite understand my hon. friend.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The hon. gentleman says he is in favour of immigration in order to increase the tonnage for our National railway system, and I presume for the other railway systems too. Would he advocate that regardless of the existing conditions?

Mr. MARLER: I do not know what my hon. friend means by existing conditions; but I do not think existing conditions are as bad as he paints them.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I wish the hon. gentleman lived in my constituency. Then he would know that conditions are worse than I paint them.

Mr. MARLER: I am very sorry indeed to hear my hon. friend is having such a very hard time in his constituency. If he will have a little patience with what I have to say I think he will agree with me that if we can have more production the conditions in his constituency will get considerably better.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the manner in which we are taxed and the extent is getting perfectly appalling to all of us. If we realize that in 1914 our taxation was slightly over $21 per head of population, as against over $42 per head in 1922, in addition to which in the last few years we have advanced to the railways over $250,000,000—

Mr. SHAW: Does that include the municipal, provincial and Dominion taxation per capita?

Mr. MARLER: No, it is simply Dominion taxation. The figures are taken from the Dominion statistics. During the fiscal year 1921-22 we collected taxes to the extent of $49.43 per head of population, and yet we went behind to the tune of $92,000,000, and in 1922 we added another $80,000,000 to our national debt. In 1923 the Main Estimates call for an expenditure of over $466,000,000. It therefore means that as we are going on at the present time our taxation cannot be reduced. I do not intend to discuss finance at any great length, that is not my purpose at all, but I do think that these figures are sufficiently impressive to make us pause and think whether or not we can keep on pyramiding our national debt in this manner. I repeat, that these are figures which should make any sane man who cares for the position of this country pause for a considerable time and wonder how long we can continue piling up these deficits year after year before we break.

But we are doing more than that. We are not only piling up deficits during our lifetime—and it is no fault of our ministers of finance, past and present, that we are piling up these deficits, for these gentlemen have done their work well, they have done everything they possibly could for their country during their respective tenures of office—I say we are not only piling up deficits during our lifetime and are taxed out of all the delights of life to the point of misery, but in addition we are handing down to the generations that shall come after us a tremendous load, we are saddling them with a staggering debt which we do not know whether they will be able to bear or not.

Mr. IRVINE: What is the hon. gentleman's proposal in this regard as a means of reducing taxation?

An hon. MEMBER: Give him a chance.

Mr. MARLER: I am going to tell the hon. member that I think if we got sufficient immigration it might in time reduce our taxation. I shall elaborate that idea very shortly, and then I shall be only too glad to answer my hon. friend's question. Taking our taxation at the present time, I was very much im-

pressed by an article which I read recently in the London Spectator, and I shall give the committee a short quotation from it. Talking about the new government, it says:

> What is wrong with us just now is that we are taking so much out of the pockets of the tax-payer that we are perceptibly diminishing the nation's stock-in-trade. To put it in more conventional language, we are injuring and preventing trade and commerce, but if we injure and prevent trade we accomplish a double curse:—we increase prices and we stimulate unemployment. By decreasing taxation we shall improve trade and so improve the demand for labour. In the words of our ancestors, we should be setting more men and women to work and thus increasing production. But that would tend to lower the price of the things produced, although not the price of labour.

Now, the same situation existed in the United States after the Civil War as we are passing through at the present time. Speaking from memory, the Civil War ended on the 9th April, 1865, when Lee surrendered at Richmond, Virginia. A serious inflation followed, then came a great depression. I have the figures here. From 1867 to 1873 trade increased from $784,000,000 to $1,164,000,000. It does seem to me that to judge the wealth and activity of a nation we must examine what the imports and exports of the country may be at the time. This is very well put by Mr. W. C. Ford, who was chief of the United States Bureau of Statistics. He says:

> The imports and exports of the United States are the expression and measure of its commercial dealings with nations and peoples of the world. Their development and importance have been commensurate with the economic growth and political power of the country and people. To compare the foreign trade of the United States in 1795 with that of 1895 would be to compare a wheelbarrow with a locomotive or an ocean liner.

As I have stated, after the Civil War the trade of the United States increased for a time, immigration also increased for a time; then there came a sharp drop in immigration and likewise a sharp drop in trade. Taking the years 1867 to 1873—and I have not picked out these years particularly—nearly 3,000,000 people came into the United States and trade, as I say, increased from $784,000,000 to $1,164,000,000. Then in 1874 immigration began to decline until in 1877 it reached the very low figure of 130,000; likewise trade dropped in the same period from $1,164,000,000 to $1,053,000,000, or a decline of $111,000,000.

Mr. GOOD: Was that external or internal trade?

Mr. MARLER: Not external trade; simply exports plus imports.

If we turn back to the history of our own country we shall also find that during active periods of immigration trade was at its best. Take our immigration figures from 1903 to 1914.

In that period there entered this country nearly 3,000,000 people, to be exact 2,789,484. During that time our trade increased from $450,000,000 to $1,074,000,000. It seems to me that the objection some have to getting immigrants is not well founded, because these figures indicate that during a period of immigration trade increases very materially. That was the effect of immigration in the United States. There are really two aspects of the value of an immigrant who lands in this country; there is his ordinary value as an addition to the country and there is his value as a potential producer. In other words, every immigrant who lands on our shores at once creates trade. That was very clearly shown during the great immigration period of our country of which I have spoken, and the same thing happened in the United States. In that connection I was interested in an article by Mr. H. A. Hill, who at one time was secretary of the National Board of Trade of the United States. Referring to the increase of immigration there, he said:

> The total immigration of 1873, as we have seen, was 422,545. The net immigration for the first half of the current year at the two principal ports of the country, so far as the returns have been accessible, proves to have been only 13,905.

He goes on to say that the immigration at that particular time would be only 100,000 for the year; then he continues:

> Such a falling off in the great army of producers and consumers which has been wont to land upon our shores, while it forcibly illustrates the severity of the industrial depression through which we are passing, represents also a most serious loss to the aggregate national wealth. If, as Dr. Young estimates, the capitalized value of an immigrant on the average is $800, this loss reaches apparently the enormous sum of $240,000,000. Actually, however, large numbers of people will ultimately come hither, who are at present deterred by the unfavourable accounts.

When an immigrant lands on our shores, then, he is of particular value to the country, and that value increases. He becomes established; he starts to produce. I am not saying that we bring immigrants here simply to place a load of taxation on them; I do not look at the matter from that point of view. What I say is this: the more we get out of the soil the more we increase the natural wealth of the country and enable those who are here and those who come here to assume their fair share of taxation.

Mr. KELLNER: The hon. gentleman is arguing that every immigrant that we bring into the country increases our wealth. Would that apply to other countries, and why are other countries anxious to get rid of their people?

Mr. MARLER: Are those other countries anxious to get rid of their people?

Mr. KELLNER: The hon. member must know that several European countries are very anxious to get rid of some of their people. England, for that matter, has an appropriation for that very purpose.

Mr. MARLER: It is true that England does want to send out some of her people because England is an over-populated country, and the same applies to many other countries across the seas. But we are not over-populated here. We have millions of acres of land; we have natural resources that we cannot use, and every man who has a pair of hands, a good heart and sound brain can enrich this country by getting the natural resources out of the soil. To leave those natural resources as they are makes them worthless to us or anyone else. It is manpower we want; we must get our wealth out of the soil—because the wealth does come out of the soil in one way or another.

10 p.m.

Mr. COOTE: Will that man who goes on the soil be enriching this country any if he gets less than the cost of production for what he produces?

Mr. MARLER: That question cannot be answered in two words, and if the hon. member will permit me I shall be glad to answer it later in the course of my remarks.

I was going to show the value of the immigrant to our country. Take our internal trade. I think it was stated in this House last year that the Dominion Statistician had reported that the value of Canada's production in 1921 was estimated at over $5,000,000,000 and that the total production plus the imports but minus the exports represented the value of our internal trade. In 1921 our imports were valued at about $30,000,000 more than our exports, so that according to this calculation our internal trade was valued at $5,200,000,000, or $600 per head of population. I claim that every man who comes into this country will increase that internal trade, and the result will be an acceleration of the work of our factories and a demand for all our farm products. In that way the unemployment which at present exists will be largely done away with.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The hon. gentleman means, I suppose, every man we can keep in this country.

Mr. MARLER: I am coming to that question also, if my hon. friend will permit me. I do not want to quote the newspapers regarding the necessity of immigration, but there are just one or two comments to which I wish to direct attention. I shall not quote entirely from the eastern press, because I have been told that the eastern press is prejudiced to a certain extent. But let me quote one remark made to the meeting of the National Trust Company. That company has a great many interests in the West, and I believe it is one of the best posted companies in the Dominion. The president of the National Trust Company says:

> I wish to-day to again emphasize this question. Immigration, it seems to me, stands in the forefront of the important problems facing our country at the present time. I feel confident there is no other single factor which would contribute so much to the solution of all our problems, and in the end to the material comfort and contentment of every class in Canada. There exists to-day upon our farms and in several of our industries a demand for labour which cannot be filled. The cry against immigration, when examined, is found lacking in substance. Immigration properly controlled and well directed will injure none, but must benefit all. What we need in this Dominion is volume of business. This is strikingly illustrated in our railway situation. We have a large equipment in every business activity—too large for the needs of our present population. More people would create greater demands upon our equipment and thus afford a larger market for labour, for agriculture, for manufacturers and for all.

There may be some hon. members who will not agree with what the president of the National Trust Company says—I hear one hon. gentleman say "hear, hear"—but it does seem to me that, generally speaking, his remarks are characterized by a good deal of sense. The member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) speaking at Winnipeg on the 10th of November, said:

> Canada has a hard way ahead of it. The surest guarantee of our future prosperity lies in the wise development of our agricultural resources.

The western members will probably agree with that.

Mr. LEWIS: "Wise development".

Mr. GOULD: Wise development, that is right.

Mr. MARLER: How are you going to have development of our agricultural lands unless you get men able to develop them.

Mr. GOULD: Make it profitable for them to do so.

Mr. MARLER: Premier John Bracken apparently does not take that view. This is what he said, speaking in the Manitoba legislature on the 31st of last January:

> What was needed was the restoration of the purchasing power of the farmer's dollar.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. MARLER: He goes on to say this about immigration:

In this connection he wanted to say there were two schools of thought in Canada regarding immigration. One thought that any kind of people should be brought to the country, and the other considered no more should be brought until agricultural conditions were improved.

Mr. MARLER: I wait for the cheering now.

An hon. MEMBER: Go ahead.

Mr. MARLER: He continues:

Many thought these two things were antagonistic. He did not regard them as that. He believed they were complementary and went hand in hand. The government would do all it could to improve agricultural conditions and, at the same time try to bring into the country a reasonable amount of good settlers.

Now, that I think from the Premier of the province of Manitoba is perfectly clear. And in the London Times which is a very well informed paper and has correspondents all through Canada—

Mr. COOTE: Did the Premier of Manitoba say that he would limit these immigrants to one class only?

Mr. MARLER: I do not know whether he said that or not. Does my hon. friend say he did say that?

Mr. COOTE: No, I was just hoping that he did not say it; I did not know what he said.

Mr. MARLER: I do not know. I cannot read what the mind of Premier John Bracken said, I can only, unfortunately, read what he is reported in the newspaper to have said.

Mr. SPENCER: Did the Premier at that time mention that the people of Manitoba owed taxes over $14,000,000?

Mr. MARLER: No, I do not think he did. I was going on to read what the London Times said about the necessity of immigration to Canada. It said on the 4th September, 1922:

What Canada needs more than anything else is population. She needs a strong immigration policy, together with the widest possible advertisement of what she has to offer. Her empty spaces are calling for settlers. She has less than three people to the square mile, whereas her neighbour across the border has thirty-five, and the Japanese across the Pacific have more than three hundred.

The Japanese my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Good) spoke about.

Now, what I would like to make quite clear to the committee to-night is that in the first place I believe the only way we can produce is by means of having more man power in this country; that unless we do produce more we cannot lighten the load of taxation which this country is suffering under at the present time.

The question will naturally arise in the minds of all those I am addressing to-night, what kind of immigrant should be brought into this country? In other words, am I in favour of deluging the country with anybody who may come in? Should we go after that class of immigrant, or should we have another kind of immigration policy in Canada? The policy that I am in favour of comprises two classes of immigrants. The first I call, for want of a better name, "A preferred class of immigrant". Those are the immigrants which, in my opinion, we should go after. Those are the immigrants we should spend our money to bring to this country and when we get them—and I will speak of that later on—keep them here. Another class of immigrant is the immigrant who presents himself at our doors, and if people voluntarily present themselves at our doors and ask to come into the country I do not think they should be refused admittance. In other words I claim this: There is ample work for everybody in this country who is willing and anxious to work. Perhaps there is not ample work for those who are not willing and anxious to work, but I would not close the door in the face of any immigrant who was sound in body and mind and came to the doors of this country and asked to be admitted.

Mr. COOTE: Does the hon. member include the orientals in that?

Mr. MARLER: No, I am not speaking of oriental immigration at all; that is entirely out of my mind.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Would the hon. gentleman suggest that something like 6,000 people who are being kept by the city of Winnipeg are not able and willing to work? The same thing is true of other cities in this country.

Mr. MARLER: I do not want to hurt my hon. friend's feelings in any way.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: There is no danger of hurting my feelings. I asked a simple question of the hon. gentleman, whether he means to imply that the large number of unemployed men in the cities of Canada are unwilling to work.

Mr. MARLER: I do not mean to be at all impertinent in replying to my hon. friend. Whether they are willing to work or not what I say is this: I believe the great majority of

those men could get work if they went out and looked for it.

Mr. McDONALD (Timiskaming): What would they get employment at during the last two years if they went out to look for it?

An hon. MEMBER: Farm labour.

Mr. MARLER: I was going to deal with the question of unemployment in Canada later on.

Mr. McDONALD (Timiskaming): I have asked the hon. member a fair question and I would like to get a fair answer. I do not believe in putting a matter off until later in the evening in order to avoid answering a question.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. The hon member who is speaking may answer the question if he so desires. If he does not desire to answer he is not compelled to do so.

Mr. MARLER: I will answer my hon. friend's question with pleasure. From all that I can read—I may not have the distinct knowledge that my hon. friend has of certain conditions—it does seem to me that the question of unemployment in this country is not as serious as has been pointed out. My knowledge is derived entirely from the press of the country. The knowledge I have acquired in that way may be quite wrong; I would be very glad to be corrected if that is the case. But here is a clipping from the Toronto Saturday Night, of 28th October, 1922, which I intended to read in any event:

In many centres in Canada, if not in all, there is a distinct shortage of labour in certain activities. This is specially apparent in the building trades. All through the spring and summer there have not been sufficient masons, carpenters, bricklayers and plasterers to meet the demand, and in consequence building operations have been held up. Structures which in the old days would have been fully completed in that period between April and November are still, roughly speaking, half done.

That is one report which I read. Another report which I read was taken from the Financial Post of the 16th February, 1923. Dealing with the New Brunswick labour situation, the lumber cut, the article says:

The lumber cut in New Brunswick for this winter is expected to exceed that of any winter for the past five years. There have been two drawbacks to a large cut—too much snow in the woods and a dearth of men. In many of the sections so much snow has fallen that cutting concerns have been unable to use horses, in fact conditions have become so acute that several companies have ceased operations.

Regarding the scarcity of men in New Brunswick, the cause is migration to other provinces and to New England.

There is a further clipping that I read some little time ago—now we go farther west—from the Financial Post of the 16th February, 1919.

Mr. CALDWELL: Does the article state where the men from New Brunswick went to? I think if it does he will find they have gone over to the states of Maine and Massachusetts.

Mr. MARLER: No not all of them. I would be glad to continue reading the quotation if the hon. member so desires. Some of them did go there.

Regarding the scarcity of men in New Brunswick, the cause is the migration to other provinces and to New England.

That is as far as I read. Now to continue:

The American government has allowed two thousand lumber-jacks to be imported into New England from New Brunswick, owing to the scarcity of men in New England. Originally the two thousand men were turned back at the border by the United States immigration agents but on the appeal from lumber companies in Maine, New Hampshire and Vermont operations, the United States labor department lifted the bars.

In addition to the two thousand that went to the New England woods, ten thousand men have gone to the woods of Quebec and Ontario.

I was going to speak of British Columbia:

In spite of warnings issued last fall that the present winter would witness unemployment in British Columbia on a scale greater than ever experienced, there is to-day very little idle labour in the province. At some points the demand for workers has been so great that men have been brought in from Alberta and Saskatchewan. This was notably the case in connection with the tie cutting operations along the line of the Canadian National railway east of Prince Albert. Logging operations in the interior have been held up by heavy snow-fall, but that is a purely temporary condition, and on the coast the logging concerns are operating at full strength.

I spoke about the situation in New Brunswick and I referred to the situation in Toronto and in British Columbia. I have given this information for what it is worth and I have taken information from the only source from which the average man obtains his information. Take the city of Montreal, the actual situation there is not as serious as has been alleged. Of course there is some unemployment there, but I have had no difficulty in my little experience in placing men who came to me asking for jobs. I have answered the question the hon. member for Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth) to the best of my ability. That is the general situation as I see it.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I do not want to press this matter unduly, but I say that resolutions passed in the city of Winnipeg have been placed before this House, calling attention to the thousands of people in that city who have been out of work and are to-day out of work.

I have information from the mayor of the city that the situation is very serious. Reference has been made to British Columbia. I know the conditions there very intimately, and men who were employed there two years ago have gone to the woods on the other side in thousands. Is that not so?

Mr. MARLER: I do not know whether my hon. friend will admit the correctness or incorrectness of these reports. Most of them are written in Toronto—a very reputable city as I have heard—and I have almost taken them as being absolutely correct. I do not deny what the hon. member says about the Winnipeg situation. I do not wish the hon. member to misunderstand me. I have no antipathy towards labour—quite the contrary—but I have asserted that I do think, that, in many cases, certain classes of labourers at the present time do not like difficult labour and they will not accept employment where the work is hard. If they would do so I think most of the labourers would be employed. That is the viewpoint I take. I have no disrespect for labour—quite the contrary.

I was going on to speak in regard to the class of immigrants we need in this country. I stated that in my opinion there were two classes so-called. The first was the class that we spoke of as the agriculturist; the man who would be placed on the land. I also said —and I would like to repeat—so that the trend of my thoughts will be continuous—that we should not close the doors to other immigrants coming to this country, but if they are strong and healthy and willing to work they should be allowed to come in. In addition to that, I would like to say, even if it is digressing at the present time, that I think that those who have relatives abroad in various parts of Europe should be allowed to bring those relatives into this country, and that certain restrictions, existing at the present time should be removed.

However, I would like to go back and explain why, in my opinion, the agriculturist is required at the present time. It appears to me that in any country we require to have a properly balanced population. If you have a larger urban population than rural population, it is ill-balanced. The rural population is tributary to the urban population. At the present time in this country our population is not properly balanced, and the rural population has in many cases gone down in percentage during the past twenty years. Take the figures for the whole of Canada, and we find that in 1901 the rural population was 62½ per cent, and in 1911 it was 54.58 per cent. In 1921 it was 50.47 per cent. In other words, the rural and urban populations are pretty nearly equal. Some hon. member will say that the reason they are so nearly balanced is because it does not pay to farm. That may or may not be the case, but I think there are other reasons why the rural population is not increasing as it should. But whether it is increasing or not the reason that I suggested a moment ago that it is decreasing on account of the farm not paying is no reason in the wide world why we should not have courage enough to bring out to this country agriculturists and place them on the land, because they are certainly needed there in order to increase production. I am not in favour of urging a great influx into our cities, but I do urge that we should bring forward as many agriculturists as we possibly can and place them on the land.

We always imagined, from our past immigration figures, that the great majority of the immigrants who came here went on the land. That is not the case. They did not, at least, go to the western provinces where we thought they were going. In the last 20 years for example, 51 per cent of the immigrants went to the Maritime provinces, Quebec and Ontario, and less than 50 per cent went to the West. Although I have urged the government at the present time to bring out agriculturists, there is no use bringing these people out and landing them in Winnipeg or some western city and not actually placing them on the farm and looking after them. We should bring them here, not as strangers, but as future citizens of Canada, and make them understand that this is to be their home. There is at the present time an excellent organization called the Soldier Settlement Board which can look after immigrants who come here. They are able not only to bring immigrants to the proper sections of the country on which they can be placed but they can explain to them what should be grown and what should not be grown. They can keep a watchful eye over the immigrant when he comes here, during his early years in Canada, and, generally speaking, the Soldier Settlement is a most excellent organization in every way, and the man at the head of it is a thoroughly reliable and able man. The Soldier Settlement Board has done remarkably well in this country in every way. Some people are very apt to say that the land which was bought for the soldiers has been a loss. There has not been a loss on that land. There has been a certain loss, I admit, on the stock and implements, but as regards land purchased for the soldiers up to 31st January last there was a surplus—I am speaking of

the lands taken back—of over $402,000 what was paid for the lands then.

Mr. CALDWELL: Does this include what the soldier himself paid as his initial payment and his subsequent payments, or just what the government put in?

Mr. MARLER: If the hon. member had asked me that question last year I could have answered it, but I cannot answer it now.

Mr. CALDWELL: I am inclined to think it does not.

Mr. MARLER: I am inclined to think it does include what the soldier put in. The hon. member does not think so?

Mr. CALDWELL: No.

Mr. MARLER: I am not competent to say whether it does or not. I would like to repeat, without wearying the House, my statement that the government should put agriculturists on the land. In addition to that, I would even go so far as to be in favour of a scheme of colonizing certain parts of this country, where the farms may be too large, by bringing people in, dividing up the farms, and letting the newcomers cultivate parts of these farms, even if the government had to set aside a certain amount of money for this purpose. I know perfectly well the minister does not approve that method, but if colonists were brought in and these farms divided up, it would not only help the colonist coming in, but it would also help very many of the farmers in the northwest, who at the present time, as I am informed, are overburdened with too much land and a great deal of debt. We have also certain free lands still in the various provinces and the leader of the Progressives (Mr. Forke) spoke about those lands to-day. He spoke of a certain class of immigrants we could bring out here. I do not think we can get all the agricultural immigrants we require from Great Britain. We will have to go to the continent of Europe for them. The question is not whether these immigrants are of a lower standard of living or not. That is a sad way to look at things. The question is whether Hungarians and people of that description are willing to go on and work and clear land of that description, when others are not willing to do it.

Mr. SPENCER: Is the hon. member, therefore, willing that we bring in immigrants of a lower standard of living?

Mr. MARLER: I did not say that at all. I particularly attempted to avoid, in as clear a way as I could, saying that there was any desire to bring in immigrants of a lower standard of living. I said that as regards these immigrants who could be got from Europe—I used the Hungarians as an example—the question was not whether they were satisfied with a lower standard of living, it was whether they were willing to go on land of this description, clear it and work it. There are such people scattered throughout Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Alberta, so I am informed, who have been doing remarkably well, and there are in those countries, I presume, people of that class, who can be made to populate such lands, who, I believe, will be contented there, and who will, in course of time, become splendid citizens. That is what I referred to in speaking of bringing in immigrants; I used the word "Hungarian" simply as an example of the class who, I believe, would be satisfactory.

Mr. KENNEDY (West Edmonton): Why should the manufacturers of eastern Canada not be willing to face the same kind of competition?

Mr. MARLER: What kind of competition?

Mr. KENNEDY (West Edmonton): When the hon. member refers to bringing in those people to live under circumstances under which the present citizens cannot make it go, or make their farming pay, he is certainly advocating a system of extreme competition. He is advocating something that, if brought to its logical conclusion, means that the present settlers will have to get out or else adopt the other standard of living.

Mr. MARLER: Does that whole question not some down to the fact whether farming in Canada can or cannot be made to pay? I claim that farming can eventually be made to pay; but there are certain fundamental facts which are at the present time preventing farming from paying. I do not think there is on the floor of this House any man who has greater sympathy for the West than I have, and I am coming to that point in just one moment.

Before doing so, I want to speak regarding the amount which has been placed in the Estimates to be used under the Empire settlement scheme. The minister has included in the estimates an amount of $600,000 for the purpose of paying assisted passages of men and domestic servants and various other classes of settlers. Let me make myself quite clear as regards British immigration. I would be only too glad to see as many British immigrants come to this country as we can get; but we should realize at the present time that there is a particular class of immigrant which

we require, that is the agriculturist, and the agriculturist should be the man preferably to be helped under this particular scheme. When there are plenty of people who will come to our doors without being paid assisted passages, those assisted passages should not be meted out to the clerical class and classes of that description under the British Empire settlement scheme. In other words, if labour is required in any particular locality, by all means help to bring out that labour. If labour can be supplied by the Canadian people themselves, we should not assist labour to come out to Canada by means of paying assisted passages. But we should pay assisted passages where the immigration officer knows there is a good farmer or a good farming family desirous of coming out to Canada for the purpose of farming. I repeat again; I am not opposed to British immigration, rather the contrary.

I wish to say just a word as regards the orders in council which are at present in force, and I hope the government will, in the course of a short time, take into consideration the question of cancelling those orders in council. No doubt they were passed at a time when it was necessary to make them, but now their usefulness has very largely passed. I cannot myself see the necessity of the non-continuous journey order in council. I cannot see the great necessity either of the alien enemy order in council.

Mr. McBRIDE: If the order in council in connection with the non-continuous journey had not been passed, would not the western part of this country have been flooded with Hindus?

Mr. MARLER: Let us face the situation like men. If we do not want Hindus in this country let us say so; but do not let us pass an order in council that blankets everybody else and says to a man coming from the United States or any other place from which we welcome immigrants: "No, you cannot come in here, simply because you have not come by a continuous journey." If we do not want Hindus or any other class of people, let us say so; but do not let us pass a blanket order in council and keep it in force.

I was going to say a few words about the alien enemy order in council. Various hon. members may have feelings on that subject. Some of us may think we should not allow into this country those who have been connected with countries which were at war with Great Britain or her allies during the great war. I know there are mixed feelings on that subject, and perhaps I am treading on very dangerous ground in speaking about the matter at all. But I do not think we should continue to foster and keep up this war feeling any longer in this country. We should recognize that we have a great big country to fill up, a country rich in natural resources, and although I am not in favour of flooding any one particular section of Canada with people from any particular part of Europe, putting them in a community and saying: "You can have your own laws, your own schools and half a dozen other things," I am in favour of a general immigration in a fair, selected and directed way from all the countries of Europe, provided that the immigrants who are brought forward are suitable. For that reason I think this alien enemy order in council should be eliminated.

Mr. SHAW: The hon. member discussed the matter of the Soldier Settlement Board. Would he favour the extension of the principles of the Soldier Settlement Board to others than soldier settlers?

Mr. MARLER: I am very much obliged to the hon. member for Calgary West, asking that question. Yes, I would. I am quite frank in saying that I believe the Soldier Settlement Board, if extended in other directions, would prove a great colonization agency in this country, and that the money would be very well spent if money were set aside for the purpose of bringing people in and colonizing them and keeping them on the land. As a proof that I do not think the country would lose a single dollar by a policy of that description, I cite the splendid work that the Soldier Settlement Board have done in regard to settling returned soldiers. When they bought their land, they had not as great experience as they have now; and if they went out now and bought land of this description and put suitable families of settlers on to those lands, the money would be well spent in the interest of this country.

During the course of this debate, the question of the lure of the south was taken up time and time again. I do not think we should be so terribly afraid of the lure of the south. You will get the ebb and flow in every country of the world; you cannot prevent that. You will never be able to prevent Canadians from going to the United States or Americans from coming to Canada. You will always have that ebb and flow so long as these two great countries, with no barriers of any kind between them, exist. But we can prevent that flow into the United States to a very great extent by making this country a better country to live in, by building up this country itself, by making positions here for our young men so that our

young men will be willing and ready to stay at home instead of going to the United States. Frankly, I do not know that one can blame an ambitious man for wanting to go to the United States now with its tremendous possibilities. As a matter of fact, one has to look around with a great deal of care and wonder what one will do with one's children when they grow up, when one sees the possibilities of this country dwindling away

I believe that anyone who has faith in this country—and I have unbounded faith in the country and in its people—will agree that it is well worth while spending money on immigration to bring immigrants into Canada. But someone will say, what about the lure of the south? Well, we have also had in this country considerable immigration from the United States of America. In the period from 1900 to 1909, 403,000 such immigrants came into this country; from 1910 to 1919, 875,000 came; and in 1920, 1921 and 1922, 127,000 came in. Someone will say, however, that a great many of our people have gone to the United States. So they have. But I doubt very much whether the figures which have been repeatedly given in this House regarding those going to the United States are absolutely correct. As everyone knows, we do not keep records with regard to emigration from this country to the United States. Those records are kept by the United States officials, and in many cases in the past they have been found to have counted as permanent settlers in the United States people who have gone there only on a temporary visit. An investigation was made by the department in two instances, in 1910 and 1912, when a large number of cases were inquired into. I am taking this from the Canadian Annual Review which I saw the other day; and out of 849 cases of persons reported as having gone to the United States to settle, it was found by actual examination that 415 had gone only on a temporary visit. The Review goes on to give the statistics of emigration from Canada to the United States and from the United States to Canada. It shows that in the period 1910-1914 there came from the United States to Canada 605,498 people while there went from Canada to the United States 329,000. In the period 1915-1919 the trend was not quite so favourable: 379,000 went from Canada to the United States as compared with 270,000 from the United States to Canada. But be that as it may, there is no reason in the wide world why the Canadian people should lose courage. There is no reason why we should be downhearted because a certain number of our citizens are going to the United States from year to year. In this matter courage is all that is required; and if we have a courageous policy, as we have a courageous people, I am confident that sooner or later we shall make this a good country to live in and shall retain not only our own people but the settlers that come in.

But when we talk to-day of Canadians going to the United States, we must realize that there are reasons for this exodus. The Dillingham law in force there, as stated this afternoon, restricts the immigration of aliens to 3 per cent of the nationals resident in the United States; that is to say, of people from the United Kingdom, only 3 per cent of the number of British people resident in the United States can enter that country, and so forth. That has made a very great shortage in labour in the United States, and now there is a tremendous building boom in Chicago and Los Angeles and I believe in Boston, although I am speaking only from memory as regards the last-named city. If our artisans therefore find that they can get large wages in the United States they are going to go there in large numbers. And they are going; there is no denying that, because it is the case. But because that is the situation at the present time, because our people are leaving Canada just now for specific reasons, is that any reason why we should conclude that the lure of the United States is something that will always exist? It does seem to me that in due course of time conditions will revive here and we shall be enabled to retain our population. But it will do us no good to sit down and declare that so long as there is this lure to the United States we are not going to get any people to come here. That is not going to do us a bit of good. If we take any such despondent attitude we shall simply find that more and more of our people will go to the United States, our trade will sink lower and lower, and our population will gradually eliminate itself, creating a condition that may be very unpleasant to contemplate.

Now I want to say a word as regards the attitude of certain gentlemen in the West on the question of immigration. And if I speak personally and feelingly I think that hon. gentlemen will believe what I say. There is no man in this House who has a greater sympathy with those pioneers who went to the West than I have, for I believe they have done for this country something that no other people have accomplished. They have withstood hardships and tilled the land and reaped enormous crops. The figures of the past year of their tremendous crop, as taken from the Manitoba Free Press, show a total of 903,000,000 bushels of grain valued at the head of the lakes at $590,000,000. I know that some

hon. gentlemen will observe that it did not pay. Well, perhaps it did not; nevertheless the men who have raised that enormous crop of grain, of such a huge value, and brought that vast area of land under cultivation, surely do not lack in courage. I am perfectly positive that they cannot lack courage, and I believe that the conditions prevailing in the West to-day are due more or less to fundamental causes which I think will be removed.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Does not the hon. gentleman think that we are entitled to a little more than commendation for our courage?

Mr. MARLER: Yes, certainly. I think you are entitled to a great deal more, and you will get a great deal more too, I am perfectly sure. As I was remarking, there are fundamental reasons to-day that prevent farming from being very profitable in the West, and I approach the matter with a great deal of hesitation, I must admit. The first reason is, of course, that the farmer's dollar is worth only about 70 cents while he has to pay a great deal more for all his commodities. But the prices of commodities are going down at the present time.

Mr. CALDWELL: What about sugar?

Mr MARLER: And when further deflation does take place it seems to me that the farmer's dollar will be worth a great deal more than it can now purchase. Another reason is that the European buying power is not what we should like it to be. It is not very good now, but I believe it will improve as time goes on; and that will make the situation still better. There is another question that we must consider, and that is the matter of freight rates, which are weighing heavily on the farming industry. I do not see how we are going to bring down freight rates unless we give the railways more freight. It is not possible for them to reduce rates unless they can get more freight.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Did the hon. member read the annual report of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company?

Mr. MARLER: Yes, in one of the Toronto papers. What about it?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): You will find in that report that they made this year a net surplus of over $22,000,000. Does my hon. friend not think that we ought to have a lowering of rates in view of that fact?

Mr. MARLER: The net surplus was not $22,000,000. After paying a reasonable dividend on the money invested it was probably more like $1,000,000, because the Canadian Pacific Railway was running behind largely all through the year, and it was only when the fall crop came that they were able to earn dividend requirements.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): May I quote the figures for the hon. gentleman's benefit? The net earnings from the railway and lake steamers was $36,301,691, and after deduction of fixed charges the surplus is given as $22,952,785.

An hon. MEMBER: The dividend must come out of that.

Mr. MARLER: Yes. Does the hon. gentleman not want the shareholders to get anything at all? The surplus of the Canadian Pacific Railway last year, after the payment of a moderate dividend after years of patient striving, was comparatively little. However, that is a digression.

Now, I have taken up with the committee as far as I think is necessary the question of unemployment, and I have only one word to add. I should like to repeat that if we adopt a courageous immigration policy and bring in the right class of settlers it will help us along very much. Some hon. members may say, "Well, if we get more immigrants in here what are we going to do?" I would reply that if we do not take a chance and bring immigrants in our home markets will dwindle, our population will decline, and the lure of the United States will continue, thus perpetuating the conditions which we now deplore so much.

Mr. BAXTER: Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to take very much time at this hour of the night, but I would not desire to economize by omitting a reference that I think ought to be made to the very valuable address which we have just listened to. Possibly I would not associate myself with all of the hon. member's arguments nor with all of his conclusions, but I think it is to the credit of this House that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Marler) should have given so much study to what in my mind is one of the two important questions that confront our people to-day. For in my judgment there are no more than two questions now before the country, nor are there likely to be any others for some years to come. One is the railway question, on which I shall not touch to-night; the other is the question of immigration. I think this committee realizes that the question which we have so often debated—the tariff—no matter how strong the views of many hon. members may be, is something that by the

agency of any party cannot be changed by more than a fractional variation from its present condition, and therefore we may as well settle down to consideration of the great questions of railways and of immigration.

I believe the country is prepared to support the hon. Acting Minister of Immigration (Mr. Stewart) if his policy contains that element so much emphasized by the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Marler)—courage. It is only by courage that this problem can be successfully handled. I do not think the people of Canada expect that every immigrant will remain here. If we were to take a view so limited we would not spend a dollar, we would not make a single effort to attract desirable immigrants; on the contrary, we would allow our country to wither, to die of inanition. That cannot be the Canadian spirit. Certainly it is not the spirit by which we have surmounted the difficulties of the past, and it is not the spirit which will solve our national problems to-day.

After all, immigration is like a fertilizing stream, which passes through the land depositing something of its value, but always carrying something away. We cannot expect to retain all the immigrants we bring in. It is our business to make conditions here favourable to the retention of every immigrant, and especially of every native-born son. But we cannot war against human nature. No parliament can stop that onward progress of the ambitious boys and girls from the farm to the civic centre, and thence to the greatest opportunities of life. Nor is it desirable that we should try to turn the world back. Progress is the natural order of events, and we should not desire to stop it even if we had the ability to do so. Neither is it possible for us to stop the tide of immigration flowing through to other countries. We know that the United States is greater in population, in wealth and in opportunity, and it is perhaps not a little to our credit that our native-born of ambition, of courage and of ability have left us to occupy leading positions in the country to the south; and there is no reason why we should desire to stop them. But we must replace them by attracting immigrants in increasing numbers, and therefore I think this country should be opened to a selected immigration, an immigration which ought in my judgment to be directed to the parts of the Dominion that want it and ask for it.

Mr. JACOBS: How can you keep that immigration there?

Mr. BAXTER: I have just said that you cannot stop its natural movement, you cannot cause a fixation of the human character. I have seen something that possibly resembles an effort at fixation, but I would not want Canada to attempt it.

I do not purpose to discuss the problem of immigration from east to west and from nort to south, but to treat it from what in one sense is purely a sectional aspect. I want to speak of immigration from the standpoint of the Maritime provinces, and I think I am justified in doing so. We have heard from every other part of the Dominion its attitude towards immigration. We in the Maritime provinces have our attitude. We would like to see our desires translated into action. While I cannot congratulate the minister upon any particular courage in the policy which he puts forward, nor upon any great ambition involved in that policy, still I feel that the hon. gentleman is sincere in his desire to do all he can so far as his path is clear to him, and I think whether we agree with him or not in details it ought to be the part of hon. members to give him at least such suggestions as they think are of value. He will then have the opportunity of selecting those which to him possess merit. It was largely for that purpose I am sure that the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George delivered his speech. I want to make this suggestion myself, I trust that this debate, which is one of very great value to the country, will be made up of a succession of suggestions with the view of giving the minister assistance which will enable him to make his department more helpful to the country.

Now, we have to a certain extent a complaint in the Maritime provinces in regard to immigration. I trust we are not of a whining breed and that we do not complain for the sake of complaining. I hope we have not yet come to the conclusion that the axis of Canada is in the Maritime provinces and that the rest of the Dominion must revolve around it and by our permission. We do not take any such stand, but we do intend to say what we think we need and to point out a way by which we think it can be given to us. Hitherto, no matter what government has been in power, as the minister said to-day, the policy has been to treat the Immigration department as a sort of fly on the wheel of the administration—a general sign hung out and a certain amount of money spent in a certain way to attract people. Where? To Canada. That is all right as a glittering generality.

The federal government has always refused to make distinctions between the provinces, and in that respect I think it has failed to do justice to all Canada. The result of that policy has been that people have flocked to the western lands. It is true that we have the burden of the Canadian Pacific to help to

carry, and we have the burden of the Canadian Northern. I shall not follow all the changes of name in connection with the Canadian Northern down to the present time, but we still have the burden with us, and it is quite right to get settlers into that country. But is it quite fair that there should be no direction of the stream of immigration toward other provinces which need the vitality of immigration quite as much as the West needs it? The House sees exactly what has taken place in the Maritime provinces. We have either lost population, as in the case of the beautiful little province of Prince Edward Island, or made a gain so slight that we are losing representation, as in the case of Nova Scotia, or are barely able to hold our own, as in the case of New Brunswick. That is the fact in relation to this last decade; in the previous decade we lost in our relative position to the provinces as a whole. Now, do we not need some of the immigration? Do we not want it? Are there not fertile valleys, pleasant slopes, lovely plains, in these three provinces? Are there not great natural resources which can be developed by labour? We want population, not talking machines. If other people want the country to stand still; if they do not want immigration; if they do not want success they can so express themselves, as they have done many times before. For my part, I will do my own talking. I am not a catechism.

Conditions in the Maritime provinces from the agricultural standpoint differ greatly from those in the West. Our soil in most instances requires to be denuded of some growth. The proposal I will make may appear startling, because it might involve the expenditure of a few hundred thousand dollars. It might even cost a million or a couple of millions. It may be startling to gentlemen on both sides who yesterday with the greatest complacency approved of the spending of millions upon millions to complete the Hudson Bay railway. If that dream of some peoples' lives is to be realized, we in the Maritime provinces may fairly put in a plea for a chance for our own lives, and what I say is that the immigration policy could very well embrace the expenditure of some money upon a suitable class of immigrants by preparing farms for them in the Maritime provinces. If you do that, we will keep them there, and we will not whine if the crops go bad. I trust that the minister may be able to persuade his colleagues to give him enough money to enable us to
11 p.m. settle good farmers upon the land in the Maritime provinces. Let him do that, and we will produce the results.

[Mr. Baxter.]

Mr. CAHILL: Mr. Chairman, I regret that I cannot agree with much that has been said by hon. members opposite and by the minister himself. We are all pretty well agreed that so far as the minister is concerned he at least has no immigration policy; the immigration policy that he is proposing has been handed to him by outside schemers who wish to have their plans promoted. I would have thought that the Liberal government after taking office would have seen fit to try to find out the cause of emigration from our country. This country has had problems of immigration and emigration for the past forty years. During all that time we have not maintained our natural increase in Canada, yet we have spent millions upon millions of dollars in bringing tourists to our shores and allowing them to drift out of the country again. The minister now proposes to do something even worse; he is going to pay passages and thus assist these people to come to Canada. If the government of the day had lived up to their pre-election pledges and promises to put a certain tariff into effect in this country, they would have freed the implements of production from customs tariff. If that had been done the result would have been a great incentive in the matter of bringing people to this country and making our present farming population more prosperous, more happy and more contented. That, after all, is what will bring the most immigrants to Canada and keep them here—a prosperous, happy and contented people. All the immigration propaganda that the minister talks of is not worth one cent to him; is not going to get him anywhere.

He proposes to spend $600,000 in bringing people into Canada by means of assisted immigration, and he intends to participate in the British Empire settlement scheme. Now, that scheme is designed to get rid of the surplus population of Great Britain. It is a very good scheme for the British people, but what are we to do with these people after we get them here? Put them in the cities and open soup kitchens for them? Nothing else can happen. These people are being brought from the cities of England; they are not people who will be assimilated into the rural life of our country. They are not people who will go on the farms of northern Quebec, northern Ontario, northern Saskatchewan and Alberta. If the minister will attempt to legislate so as to make conditions in the rural districts livable for the people who are there; if he will do something to bring prosperity to the farming communities, then he will get all the immigrants that Canada wants, with very little effort on his part.

There are four things necessary for this country to-day, and one of them is tariff adjustment. We have lived under this present tariff arrangement of protection for the past forty years and we have got nowhere. Our transportation system is bleeding the people white, and it is the duty of the government to see that the people get a square deal from the transportation companies. Our banking system is so arranged that there are no rural credits, no provisions for the development of the rural districts. It is so arranged that the money is gathered into the cities. I am not blaming the banks; they are doing business according to their lights, according to the best profit they can get, but under the present system the country banks are simply gathering offices for the cities. The result is that the bankers of Canada are in the large cities—Toronto and Montreal; and they are anxious to lend money to the manufacturer, the jobber and the speculator. Your money and the money of the rural districts finds its way to Montreal and is there lent out. I do not know that this condition can be remedied immediately, but it is one of the things that has helped to depopulate rural Canada. There is no person in rural Canada in a position to make loans through the banks. It is true that a private individual can make loans; but the boy in the bank in the rural districts of Canada is not competent to do so.

Mr. LADNER: Is the hon. gentleman aware that in the prairie provinces the loans from the banks exceed the deposits.

Mr. CAHILL: Who gives my hon. friend that information? Does he get it from the farmer on the prairies, or does he get it from the man that wants to make him believe that the present system is the finest in the land?

Mr. LADNER: The hon. gentleman's method of answer might suit the hustings but in the House of Commons—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. LADNER: I submit the hon. gentleman has not answered the question which I put. He may not have the information. If he does not have it no doubt he will say so; if he has the information he will probably let us know.

Mr. CAHILL: I will answer the hon. member in this way: I am not aware that his statement is true.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this waste of money in Canada has gone on too long. This system of paternalism is getting too great a hold on the Canadian people. We are not only going to bring these immigrants into Canada but we are going to regulate their movements after they get here; we are going to have a system of inspection and of restrictions. We are going to tell these people how they are to farm, when they are to farm and why; we are going out to waste the money of the Canadian people, a thing that we cannot possibly afford to do.

My hon. friend also has a scheme to spend $100,000 with the Canadian Colonization Company. Just imagine the federal government meddling with real estate problems! Just imagine them wasting the people's money in a real estate deal of that kind! Why if my hon. friend will spend, not $100,000 but $1,000, he will be able to stop as many people from leaving Canada in a week or in a day as his agreement requires to be brought in in a year. The whole scheme is absurd. I propose to vote against the appropriation of $100,000 for this purpose, and against that of $600,000 for assisted immigration to Canada until the conditions are better, and until this is a more satisfactory country for people to come to, and for the people who are now here to live in.

Mr. EVANS: I had not intended taking part in this debate but in view of the manner in which some hon. members have discussed this most serious question I rise to make known my views from a humanitarian standpoint. The economic system of this country has been such that all those who own the public utilities which the farmers and agriculturists of Canada need to use—the railways, the banks, the grain dealers, the elevator concerns and the loan companies—are accumulating great wealth, while the man who creates the new wealth of this country every year does not make enough to clothe and feed himself in decency. Some of these men are still hanging on to their farms in the hope of salvaging something out of the labour which they have so many years devoted to the building up of what they fondly call home. Why any government should inveigle newcomers to take the places of the old and experienced farmers who have failed, without considering the reason for that failure is to my mind political insanity. The present immigration policy is nothing more than the inveigling of the uninformed into taking the places of men who, through hard times, have had to leave their farms every year. The time was when we thought that the western part of this country was rich enough to carry any overhead expense, and we built thousands of miles of railway which have never been needed and which can never economically serve the interests of Canada. Freight rates were in-

creased to pay the dividends of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. This, it was said, was needed to maintain the country's credit and the settler had to pay for it. Our legislators have looked on with unconcern whilst the lake shipping combine, and other combines obtained control of the wealth which the farmer each year made for this country. The effort was made to ease the settler's mind by telling him how much his farm had increased in value; and so he went on adding to the wealth of the country and borrowing at a high rate of interest from the banks, to meet his own obligations. Implement companies have been left to conduct their operations virtually as they pleased. So the dance has gone merrily on.

There are a good many things which the government can do in the way of carrying out a consistent immigration policy, but it seems to me that they are still surveying the situation with unconcern. The present immigration vote, under existing conditions, is certainly bound to meet with lively opposition. It is known to all that are on the land endeavouring to make a living that it is useless to bring in settlers under present conditions to take the place of experienced farmers who are failing to make good. The fact that the Acting Minister of Immigration says the present conditions are largely our own fault does not alter the case. It was not the war, as he says, that caused excessive or undue inflation of the price of land. The conditions with which we are now faced threatened to arise before the war began; the war only postponed them for a time. The conditions, coupled with the rise in freight rates, have been so bad that the farmers' products have fallen even below the prices which prevailed previous to 1914. I think it is certainly reasonable to say that under present conditions it is a useless waste to spend money on immigration. Take the case of a new settler. The proposition is to people 20,000,000 acres of land within ten or fifteen miles of the railways. Now, just see what the overhead expenses of the intending settler will be to start with, and I have only mentioned those things it is imperative for him to have. He needs a binder, which costs under present conditions $330; a drill, which costs $180; a wagon, which costs $160; a plough, which costs $60; a harrow, which costs $30; and a rake and mower, which costs $180. He will also need four horses, costing $400, and he should have two cows which he can buy at present for about $40 each. Then he should have in cash—outside of what he can make as he goes along—to feed his family for one year and a half until returns come in, at least $600. He will also need another $100 for fuel. Now he requires to buy a quarter section at $20 per acre, and if he can get the necessary money at 6 per cent that will represent an interest charge of about $204. He has to pay the interest the first year, but at the end of the second season he still finds himself in debt $2,324. Now it seems to me that he cannot borrow this amount from the bank because the present rate of interest is too high. One of the reasons why farms are vacant to-day is that the rates of interest are so high that it does not pay to borrow money to work a farm.

I just rose to say that I oppose the vote for this expenditure on immigration, and I do it largely from a humanitarian standpoint.

Mr. FORTIER (Translation): Mr. Chairman, I listened, this afternoon, with great satisfaction to the government's policy on this important question of immigration; it gave me much pleasure to hear the eloquent speech delivered by the Minister of the Interior, who gave us a masterly outline of the situation. I therefore approve of the government's policy. I am in favour of this wise moderate policy, and, I think we are fully justified, under the circumstances, to avoid extremes and more than ever we can say in medio stat virtus. No doubt the country is in need of immigration but a select and desirable one; Canada must not follow the example of other countries and hold a wide opened door to all immigrants of the world. It seems to me, that at this period in our history, it would be bad policy to erect either on our Atlantic coast or the shores of the St. Lawrence, a new Statue of Liberty opening widely its mantle to gather in all the wandering children of the earth.

I listened with pleasure to the Minister of the Interior bringing out new features in regard to this immigration policy. I think the criticism of the government by the opposition for following up the old policy is not well founded, because as I have stated there is in the government's policy new features. In fact there is the co-operation of the government with the provinces. This is a new element which will be appreciated by the people of this country. Another new feature is the one of the publicity which will be widespread encouraging immigration not only towards the western provinces as in the past, but towards the nine provinces of the Dominion. These are the new features introduced in the policy of immigration that deserve to be pointed out and with which I entirely agree. This new policy is acknowledged by the Progressive

party since they reproach the government for changing the old policy by introducing this special new feature by which the Dominion government would co-operate with the provinces and, they seem rather astonished at the fact of this co-operation. We may have, in the past, made mistakes by opening too wide the gates to immigrants and especially by directing them towards those territories, the western provinces, only which, according to certain people, seem to be well fitted to immigration.

A member of the opposition commenting upon the remarks made by a previous speaker, stated that the important questions which interested the country, at present, were those of immigration and railways, and, that both had been discussed in a masterly way by the speaker who had preceded him. No doubt these two questions are of the utmost importance; but to my mind, there is one which dominates both of them: it is the question of colonization. The latter holds the foremost place, while railways and immigration are but means to attain the great aim. It is by co-operating with the provinces that we may help immigration and especially colonization in this country.

No doubt in the western provinces this co-operation cannot exist between the Dominion government and the provincial government for the simple reason that the natural resources belong to the former. These provinces take no interest in the question because they cannot supply lands to those who wish to settle in this country. In the older provinces, the eastern provinces, it is absolutely necessary that lands favourable to farming be offered to settlers so as to help immigration. There must be lands offered but there must also be settlers to take them over. This work accomplished by the older provinces and that the Dominion government now wish to help, is an excellent thing for this country. Indeed, it was by opening up areas of arable lands that we were able to keep our people in this country; it is through such a colonization policy that we succeeded in preventing the exodus of our children to the United States, and it will again be through applying such a policy, backed by both Dominion and provincial governments that we shall hold the settlers amongst us and assist in the work known as repatriation. If praise is due to the government, at present, it is certainly for having contributed to establish the work of repatriation. I wish to congratulate them on this achievement, and, on having designated to perform such work a man whose ability is indisputable. Indeed, Mr. Arthur Lemont has a wide experience in economic questions; he was attached during a number of years to the Department of Colonization in our province; as a journalist, during twenty years, he wrote on all the important subjects interesting our country and has even published works on Canadian economic questions. I have reason to hope that this organization and under the direction of the official in charge repatriation will proceed in an efficient manner.

These are the views that I wished to emphasize in this debate. I renew my most sincere adhesion to the government's policy. I state that we should encourage the repatriation of our people to the older provinces, and, specially my own province, and that we should also help in the settlement of the western provinces. Those who wish to return and live under the skies of their province are always welcome. At present, settlers are not numerous enough; they must come in greater numbers so as to further develop the eastern provinces. If amongst us, there are people having an adventurous turn of mind, rather than cross the 45th parallel to seek work in the New England mills, they would be better off to go west and settle the Red river, the Assiniboine and Saskatchewan valleys, taking their place among their own people already settled in those parts, and who, thanks to Providence, are prosperous. I therefore favour this policy of the government in regard to immigration and shall cast my vote with pleasure in support of the credits asked by the government.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King, the House adjourned at 11.25 p.m.

Wednesday, March 14, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

NEW MEMBER

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Clerk of the House has received from the Chief Electoral officer certificate of the election and return of Albert Frederick Healy, Esquire, member for the Electoral District of North Essex.

NEW MEMBER INTRODUCED

Albert Frederick Healy, Esquire, member for the Electoral District of North Essex, introduced by the Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King and Hon. George P. Graham.

CIVIL SERVICE ACT

FIRST REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Mr. JAMES MALCOLM (North Bruce) presented the first report of the special committee appointed for the purpose of inquiring into chapter 12, 8-9 George V., an act respecting the Civil Service of Canada as follows:

Your committee recommends that its order of reference be so enlarged as to empower it to make recommendations looking toward the betterment of aforesaid act and the Civil Service in general, and also that the committee be empowered to sit while the House is in session.

INQUIRY INTO AGRICULTURAL CONDITIONS

THIRD REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Mr. ANDREW McMASTER (Brome) presented the third report of the committee appointed to inquire into agricultural conditions, as follows:

The committee appointed to inquire into agricultural conditions beg leave to present the following resolution which was unanimously adopted.

That in the opinion of the committee it is advisable and in the interest of agriculture in this country that a full and searching inquiry should be made into all aspects of the grain trade in Canada and that for this purpose a Royal Commission should be appointed, clothed with full powers not only from the Dominion government, but from all provinces, desiring to co-operate in such inquiry.

NARCOTIC DRUGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Hon. H. S. BELAND (Minister of Health) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 72 to amend the Narcotic Drugs Act.

He said: The purpose of this bill is principally to consolidate previous legislation for the suppression of the traffic in narcotic drugs. Legislation was first enacted in 1908, and subsequent legislation was enacted in 1911, 1919, 1920, 1921 and 1922. At present the legislation is somewhat confusing, and the purpose of this legislation is to make the interpretation of these different statutes clearer and easier for those charged with the administration of this law. There are a few minor changes. One change relates to the right of appeal which in some cases is limited to a point of law. There is another minor change, as I take it, providing for the indentification by the finger prints of criminals convicted under the act.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST READINGS

Bill No. 55 (from the Senate), for the relief of Margaret Elizabeth Moran.—Mr. Church.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Bill No. 56 (from the Senate), for the relief of Ethel Lillian Duncan.—Mr. Macdonald (Pictou).

Bill No. 57 (from the Senate), for the relief of Florence Mary Ramsden.—Mr. Macdonald (Pictou).

Bill No. 58 (from the Senate), for the relief of Ross John Craig.— Mr. Macdonald (Pictou).

Bill No. 59. (from the Senate), for the relief of Florence Dodds.—Mr. Hocken.

Bill No. 60 (from the Senate), for the relief of Blanche Hilton.—Mr. Harris.

Bill No. 61 (from the Senate), for the relief of May Woodbridge.—Mr. Harris.

Bill No. 62 (from the Senate), for the relief of Alice May Smith.—Mr. White.

Bill No. 63 (from the Senate), for the relief of Albert Ernest Mould.—Sir Henry Drayton.

Bill No. 64 (from the Senate), for the relief of Winifred Rose Foster.—Mr. German.

Bill No. 65 (from the Senate), for the relief of Emily May Small.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 66 (from the Senate), for the relief of Irene Herdsman.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 67 (from the Senate), for the relief John Frederick King Hall.—Mr. McMaster.

Bill No. 68 (from the Senate), for the relief of Herbert Martin.—Mr. Shaw.

Bill No. 69 (from the Senate), for the relief of Frederick John Saunders.—Mr. Shaw.

Bill No. 70 (from the Senate), for the relief of Robert Archibald Logan.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 71 (from the Senate), for the relief of Violet Marie Finn.—Mr. Sheard.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

QUEBEC HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS

Mr. HOCKEN:

1. What are the names of the Harbour Commissioners for Quebec?
2. What salary is paid each commissioner?
3. Are any of the commissioners employed in any other capacity by the board?
4. If so, what are the names of those so otherwise employed, and amounts paid each, or any of them for such other services?
5. What is the total amount paid each commissioner for salary and other services or commissions during year ending December 31, 1921?
6. What dismissals or changes have been made by the present government in the personnel of the commission?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. President, Mr. W. Gerard Power; Commissioners: Brig.-General T. L. Tremblay and Jules Gauvin.

2. President, $6,000 per annum; $4,000 per annum to each of the other commissioners. These salaries are paid out of the revenues of the harbour.

3. Yes.

4. Brigadier-General Tremblay, Chief Engineer to the board since 1st July, 1922; salary, $4,000 per annum.

5. Annual salary only: Major-General Sir D. Watson, $6.000; A. S. Gravel, $4,000; Brig.-General T. L. Tremblay, $4,000.

6. The former three commissioners tendered their resignations to be effective from the 1st March, 1922. The commissioners named in answer to question 1 above, were appointed in their place.

MONTREAL HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS

Mr. HOCKEN:

1. What are the names of the Harbour Commissioners for Montreal?
2. What salary is paid each commissioner?
3. Are any of the commissioners employed in any other capacity by the board?
4. If so, what are the names of those so otherwise employed, and amounts paid each, or any of them for such other services?
5. What is the total amount paid each commissioner for salary and other services or commissions during year ending December 31, 1921?
6. What dismissals or changes have been made by the present government in the personnel of the commission?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. Commissioners: Dr. Wilfrid Laurier McDougald (president); Dr. Milton L. Hersey, B.Sc., LL.D.; Mr. Emilien Daoust.

2. President, $7,000. $5,000 to each of the other two commissioners. These salaries are paid out of the revenues of the harbour.

3. No.

4. None.

5. Annual salary only. Mr. W. G. Ross, $6,261.10; General A. E. Labelle, $5,000; Mr. F. Robertson, $5,000.

6. In November, 1921, Mr. W. G. Ross, former president, resigned his position to contest St. Antoine division, Montreal, and the other two former commissioners, Mr. Farquahar Robertson and Brig.-General, A. E. Labelle resigned as members of the commission in December, 1921. The commissioners named in the answer to question 1, above, were appointed in February, 1922.

CREOSOTED PILING

Mr. CLARK:

1. What quantity of creosoted piling has been used on government wharves in the province of British Columbia during the years 1920, 1921, 1922?
2. What firms supplied the piling aforesaid?
3. What amounts were paid to the said firms?

Hon. Mr. COPP:

1. Purchased and used by the Department of Public Works: 1920, 29,534 feet; 1921, 37,979 feet; 1922, 19,527 feet.

2. The Colman Company of Seattle, and the Vancouver Creosoting Company to the department creosoted piling was bought and paid for by the following contractors who had lump sum contracts for the following works: 1920, Half Moon Bay, Fraser River Piledriving Co.; Lang Bay, McDonald, Watson & Withers; Shoal Bay, McDonald, Watson & Withers; Squamish, McDonald, Watson & Withers.

1921, Granthams Landing, W. Greenlees; Gibsons, W. Greenlees; Hopkins, Fraser River Piledriving Co.; Port Moody, Vancouver Piledriving Co.; Savary Island, R. Bumstead; Hollyburn, W. Greenlees.

1922, Lang Bay, R. Bumstead; Powell River, W. Greenlees; Quathiaski Cove, McDonald, Watson & Withers; Hornby Island, McDonald, Watson & Withers; Mansons Landing, W. Greenlees; Ioco, R. Bumstead had a unit price contract at 90 cents a foot for 3,628 feet.

3. Paid by this department: 1920, Colman Company of Seattle, $11,292.27; Vancouver Creosoting Company, $6,278.75.

1921, Colman Company, $3,234.90; Vancouver Creosoting Company, $16,265.62.

1922, Colman Company, $2,062.15; Vancouver Creosoting Company, $4,209.57.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Mr. LOVETT:

1. What has been the total cost to the government of Canada for the Civil Service Commission from 1917 to 1922 both years inclusive?
2. What was the total cost respectively of the Young and Griffenhagen commissions for services in connection with the Civil Service?

Hon. Mr. COPP:

1.

Date	Salaries	Contingencies	Bonus	Total
1917-18. ..	$ 30,372 65	$ 13,552 79	.....	$ 43,925 44
1918-19. ..	42,002 84	66,473 26	$ 3,579 55	112,055 65
1919-20. ..	60,578 82	119,489 78	22,624 35	202,692 95
1920-21. ..	103,540 33	176,037 51	39,307 96	318,885 80
1920-21. ..	14,661 99	.....	.....	14,661 99†
1921-22. ..	178,264 61	123,657 09	35,553 08	337,474 78
1921-22. ..	5,007 54	.....	.....	5,007 54†
1-4-22 to 31-12-22 ..	146,830 01	52,946 78	.....	199,776 79
	581,258 79	552,157 21	101,064 94	1,234,480 94

Note.—The amounts marked † are arrears of salary.

In 1918-19 a preliminary investigation into the affairs of the Printing Bureau by Messrs. Lewis, Tarte and Slack cost $2,648.55.

2. 1918-19, A. Young & Company, $34,695.76; 1919-20, A. Young & Company, $95,306.81; 1920-21, A. Young & Company, $28,452.33; Total, $158,454.90.

In addition to the above the Auditor General's report shows an expenditure of $162,475.26, charged to the Civil Service Commission. This amount was voted to cover the cost of the reorganization of the Bureau of Public Printing and Stationery. It includes the cost of new machinery, the labour of installing the same, etc., this being by far the greater portion of the total.

PACIFIC COAST SHIPBUILDING CONTRACT

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton):

1. What is the name of the bond company pledged for the amount of $321,000 in connection with the contract to build the two ships on the Pacific coast, referred to on page 3515, Hansard, 1922?
2. Has the full guarantee or any portion thereof now been paid by the bond company?
3. If not, what efforts have been made by the governmnt to collect this guarantee?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. The London Guarantee & Accident Co., head office in Toronto.

2. No portion of the guarantee has been paid by the bonding company.

3. Suit was begun some time ago by the Department of Justice on behalf of the Department of Marine and Fisheries to recover the full amount of the guarantee. The pleadings have been made and the case is awaiting trial.

HOUSE OF COMMONS--FURNITURE

Mr. HODGINS:

1. By whom is the furniture ordered for the House of Commons?
2. Are the orders approved by the Department of Public Works before being forwarded?
3. From whom is that furniture bought?

Hon. Mr. KING (Kootenay):

1 and 3. Tenders for 128 members' back row desks were called on December 12, 1919, and contract awarded on December 22, 1919; for 28 members' front row desks, tenders were called March 9, 1920, and the contract awarded on April 15, 1920. These desks were supplied by the Valley City Seating Co., of Dundas, and by Geo. Roberts & Sons of Montreal. Tenders were called for 312 members' chairs on March 9, 1920, and contract awarded on April 15, 1920, to Castle & Son, of Montreal. Tenders were called for tables and chairs for Clerks, Sergeant-at-Arms and Hansard staff on June 23, 1920, and the contract was awarded on July 6, 1920, to Henry Morgan & Co., of Montreal.

[Mr. Copp.]

2. No, after tenders had been received by the architect for the Parliament Buildings and approved by the Joint Parliamentary Committee, the furniture was ordered by the architect.

CANADIAN GOVERNMENT MERCHANT MARINE —SCRAP METAL AND MATERIAL

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. What has been done with scrap metal and material coming from the fleet and elsewhere belonging to the Canadian Government Merchant Marine in 1921?
2. Was this metal sold by tender or disposed of otherwise?
3. If so, on whose authority was this scrap metal and material sold, and at what price?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. All scrap was sold.

2. By tender.

3. By Purchasing department. Price realized scrap rope, June, 3 cents per lb; September, 3½ cents per lb; December, 4¼ cents per lb; Cast scrap, September, $18, gross ton. Grate bars, September, $9, gross ton; December, $10, gross ton. Twisted band iron, $6.50, gross ton. Empty paint barrels, $1 each. Scrap dunnage, $2 a load. Column casting, $15, gross ton. Pipe and retarder, $6, gross ton. Scrap grain bags (by auction) 1½ cents each.

Mr. H. MILBURN

Mr. BENOIT:

1. Have complaints been made against one H. Milburn, assistant to the manager of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine in Montreal?
2. Have those complaints been investigated?
3. If so, who investigated same?
4. What was the result of the investigation?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Yes.

2. Yes.

3. H. J. Page, chief of the investigation department.

4. Complete exoneration of Mr. Milburn.

MONTREAL POST OFFICE

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. What is the name of the clerk at the Montreal post office, who is in charge of accounts and collection of postage on all newspapers published in Montreal, and is in charge of the paid in cash postage system?
2. How long has this employee been in the service of the Post Office department?
3. What is his salary and classification?
4. Who is the clerk in charge of the same service at Toronto?
5. How long has he been in that post?
6. What is his salary and classification?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM (for the Postmaster General):

1. Camille Bolte.

2. 14 years, 6 months.

3. $1,500 a year. Postal clerk.

4. The organizations of the Toronto and Montreal post offices do not coincide. Duties similar in character to those performed by Mr. Bolte are performed in Toronto by Mr. W. W. Gibson in conjunction with more highly classified work.

5. Sixteen years, 9 months, employed in the service and has been performing his present duties since 1915.

6. $1,800 a year. Senior postal clerk.

ONTARIO PROVINCIAL HIGHWAY

Mr. CHAPLIN:

1. Have the plans for the Ontario provincial highway between Canboro via Dunville and Welland to Allanburg been filed with the department in Ottawa?
2. What is the estimated cost of this section?
3. Has any federal grant been paid in respect to it? If so, how much?
4. Was there any alternative route mentioned from Canboro village direct east down the Canboro road to Allanburg?
5. Have any representations or objections been sent to the department at Ottawa claiming that the route by way of Dunville and Welland is about 12 miles longer, and pointing out that the cost will be many thousands of dollars more than the direct route?
6. Does the department intend to pay any portion of this increased cost?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Yes.

2. Estimated cost of portion of highway within the township of Canboro, 8.8 miles, $263,280. Estimated cost of portion extending from the westerly limit of the city of Welland westerly to the west side of lot 19, Wainfleet township 7.1 miles long, $136,745. No other sections of this highway between Canboro and Allanburg are under agreement with the federal government.

3. Yes; $87,955.20 in respect of that portion lying within the township of Canboro.

4. No such alternative route was submitted.

5. Yes, but it was explained that road was located through Dunnville and Welland in accordance with policy of provincial government of improving roads leading to county seats and larger centres of each county, and with the object of connecting in the future with an extension of the provincial system on the old Garrison road through townships of Bertie, Humberstone and Wainfleet to Fort Erie.

6. The department will pay 40 per cent of the actual, necessary and reasonable cost of such sections of this road as are under agreement.

DRESSED TURKEYS

Mr. COOTE:

1. During the calendar year 1922, what was the total quantity of dressed turkeys imported into Canada?
2. From what countries were they imported?
3. What was the quantity and value of the importations from each country?

Hon. Mr. BUREAU: Imports of dressed turkeys are classified under the heading of "Poultry and game, n.o.p.," and the department has no record of the separate imports of different kinds of poultry included in this item, nor do the entries and invoices always show the different varieties.

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

INDIAN RESERVES—GRAIN PRODUCTION

Mr. EVANS:

1. How much grain has been grown on the Indian reserves in the three prairie provinces during the last five years?
2. What proportion of this was grown by individual Indians?
3. What proportion by white lessees?
4. What proportion by the greater production operations?
5. How much grain was grown on these same reserves during the five years previous to this period?
6. What area has been summer-fallowed and broken by Indians during the last five years?
7. What area during the previous five years?
8. What amount of rentals has been collected during the last five years?
9. What amount during the previous five years?

Hon. Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Stands as an Order for Return.

Mr. MEIGHEN: As regards this question which has been asked to stand as an order for return, I think this is an abuse of the rule. Of all the nine questions there—I went over the list just now—there is not one the answer to which would be one line in length.

Mr. BUREAU: It is the time it takes to find out the information.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That does not matter.

Mr. BUREAU: It does.

Mr. SPEAKER: Of course, the rule of the House does not leave much discretion to the Speaker. Paragraph (4) of section 37 states:

If a question is of such a nature that in the opinion of the minister who is to furnish the reply, such reply should be in the form of a return.

There is no discretion left to the Chair.

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

PROPOSED REORGANIZATION

Mr. J. S. WOODSWORTH (Centre Winnipeg) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, it is in the public interest that the present Royal Canadian Mounted Police force be disbanded, and that there be organized (a) a federal police force for the protection of government buildings and other federal property, (b) a northwest mounted police force whose activities would be confined to unorganized territories.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this resolution is the same as that which I introduced on this subject last year. The resolution has been modified in form to meet an objection offered by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) that, in the event of its being carried as it was presented last year, it might leave public buildings without guards. The object is essentially to have that force which was formerly known as the Royal Northwest Mounted Police restored to the status it once held. I had hoped that this reorganization would have taken place without the introduction of this resolution this year. In a speech delivered in Toronto on August 30th, the Prime Minister intimated that there would be a change in the control of the Mounted Police. Let me read from the report that appeared in the Citizen of August 31st:

> That there will shortly be a radical change in the organization and jurisdiction of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police was intimated by Premier King in the course of his speech at a banquet in his honour here to-night. The Premier advanced as one of the "Striking evidences of the centralizating tendencies" of the recent Union government the change made in the Northwest Mounted Police, whose headquarters were transferred from the northwest to Ottawa, and its character changed from that of a "police for unorganized territories" to a "federal and practically military force." Already, said the Premier, the Liberal government had discharged a large body of the new force, and he hoped that the time would soon arrive when the headquarters of the force would no longer be in Ottawa.

That announcement of the Prime Minister was received with favour in many sections of this country and I should like to quote one of the press comments upon it. In the Montreal Star there appears an editorial from which I extract the following paragraph:

> The Northwest Mounted Police are part and parcel of the history of this country. Their fame is world-wide. Their work has won for them recognition in every land where law is the basis of civilization, and their achievements have formed the basis for many a thrilling novel over a long course of years. To take them from their old home in the West and make them an appanage of the formalities and red tape of the capital was at best a mistake. The Premier is courageous enough to undertake the remedy and does not hesitate about making his views known. It is clear that the headquarters are to be re-established in the West, and that in size and duties the force will be remodelled on the old and tried lines.

Now, there is an impression in some quarters that a resolution of this kind is a reflection upon the work of the force. Rather it is, I take it, a plain practical proposition as to how we can more efficiently and economically administer the affairs of this department of the public service. Further I think I am speaking on behalf of a very considerable section of the old force when I say that they would welcome a change along the lines contemplated by this resolution. I notice in the March number of a little publication entitled the Maple Leaf, the organ of the Canadian Club of New York, an article by F. J. E. Fitzpatrick, an ex-sergeant of the Mounted Police, in which he speaks of the exploits of the old force in bygone days. May I quote a paragraph as bearing on this point?

> I use here the appellation "Northwest" advisedly, as you are aware that within recent date, that term has been eliminated owing to the fact that the romantic and famous corps has been amalgamated with the Dominion Police Force, an entirely different institution and of a very different composite.
>
> Members of the Northwest force have for a great many years been of the adventurous young element, while that of the Dominion force, of men of more mature and sedate habits, satisfied perhaps with a more humdrum life. I believe it was a mistake to merge the two. The attraction of the western prairie life appealed at all times to the spirit of youth with red blood. The duties in the new force, with the prospects of a station at some coal mine in Nova Scotia or some such prosaic duty, will likely eliminate all enthusiasm in the new recruit.
>
> No. Better unscramble the sad mixture. Let romance return to its lair for future additional glory to attach to the name—The Royal Northwest Mounted Police of Canada.

The original force is the one with which we were familiar in the earlier days in the West and the activities of which were confined to the Northwest Territories, where we know it performed a very valuable service in protecting the pioneer settlers and in dealing with the Indians and cattle thieves on the western ranches. But in February, 1919, the activities of that force were extended so that it operated from Fort William to the coast; and on June 7, 1920, it was organized on an altogether new basis. From that time the cost has been tremendous, ranging from $3,000,000 to $5,000,000 a year. This year we have in the estimates an amount of $2,587,999.11 to which must be added the expenses connected with civil government, salaries and contingencies, bringing the total up to $2,634,224.11. We note an addition this year of a sum of no less than $100,000 to assist in the enforcement of federal statutes. We were told by the Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin) that this was not a new item; but it does not appear that any of the other departments have cut down their estimates proportionately. It would seem therefore that this $100,000 is really an additional expenditure. As a matter of fact, some of the departments have rather extended their provisions for the enforcing of federal statutes. For example, I notice an item in connection with the appointment of Walter Duncan at a salary of $2,550 per annum as a special investigating officer under the direction of the Department of Finance, with further contingent expenses

in connection with this service amounting to $2,500, or a total of $5,050 for this particular work of investigation. If the Royal Canadian Mounted Police are doing the work of investigation for all departments of the government, and are doing it efficiently, why should we have additional items of this character in connection with the various departments?

There is a motion on the order paper looking to the reduction of the sessional indemnities of members, and which may come up today. Without anticipating that debate to any extent, might I point out that the amount spent this year on this force alone would pay the sessional indemnities of all the members almost three times over. It seems to me that we may very well hesitate to pay out such an enormous sum for this particular force unless a great deal more is being done by it than is apparent from the reports.

The report shows a force now of some 1,200 officers and men. I think the figure given us by the Minister of Justice the other day was in the vicinity of 1,100. But I wonder whether he was correctly informed when in answer to a question he stated that 118 men were located in the city of Ottawa? My information with regard to the local force—and if this is not correct I shall be glad to be put right—is as follows: At headquarters, one assistant commissioner, two superintendents, one surgeon, three inspectors, one sergeant-major, eight staff sergeants, eleven sergeants, four corporals, twenty-three constables, and three lady stenographers—a total of fifty-seven. In A division, one superintendent, two inspectors, one sergeant-major, one staff sergeant, fourteen sergeants, one hundred and fifty-two constables and two lady stenographers—a total of one hundred and seventy-three. In N division, one superintendent, one inspector, three sergeants, two corporals and twenty constables —a total of twenty-seven. If these figures are correct we have a staff of two hundred and fifty-seven for Ottawa alone. According to the report I notice the force has been reduced during the past year from 1,680 to 1,227 men—a reduction of 453, or 27 per cent. But the officers have only been reduced from 70 to 64 —merely a reduction of 6 or, say, 10 per cent. I think we might say of this force as one of the members across the floor said recently with regard to the permanent force, that we have generals where we might have colonels, colonels where we might have majors, and so on all down the line. There does seem to be a very, very large number of officials in proportion to the men.

Now, what is this large force doing? Originally it was confined to the vast teritories in the West. I note from the report that out of the 1,100 or 1,200 men there are only 78 stationed in the Yukon and the Northwest Territories. If we had to provide only for this small force the expense would be very considerably cut down, and the duties which were originally intended to be discharged by the Royal Northwest Mounted Police could be attended to. Of course, there is the other part of the work to which reference was made by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) last year—the guarding of our public buildings. I have often wondered, Mr. Speaker, as I have gone in and out of the public buildings here whether we need quite so many guards in them, and especially whether we need as guards men who are presumably trained to do work on our frontiers. As we go into our library I notice there stands on guard at the door a man in the uniform of the Mounted Police. I have no doubt he does very efficient work, but I do not know that he is more efficient than the other guards who are stationed in other parts of the building. I am told that he was placed there at the time of the fire. I presume no one has told him to go away since that time, so he is still there and likely to continue for some years to come unless some action is taken by this House. A few weeks ago I paid a visit to the art gallery, and found there guards in the uniform of the Canadian Mounted Police. They were very estimable men, and I found one had developed into quite a connoisseur and he showed to me and explained the pictures. I was very grateful to him for so doing, but I still wonder whether we need a mounted policeman to do that kind of work. I have noted that in the art galleries of the Old Land aged pensioners are employed for this work and they do it very efficiently. Of course, if we possessed such a great work of art as a Mona Lisa, and an attempt were made to carry it off, I have no doubt that these gallant men might stage a spectacular rescue and we would have it pictured in the movies. I am not sure if something of this sort is anticipated. But to guard pictures in our art galleries, however valuable those pictures may be, it does not seem to me necessary to employ members of the Mounted Police.

Mr. RINFRET: What about suffragettes?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: We do not have any since we have a lady member of the House. Undoubtedly during the war and post-war periods there may have been certain duties for these men to discharge, but that part of their work has largely ceased. I am glad to think that it is not the policy of the present government to use this force for the

settlement of industrial disputes. During the past year on two occasions the permanent force has been called out, or at least was asked for, in Edmonton and Cape Breton. The Mounted Police were not requisitioned, so it would seem as if here again one of the tasks for which this force was organized in its present form no longer requires their attention.

Mr. CARROLL: Does the hon. gentleman know of any industrial strike in this country where the Mounted Police were called out?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Yes. There was an industrial strike in Winnipeg in 1919, there was also some trouble at Thorold in the Niagara peninsula, and at Drumheller.

Mr. CARROLL: Does he know as a matter of fact whether or not the Mounted Police were called or sent to Glace Bay in 1922?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I cannot give any information in regard to that. Then there is the enforcement of federal statutes. Just how far men trained to do frontier work are capable of discharging this duty I do not know. It seems rather strange that when the Postmaster General wished to discover the criminal responsible for the theft of $50,000 from the Edmonton post office he had apparently to go outside the Mounted Police for assistance. I am not quite sure how effectively the Narcotic Drug Act has been enforced by the Mounted Police. I should like this House to be informed as to how many non-commissioned officers and men have been dismissed during the past two years for dishonesty in connection with this work. The very nature of enforcing this act in Montreal and in Vancouver would apparently leave the way open for considerable connivance by the men with the very criminals whom they are supposed to suppress, and I think during the course of this debate the House might very well be informed as to how many men of the force have been dismissed for complicity with these criminals.

Another serious question involved in this matter is that of the enforcement of the Criminal Code. We have before us—at least, I hope it will come before us at this session—a bill to amend the Criminal Code. Very few of the citizens of Canada realize the great powers that under the existing Criminal Code are vested in the Mounted Police. Let me read one subsection of the code as assented to July 7, 1919:

> Any property, real or personal, belonging or suspected to belong to an unlawful association, or held or suspected to be held by any person for or on behalf thereof may, without warrant, be seized or taken possession of by any person thereunto authorized by the chief commissioner of Dominion Police or by the commissioner of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police, and may thereupon be forfeited to His Majesty.

It is not necessary, according to this clause, that a man should be a member of an unlawful association; if he is suspected of belonging to an unlawful association the officer may without warrant seize his property, which shall be forfeited to His Majesty. I know of cases where several years ago mounted police entered the homes of reputable citizens and seized books—in one case a library brought years ago from Great Britain, which was confiscated. To this day the gentleman I have in mind, who is an alderman, by the way, of one of our western cities, has been unable to obtain redress, and under this act I do not see how he can. Arbitrary authority is in this instance vested in the Mounted Police. At the time that certain books were banned during the war, mounted police entered the library of the city of Regina and took from the shelves of that institution a book called Myer's History of Canadian Wealth. It is quite true that that book, which was written from material in the Archives here in Ottawa, is no longer on the banned list, but it is quite possible under this statute that similar proceeding might be taken in regard to any other literature or any other property.

Let me put a purely suppositious case. Some of the members of the Progressive party are anxious to have radical changes made in the Bank Act. Suppose it should be considered that they were going to do that by unlawful means and were accordingly suspected of belonging to an unlawful association. There is no reason why, under the Criminal Code as it stands, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police might not seize any property belonging to the Grain Growers' Association or the Progressive party.

An hon. MEMBER: They have nothing to seize.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Perhaps not. The fact is—this is no supposititious case—that under the guise of ferreting out sedition there has been established a system of espionage that is most objectionable, at least to the labour unions of the country. This was brought to the attention of many of us several years ago. On the witness stand one of the corporals of the Canadian Mounted Police confessed that he had wormed his way into the unions, that he had secured the confidence of the members and had actually tried to get people to purchase books which he knew at that time to be banned, and thus, if possible, to persuade them to commit crime. So far as

I am able to learn, that particular corporal is still in the employ of the Canadian Mounted Police and still carrying on that kind of work. He has been transferred from Calgary to Montreal.

Mr. RINFRET: We will send him back.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: He was introduced to some labour people of Montreal by a man who is generally known in labour circles as being a "red." The labour people do not understand why the government has not arrested this man, who all along has been supposed to be a great agitator. It is passing strange that he should be the very man who introduced this corporal of the Canadian Mounted Police to the unsuspecting workers of Montreal. One thing I should like this House to know is that in the free and easy meetings often held by the labour people in their halls, when almost any man is free to get up and say what he thinks, if someone urges violence the word is immediately passed around that group, "Be careful of that man; he is a government agent." Is it a desirable condition, Mr. Speaker, that it should be said or suspected that when a man urged violence in this country he was a government agent, trying to get a certain number of people into trouble? But this is said and said freely, and we have good reason to believe that it is true. I do not know that the officers in charge know of what is being done in this respect by their subordinates and by the detectives who are subject to their direction. I do not suppose they do. But one man put it this way: "I have to keep my job. To do so I must make many reports. But it is not necessary to tell all the truth, because who is to check me up?" There is no reason why labour people should be spied on in this way, nor is there any reason why public funds should be diverted to the maintenance of a certain number of individuals whose business it is to go in and out of meetings of labour people to try to find out what is going on. If this is to be done, I submit it might be of more advantage to the people of Canada if some of these men were detailed to visit boards of directors of some of our big corporations. If the board of directors of the Merchants' Bank, for instance, had been watched in this way, a good many dollars might have been saved to certain people of this country. Essentially the trouble, it seems to me, is this: that we have half a dozen entirely different classes of work placed under the supervision of one particular group of people. It would clarify the situation a great deal if we had an entire reorganization of the force. I think I am not making an unreasonable request.

I wish to close by quoting the remarks of eminent gentlemen who have given considerable attention to this matter. Perhaps Mr. Speaker will pardon me if I quote from Hansard some words of his, spoken as far back as June 7, 1920. He said:

> Whenever I meet those fine young fellows walking with a jaunty air on the streets of Ottawa, I ask myself why they have been taken from the plains of the West where they represented law and order and sent to Ontario where we have a strong body of provincial police, in addition to having a strong body of provincial police in Quebec, and similar bodies in the other eastern provinces.
>
> During the period of war, when the government had some drastic action to carry out in connection with military service and such business, I could understand that the government should strengthen the arm of the law for the carrying out of such policies, and I did not begrudge the help that might under such circumstances be given by the Northwest Mounted Police to the Federal authorities, but now that war is over and all such troubles are past, I do not see why we maintain at such a high cost this body of fine young fellows at Ottawa. Their place is in the vast solitudes of the West, of the prairies, where they can maintain, as they have done heretofore, British law and order.

If I need even a more conservative authority, one whose opinion for many years has received respect, I would quote that of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) who according to Hansard said on that occasion:

> Yet with the creation of the provinces and the development of municipal and provincial governments who have all the resources of civilization at their command, there is no longer any need for the Mounted Police. The Yukon might need it perhaps, but there is hardly room for a very large force out there, and in the Northwest Territories I suppose there is not enough population to require very much attention along that line. I wish that we could find some useful service for the Mounted Police.

I think I have nothing to add to that, Mr. Speaker. It seems to me that we are talking economy and efficiency in all these different departments and here is one place where we can practise economy and where by a reorganization of the service we can secure a great deal more efficiency.

Mr. GEORGE BLACK (Yukon): I have listened with considerable interest to the remarks made by the mover of this resolution (Mr. Woodsworth), expecting to hear some more logical and more sound economic reasons given to back up this resolution than we heard at the last session of parliament when a similar resolution was before the House. I expected to hear to-day some valid or reasonably sound economic reasons given for disbanding the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

The resolution states that it is in the public interest to disband the force. I do not think the words "public interest" can be used there in the ordinary sense, that is, meaning for the good of, or for the benefit of the public. On

the contrary, I think that the interests that would be served by the disbanding of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police are interests which are entirely inimical to the public interest of Canada. The mover of the resolution is apparently willing to have a smaller police force in the unorganized territories, though I am afraid he has failed to make clear to the House what he means by unorganized territories. I heard the Yukon Territory and the Northwest Territories mentioned, but I would hardly say that either of these are unorganized territories. The mover of the resolution, however, is taking the proper stand in not desiring to move the Mounted Police from the Yukon territory. Such a move would be most unwelcome out there.

As the mover of the resolution has failed to take the House into his confidence as to the real reasons behind this desire
4 p.m. to disband the Mounted Police we must draw our own conclusions why anyone would want such an admirable body, and one which has rendered and is rendering to-day such a splendid service, disbanded. The Mounted Police have been efficient in the West, and they are efficient to-day in other parts of Canada, and to my mind, to use a slang expression, that is just where the shoe pinches. They were never popular with law breakers in the West nor with outlaws in the West, and they are apparently not popular to-day with the same class of people elsewhere in Canada. Why should anybody want to see them disbanded? Not in the interests of economy, although that plea has been advanced, for I think that for the amount of work they do it is one of the most economical services we have in Canada. That may not be saying very much, for I do not know that we are much given to economy in any of our services. But in value received I think we get as good service from the Mounted Police as from any other branch of the service, and more.

The suggestion was made that if the Mounted Police were disbanded, and two or three million dollars saved thereby, there would be no necessity for further advancing the resolution on the order paper to cut down the indemnity of members and senators. Surely the members of this House are not to be appealed to in that way. Even at the loss of a portion of their indemnity they would not cut out a public service such as the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. In that I think the hon. member is underestimating the calibre of the members of this House.

The mover of the resolution has carefully refrained from giving the House any information as to the wonderful amount of work done by this magnificent force. All told the Royal Canadian Mounted Police number only 1,227 officers, non-commissioned officers and men, and their activities extend from the Atlantic to the Pacific and from the Arctic to the southern boundary of Canada. As was pointed out, which must have been good news to the people who wish to see it disbanded, the force has been reduced by 27 per cent within the past year, but the work accomplished even by that reduced police force probably does not make such enjoyable reading to its detractors. Last year the Mounted Police made 12,600 investigations. This year with the reduced force they have made 14,000 investigations. Under the federal statutes they have made 5,235 investigations; under the Criminal Code 470; under provincial statutes and park regulations, 219; and investigations for other departments of the government totalling no less than 8,108. That information is obtainable in the annual report issued by the Mounted Police department. The report is a colourless affair, a cold, matter-of-fact statement, not seeking in any way to add lustre to the splendid reputation of the force or its accomplishments. It is on an examination of the report that one realizes the importance of the services so efficiently rendered.

Of the 5,235 investigations and prosecutions under federal statutes we find that there were 73 under the Chinese Immigration Act; 84 under the Customs Act; 107 under the Explosives Act; 119 under the Fisheries Act; 622 under the Indian Act; Inland Revenue, 1,606; Immigration, 219; Opium and Drug Act, 1,694, and under the Railway Act, 166. Now somebody had to make these investigations for the various departments enumerated; if not the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, then some other police force, because it is inconceivable that these departments could each employ a secret service corps, for that is what it would amount to. The investigations for other departments were no less than 8,108, and included investigations for almost every department of government in the Dominion of Canada. We find them all enumerated at page 11 of the annual report—Finance department, Soldier Settlement Board, Customs department, Immigration, and in fact practically all the departments of government of the Dominion of Canada. There were no less than 8,108 investigations held and in many cases prosecutions carried through. Under the Opium and Narcotic Drugs Act alone there were 1,694 investigations, and I say that if the Royal Canadian Mounted Police did nothing but the work they performed in enforcing the Opium and Narcotic Drugs

Act the country has been well repaid. I will read shortly a very interesting extract from the acting commissioner's report in regard to narcotic drugs. This report says:

An important and arduous task is the support of the Department of Public Health in enforcing the Opium and Narcotic Drugs Act. Reference was made in the last annual report to the calamitous nature of this traffic; I regret to be obliged to state that the evil persists, and I fear has grown in some parts of the country. To check it will require the united efforts of this force and the provincial and municipal authorities, and also drastic punishment of the agents, such as the peddlers who deliberately create addicts.

The figures already given show that we have been active, having arrested and prosecuted over one thousand persons, and having secured 800 convictions, with nearly 350 prison terms and over $60,000 in fines. The quantity of cocaine, morphine and heroin seized in the year is nearly 1,250 ounces. This amounts to about 600,000 grains and as a "deck," the cant name for a dose, usually is five grains or less, it will be seen that we have intercepted fully 120,000 doses. These "decks" are sold to addicts at from one to five dollars each, according to circumstances; so that this quantity represents from one-third to half a million dollars which would have come from the pockets of the wretched customers of these harpies.

A recent change of the act provides for the deportation of aliens convicted under its provisions. With regard to orientals, when such convictions are obtained we turn the particulars over to the Chief Commissioner of Chinese Immigration, and I understand that about one hundred offenders are awaiting removal from the country. It has been observed that Chinese addicts to this vice continue to be devoted to opium, and to be little inclined to the use of the other drugs; but further that cocaine and the other noxious drugs usually are to be obtained in the Chinese opium dens, so that white addicts repair to these plague-spots.

The difficulties of repression are exceedingly great, for several reasons. One is the ease with which these drugs, which are small in bulk, can be imported; numerous and very cunning devices are resorted to for the purpose of smuggling them, instances being known of their being most artfully concealed in shipments by apparently reputable firms from abroad. An effective international governmental control of the manufacture and trade in these drugs seems the only real preventive of this illicit form of international commerce. Another difficulty is that the traffic is so remunerative that those who take part in it have abundance of money at their command and use it to counter our measures, and to fight cases stubbornly in the courts. Yet another obstacle is the repulsive nature of the work of repression, entailing as it does contact with peculiarly loathsome dregs of humanity; our men greatly dislike it, and it is undertaken only in accordance with duty, and because of the knowledge that while unpleasant it is a service to humanity.

I can only repeat that if the Royal Canadian Mounted Police did nothing except what they did under that act, their services are well worth the money we pay for them. Then further, if the Royal Canadian Mounted Police did not perform those services, who would perform them? You answer: the provincial and municipal police. Well, municipal and provincial police are all very well in their way, but they do not commence to compare, as a police force, with the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. The provincial and municipal forces are all subject to local influence and pressure. It may be imperceptible and we may regret to have to say it, but the pressure is there just the same. Anyone who has had anything to do with the practice of law in the various parts of our country knows that that is so. The Royal Canadian Mounted Police are above that sort of thing. They cannot be bribed, and they cannot be bluffed or intimidated. They are not now in politics and never have been, so far as I know. I remember on one occasion a Tammany politician in the north tried to get them in politics. He succeeded, but very much to his discomfort, and it was never tried again. That was the only time in my experience that political influence has been applied to the Mounted Police and that effort was promptly resisted and properly resented.

In the matter of morale, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police are comparable to the Canadian corps overseas. They have their traditions and are proud of them. They are proud of the record of the force and they do not want it lowered. Every man is seized with the idea that it is up to him to do his duty under all circumstances, and there is no task too arduous or hazardous, and on the other hand no task too monotonous, for the Mounted Police, if it is their duty to perform it. In that northern country, where there was at one time, as the hon. mover of the resolution (Mr. Woodsworth) says, a certain amount of lawlessness, I have seen a stripling of a boy, in the Northwest Mounted Police uniform, walk into a bar-room where a dangerous row was going on, and where armed and enraged men were fighting. The men were arrested and disarmed by him without protest. He came in there with as much authority as the British fleet would have in sailing the seas. The row stopped at once, the men were taken to the lock-up, and no one had the slightest idea of resisting this officer. When he came in the row was over. It was not because of any superhuman power, on his part, but because public opinion of the Dominion of Canada was behind him. That public opinion being behind him, the whole force and all the resources of the Dominion were behind him, and the law breakers knew this force would be exercised and that this man would be backed up to the limit in the performance of his duty.

As I say, by comparison, there is no police force like it in the world. During the great gold rush to the north, the bulk of the men went up through Alaskan territory. They landed at the American town of Skagway,

where they had marshalls and special police without numbers. Well, they were entirely useless. They had no real authority. Nominally they had the authority of law, but they were not backed up and they could not enforce the law. It was every man for himself in that town, and holdups and murders were of daily and nightly occurrence. The rush moved up the trail some 40 miles across the boundary, and came under the Union Jack and the Northwest Mounted Police. Then the guns simply had to be put away while on the American side you had to have them to protect yourself. If a man was seen carrying a weapon of any kind, he was politely tapped on the shoulder by a Mounted Police officer and told that he did not need it, that he would have to put it away else someone might be hurt by it. He certainly did not need it, because life and property were fully protected by the Mounted Police in that Canadian territory.

There is no demand from the public for the action contemplated by the resolution. If there were we would hear about it. We have never heard of it anywhere, except in the House last session, from the same honourable member who moves the resolution to-day. If there were any proportion of the population dissatisfied with the Royal Canadian Mounted Police we would hear of it through other channels, as well as the channel through which we have heard it to-day. As I said last session, when the question was discussed, I do not think this is a matter on which any private member is qualified to advise the government. It is a matter for the government of the day, and for the Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin). If the Minister of Justice and the other government departments are getting satisfaction and receiving value from the services performed by the Mounted Police, the minister will continue them. If he is not getting satisfaction, I am sure this parliament would back him up in disbanding, or reducing the force, or creating some other force. But, with the past record of the Mounted Police, which cannot be gainsaid, and its record of work being done to-day, as disclosed by the official report and by our own observations as Canadians, I say the matter is one to be left for the government and for the Minister of Justice to decide, and that the resolution should not receive the support of this House.

Mr. JAMES STEEDSMAN (Souris): Mr. Speaker, in rising to discuss this resolution, I find myself in agreement with certain portions of it only, although I wish to say as well that I cannot endorse all the reasons offered with regard to the resolution by the hon. member (Mr. Woodsworth) who introduced it. The chief reason that I will give at the present time for supporting the resolution is my great regard and admiration for that old force known as the Royal Northwest Mounted Police. I was very sorry when the Royal Northwest Mounted Police were amalgamated with the Dominion Police. At that time we had two forces. To-day we have one. All that has been said by my hon. friend (Mr. Black) to my right with regard to the force, has been said with regard, not to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, but to the Royal Northwest Mounted Police. As we in the West, particularly those of us who are old-timers, know, the mounted policeman is not fitted by disposition, temperament, nor training, for police duty in industrial centres. His place is out on the frontier, and that is where the Mounted Police have made their record. I am seized of the fact that the West is not yet in a position to do without a mounted police force. Not only in the unorganized territory, but in the very provinces we still require the services of a mounted police force.

I should like to recall an incident that took place a short time ago, in fact in the early days of the war, when the producers of the West were being urged on every hand to increase production and they were doing it to the limit, at a time when our country was supposed to be flooded with spies, and at a time before the United States had gone into the war. We knew then that those western states were full of enemy supporters, at any rate, and during the harvest of 1916, I think, speaking from memory, a rumour spread throughout that country to the effect that a large portion of the ripened crop was about to be destroyed by fire by alien enemies. Whether that rumour was correct or not is neither here nor there. It existed, and you can readily understand the feelings of the people at that time. What happened? An appeal was made for a guard of Mounted Police and they were sent in there. The feelings of relief and protection that came to the people of that district when they saw that thin red line spread out towards the boundary, there to be broken up into small groups and spread along the boundary forming a complete patrol of the southern portion of the constituency from which I come, must be experienced to be realized.

I want to draw the attention of the House to a condition that existed last year in that same part of the country. A band or bands of robbers invaded that district and bank robberies took place there, not only in one town but in many. The people again were ter-

rorised. I shall mention just one case in particular, that of the robbery of the Dominion bank at Melita, Manitoba, where, together with many thousands of dollars, the property of the bank, over $100,000 worth of Victory bonds, the property of the people of that community, were stolen. Not only that, but a very intimate friend of mine was shot and very severely wounded in an effort to arouse the citizens of that town. I am aware that a certain number of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police were sent in there at a late date; but I am forced to the conclusion that either they were not there in sufficient numbers or their organization was not complete enough—there was some reason at any rate—they did not succeed in rounding up any of that band of robbers. That band is still in existence; those robbers are still free, and we have every reason to believe that when spring opens up and the roads get into condition to suit them, they will be upon us again. What is to be done about the matter? There is only one course to follow, and that is to have the Royal Northwest Mounted Police fully equipped and organized so that they can take control of the situation and stamp out and bring to justice that band of bandits who are terrorising those people.

I should like to point out that the prairie provinces are not yet in possession of their natural resources, and again, speaking for Manitoba, the province from which I come, I think the House is already very familiar with the development that has taken place in the northern part of that province. It is entirely unfair and unjust to expect that Manitoba should bear the cost of preserving law and order in that territory. There is no force equal to a force of mounted police to take charge of the work in that country. Therefore, I contend that the time has not yet come when the western provinces can do without a mounted police force. That is my answer to the last part of the hon. gentleman's resolution, that we are not ready to have the Mounted Police pushed out into the unorganized territory; that we still need them in the provinces, especially the prairie provinces. For these and other reasons, I would urge upon the government to disband the present force, to establish or reorganize the old Royal Northwest Mounted Police Force, and to let that force be continued as long as there is need for a mounted police force in Canada. When the time comes that there is no longer any necessity for them, let them go down in history and in the hearts of the people of Canada with all the honour and the glory of their traditions to which they are entitled.

Hon. Sir LOMER GOUIN (Minister of Justice): The hon. member for Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth) wishes this House to declare that it is in the public interest that the present Royal Canadian Mounted Police force be disbanded and that there should be organised:

(a) a Federal Police force for the protection of government buildings and other federal property, (b) a North West Mounted Police force whose activities would be confined to unorganised territories.

In other words, the resolution proposes that we should revert to the old system under which we maintained two forces of federal police. In order that I may make my statement as clear as possible, I would ask the permission of the House briefly to outline the history of the legislation which has constituted the present status of our federal police. In 1868 the Dominion Police, as that force was called, was organised for the purpose of enforcing the criminal and other laws of the Dominion only. In 1873, the Royal Northwest Mounted Police was organised to repress crime and maintain peace and order in the western territories. In 1919, it was provided by statutes 9 and 10, George V, Chap. 69, that the Royal Northwest Mounted Police might be employed to maintain peace and order throughout Canada; and in the same year, by another statute passed at the second session of parliament, the name of the force was changed to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. In 1920 the powers of the Commissioner of Dominion Police were transferred to the Commissioner of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the result of that amalgamation, as I find it after an experience of one year of administration of our federal police, has been to bring more uniformity and efficiency to bear upon the performance of the duties of our police throughout Canada. We now have one bureau, and there is no more uncertainty as to the duties to be performed by our police both inside and outside of the Dominion. There is no more overlapping between two forces as we had in the past; and we no longer require the employment of private agents. The duties of our police are to act, under the instructions of the minister in charge of that branch of our administration, for all departments of the government. The Dominion Police, or rather the Royal Canadian Mounted Police—the name is hardly of such great importance—is charged with the maintenance of peace and order in the unorganised territories and the Arctic region; and that same body has to enforce, among other federal statutes, the Inland Revenue Act, that is to say, they must see to the suppression of illicit stills, and

the Opium and Narcotic Drugs Act, the Indian Act and the matter of the protection of reserves. The number of reserves, as hon. members know, is considerable. We have in Canada about 1,200 Indian reserves in Alberta, Saskatchewan, British Columbia and the Northwest Territories. And in Ontario there are 70 Indian reserves which are under the administration and control of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. Our federal police force is also charged with the carrying out of the following acts: The Radio Telegraph Act, the Immigration Act, the Fisheries Act, the Chinese Immigration Act, the Explosives Act and the Post Office Act. Practically all of these acts were enforced in the past, before the amalgamation of 1920, partly by the Dominion Police; but many of the departments employed private agents to do that kind of work. Since the amalgamation, however, there is no longer any necessity for going outside to have that work performed. So that the result of the amalgamation has been, as I will show, a reduction in the number of men employed, with the consequent dispensing of private agents, which means a great economy in the cost of administration.

The hon. member for Winnipeg, in support of his proposition, contends that if we were to disband our Mounted Police, as it is to-day organised, and create a special force for the unorganised territories and a special police for the protection of buildings belonging to the federal government, we should save money. Well, I am in a position to show that since the amalgamation we have considerably reduced the strength of our force and considerably reduced the expenditures. In 1920-21 we had a force of 2,605 men and the estimates totalled $4,674,066. For the year 1923-24, the estimates are only $2,587,999. We have reduced the number of men by about 1,500, and as will be seen from the figures I have quoted we have cut down the expenditures by over $1,000,000. The men are now distributed as follows: In the Maritime provinces 32; Quebec district 32; eastern Ontario 312; western Ontario 34; Manitoba, 97—as a matter of fact, it is only 71—; southern Saskatchewan 196; northern Saskatchewan 55; southern Alberta 114; northern Alberta 90; British Columbia 152; and the Yukon territory 49.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Before the minister proceeds, will he give us the estimates for 1921-22?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: The 1921-22 estimates were $3,527,670. We had then 1,726 men. The number of men and the expenditure have decreased, while the work has been increasing every year. It will be found on reference to the last report of the department that in 1920-21 we had 10,888 investigations, which in 1921-22 had increased to 14,032. In regard to the enforcement of federal statutes, in 1920-21 we had 2,068 cases, while in 1921-22 they had risen to 5,235—an increase of nearly 150 per cent. At page 11 of the same report it will be found that we have made over 8,000 investigations for the various departments. This work has to be performed. In the past, as I have already said, it was done by our Dominion and our Mounted Police. The duties now performed in the unorganized territories are the same as those which have been performed since 1873; our men now known as members of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police are doing exactly what their predecessors, the members of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police, did for so many years. They are engaged in investigating work for the various departments of the government. If we take, for instance, the province of Manitoba, we shall find at page 54 of the report that our federal police investigated 601 cases, and at page 55 the figures are 1,302.

The hon. member for Winnipeg, referring to an answer that I gave him when I brought down my estimates, said that I was in error in telling him that we had in Ottawa 118 men. What I said then was that we had 118 men in charge of our public buildings. I never said that this was the total force in Ottawa. We have a special corps here to prepare our men, and, as detailed by him, we have a local force of about 212.

The hon. member seems to object to our employing members of the Mounted Police as guardians of this and other buldings in Ottawa. He even objects to their uniform. Well they may be called members of the Dominion Police or members of the Mounted Police, but I do not see what difference this could make. We have to have such policemen all over the Dominion. Too many people are under the erroneous impression that the federal government has nothing to do with the police work of this country, and are under the impression that because the provinces are charged with the administration of our criminal laws they should do all the police work for the federal government. But there is nothing in our constitutional law which imposes such work on the provinces, perhaps we may have the right and power to transfer this administration to the provinces, but unless we legislate to that effect the provinces are not concerned. The Fathers of Confederation understood our constitution in that sense, because immediately after confederation, in 1868, they passed the statute to which I have referred constituting

the Dominion Police, a statute which is still in force.

The hon. member for Winnipeg complains that we have increased the estimates by $100,000 for special police work to be performed for the various departments. He regards it as an increase because he finds no corresponding reduction in any of the other departments. As I had the honour of explaining to the committee when my estimates were under consideration, reductions were made, not by the other departments, but by the Department of Justice itself. Formerly the expenditures for investigations which we made for the various departments appeared under different headings, those departments reimbursing the Department of Justice. We have changed the system, we do not now ask any of the other departments to pay for any work performed for them by the Mounted Police, and it is for that reason that we have this apparent increase of $100,000.

The hon. member for Winnipeg has brought before the House certain cases, which he mentioned last year when he discussed a similar resolution, to show that the Mounted Police had been unfair to certain citizens in the West and had acted in a way that could not be approved by this House. I cannot contest any of the allegations made by the hon. member, but supposing they are perfectly true—and I have no doubt that they are—this affords no reason for changing the system. If some of our men have abused their power they should be reprimanded or even dismissed, but to say that their action should be sufficient reason to discard our Mounted Police system is a proposition which I cannot accept.

There is one interesting fact in connection with the Mounted Police that I would like to mention. The hon member for Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth) complains that there are too many men in the force. We had a post at Brandon in his province and one at Portage la Prairie. We decided to close both these stations, but immediately after acting upon that decision we received protests from the municipal authorities and from practically the whole population of the districts concerned, who urged that we should send back the men we had there before. I do not know of any province where the people are complaining of there being too many men in the Mounted Police. In the Maritime provinces there are 32 men in the force, and I have not yet heard any citizen of any of those provinces ask that a single one of these men be withdrawn. We have 32 in Montreal, and they are doing good work. Hon. members know what the Royal Canadian Mounted Police are doing in Ontario. I have come to the conclusion, after an experience of one year in the administration of the Mounted Police, that the system we now have is a good one and that we are saving money by having only one police force. If there is objection to the name; if the majority of hon. members are of the opinion that we should not call the force the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, that is a matter of detail. But to say it is in the interests of this country that we should reduce the force very considerably is to make a proposal the soundness of which I cannot admit. If our officers are not diligent; if they are not performing their duties as they should, that is another matter. I must declare that I have found those officers most diligent, intelligent, and honest. But I say that if it can be established to my satisfaction that any one of them should be removed, I am prepared to do it. If any one of our constables is not an honest man, honestly doing his duty. I am prepared to dismiss him. But I must say in all sincerity, with no other interest in the matter than a desire to promote the welfare of our country, that in my opinion we cannot have a better system for our police than the one we now have.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Before the hon. gentleman concludes, would he not admit that the increased numbers of the force following the war was due to the returned men who went from the force and who on coming back were entitled to reinstatement, they being reinstated before others who had been enlisted had served their whole term of enlistment? As those who enlisted in the force during the war have completed their terms of enlistment, it has of course been possible to make the reductions that have been made ever since.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: That is quite possible.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: May I ask a question of the hon. Minister of Justice? Did I understand him to say that there was at present no more employment of private agents? If I remember rightly, the public accounts last year showed considerable sums paid out to various detective agencies. Am I right in understanding that no private agents at all are employed?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Some private agents may have been employed, but in very few instances. I say that in the past it was the rule to employ private agents; now it is only occasionally that we do it.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have not been able to follow this debate, but I have

heard the address, or most of it, of the hon. Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin). I wish to express my commendation of the courage he has shown in standing by his guns in relation to this resolution. I wish the example he has displayed were more generally followed by his colleagues in other matters connected with the administration.

I only wish to comment on three phases of the minister's address. He commends the action of the government in 1920 in amalgamating the Dominion Police and the Royal Northwest Mounted Police. I think the commendation is well placed, because that action made possible reductions that have since actually taken effect. He also states that it is essential to maintain in Montreal, in the Maritime provinces, in Quebec and Ontario, certain units of the Mounted Police. That I wish especially to draw attention to, and I do so because my memory still is green of attacks on that very policy, attacks on claims that we made when in office that units of the police were essential in those eastern cities and those eastern districts; attacks which the minister now, after experience in the department, finds to have been utterly unfounded and uncalled for. My reference, though, particularly is this: I understood the minister to admit the truth of certain allegations made by the hon. member for Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth) that there had been misbehaviour on the part of the Mounted Police in the past or that improper means had been adopted by them. I did not hear the hon. member for Centre Winnipeg, but my recollection of his address a year ago would lead me to believe that his reference was to the conduct of the Mounted Police in connection with the strike situation in Winnipeg in May, 1919. If that is the case, I do not think the Minister of Justice was justified in stating not only that he would not contest the allegation, but, as he said in the following sentence, that he would admit the truth of it.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I did not have the Winnipeg strike in mind at all.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Well, I do not know what the reference, then, was. I am sure the House will receive with pleasure the minister's assurance that he did not wish to cast a reflection on the conduct of the police on that occasion. That was an occasion of real difficulty such as had not arisen before, I think, in the history of confederation. It was a difficulty that could not be handled by those quiet, unobtrusive measures that may be satisfactory in normal and gentle times; a difficulty that had to be met in a spirit of determination and of courage—and I think it is correct to say that it was surmounted with surpassing success. If it is stated that there was another occasion when the members of the Mounted Police did not behave according to their tradition and their duty, and the minister really is of opinion that that is true, then it seems to me he owes it to the service to make such facts known to the public, to bring home guilt, and at the same time to administer correction by dismissal.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: If my right hon. friend will allow me, I simply said this: that the allegations made by the hon. member for Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth) might be true; that I supposed they were true, since he was making them. But I do not know anything about such allegations.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am very much relieved to hear the minister put it that way. I would suggest that in future his suppositions be not so easily arrived at. In fact, the supposition does not follow. I would be very much surprised myself if the allegations were found to be correct after full and fair investigation.

Mr. ROBERT FORKE (Brandon): Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to take any part in this debate other than to point out to the minister that the Brandon city council suffered an injustice when the Royal Canadian Mounted Police were removed from that city. The city had gone to a large expense in providing equipment, stabling, sewerage and other conveniences for the maintenance of the force, and then the force was suddenly removed and all that equipment and the improvements that had been made were entirely lost. I think the city has really a claim for some recompense for the expenses that were incurred in that connection.

In regard to the vote that was taken last year, I must say that I cannot see my way to following the same course this year. During last year there was considerable outlawry and, as one hon. member has said, banks were being broken into. I know that I appealed to the Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin), myself for some help to the local police in the province of Manitoba and he very courteously replied that every assistance would be given by the force that was stationed in the province at that particular time. Taking all these facts into consideration, I cannot see my way to supporting this resolution

Mr. D. W. WARNER (Strathcona): I do not care to enter into this discussion at any length, but I should like to say a few words as we have a station of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police where I live. Last year we had considerable difficulty during a strike by the coal miners, when men who were citizens of Canada and who wanted to work were prevented from working. There was a police force there engaged to see that these people could exercise their right of going to work when they wanted to work. I am not going to enter into a discussion of the difficulties in that case, but I should like to point out this to the House: The people in my community showed a lack of confidence in the provincial police when they pressed for the services of the Dominion Mounted Police to take charge and see that law and order were enforced. I do not know why that force was not permitted to be made use of on that occasion. I have no knowledge of the reasons why that was not done, but I know that I attended several meetings where I was pressed to see that the Dominion Mounted Police were put in charge to look after the difficulties at that place. I should like to ask the Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin) now why the Dominion Mounted Police were not used on that occasion after they had been asked for by the people of Edmonton.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: The reason why we did not intervene was because we considered the municipal police could maintain peace and order in Edmonton.

Mr. WARNER: I am glad to hear the explanation. As I said before, I wanted to point out to this House the confidence that our people have in the Dominion Mounted Police. We used to call them the Northwest Mounted Police. I know when I went into that country in 1898 we had no fear from any source so long as we felt that the Mounted Police were in charge. They commanded the respect of the people, and still command their respect. I should like to see it made possible for the Dominion Mounted Police force to co-operate with the provincial force when that should be necessary. Our people thought it was necessary at that time. I feel that there is perhaps more or less overlapping between the two police forces, the city police and the provincial. The city police on that occasion had charge of part of the work which was inside the corporation, and the provincial police was supposed to keep order outside, but order was not very well kept. Now if the Dominion police had taken part, I believe that order could have been kept, and that we would have had order at once. That is my opinion from my understanding of the situation. I would like to see it arranged that the Dominion Mounted Police could co-operate with the other two police forces whenever need should arise.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I think I have nothing to add to my statement of the case. I would call attention to the fact that the protest of the citizens of Brandon against the taking away of the Mounted Police from that city was, so far as the public is concerned, based very frankly on the fact that they missed a very large pay roll in that particular town. It did not concern itself primarily with the necessity of maintaining the old policy.

If I understood the Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin) aright, he said that in the western provinces the Mounted
5 p.m. Police were now doing the same work as the old Northwest Mounted Police. Of course so far as Manitoba or British Columbia are concerned, we did not have any Mounted Police in the old days. The kind of work to which most of us have objected is not that taking place in the outlying districts, but rather it is that connected with the industrial communities. I might say that whilst this term "unorganized territories" may be somewhat indefinite, it is the very self-same term that the Prime Minister himself used when intimating that the force was to be reorganized. I used it because I did not want to limit exactly the position which the force was to occupy, whether it was to be entirely outside of provincial boundaries or outside of the municipalities where there was an adequate municipal police force. Purposely I left it general in that way.

In closing I should like to call the attention of the House to the fact that the Minister of Justice accepted my statements, as I think he is bound to do, with regard to certain arbitrary actions of the police several years ago in certain districts of the West. I think the House will recognize that my statements on the floor of this House must stand, and it seems to me, that the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) came very nearly calling them in question. I am quite sure he could not have intended to do it. He confessed that he was not present when the statements were being made. I think I have the right to have my statements of fact go unquestioned when made on the floor of the House.

It seems to me there has been a little bit of tendency on the part of hon. members in this House to rather disparage or ridicule measures

submitted by the labour representatives, some hon. members suggesting even to-day that these measures would be welcomed by those who wish to perpetuate lawlessness. It seems to me that the time has come when that kind of thing should cease on the floor of this House. We had industrial and political troubles in 1919. I did not intend, nor do I intend now, to go into that matter here. We had trouble when certain fundamental rights of British subjects were taken away from them by the late government. So far as the city of Winnipeg is concerned, the citizens expressed themselves at the last general election in no uncertain terms. I claim that on the floor of this House we should discuss particular measures on their merits and not enter into controversies as to whether or not somebody has some ulterior motive in proposing them.

With regard to this matter, I have been perfectly frank in suggesting the various economies which I think might well be effected by the proposed change, and also in bringing forward a situation which has been brought to my attention again and again by large numbers of labour people in all sections of this country. I state frankly that the labour people resent the espionage system which has been foisted upon this country. I am glad to think that, to a certain extent, under the present administration the evils of that system are being lessened. I should like to have the assurance of the minister that that kind of thing would entirely cease, because we cannot have industrial goodwill in this country as long as we have a system by which one particular section of the community is under surveillance.

In order that I should conceal nothing I mentioned that among other reasons why I would like to see the activities of the Mounted Police confined to unorganized territories was the abolition of the use of secret service agents in our industrial sections. Many of these men are not of a high character. I know whereof I speak, and if occasion arises I can bring evidence to prove that they are not of a high character. The matter was before the courts several years ago, when it was clearly shown that there was serious interference with a number of citizens of this country. It is for that, among other reasons, that I have proposed this resolution, and I submit that it would be in the interests of the country at large that a reorganization of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police should take place.

Let me remind the House that several of the gentlemen whom I have quoted, who cannot be accused of having any particular sympathy with the lawless elements of this country, very urgently pressed this course upon the country.

The House divided on the motion of Mr Woodsworth which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs.

Bancroft,
Bird,
d'Anjou,
Davies,
Drummond,
Evans,
Findlay,
Garland (Bow River),
Gould,
Humphrey,
Irvine,
Kennedy (Edmonton),
Kennedy (Port Arthur & Kenora),
Lanctôt,
Leader,
Macphail,
McDonald (Timiskaming),
Neill,
Shaw,
Spencer,
Thurston,
Ward,
Woodsworth—23.

NAYS

Messrs.

Anderson,
Arthurs,
Baldwin,
Baxter,
Beaubien,
Béland,
Benoit,
Binette,
Black (Huron),
Black (Yukon),
Boivin,
Boucher,
Bourassa,
Bowen,
Boys,
Brethen,
Brown,
Bureau,
Cannon,
Cardin,
Carmichael,
Carruthers,
Casgrain,
Chaplin,
Charters,
Chevrier,
Chisholm,
Church,
Clark,
Clifford,
Copp,
Déchêne,
Delisle,
Denis (Joliette),
Denis (St. Denis),
Desaulniers,
Deslauriers,
Desrochers,
Dickie,
Drayton (Sir Henry),
Duff,
Duncan,
Elliott (Dundas),
Euler,
Fafard,
Fansher,
Fielding,
Finn,
Fontaine,
Forke,
Forrester,
Fortier,
Garland (Carleton),
Gauvreau,
Gendron,
Good,
Gouin (Sir Lomer),
Graham,
Grimmer,
Halbert,
Harris,
Hatfield,
Healey,
Hodgins,
Hoey,
Hubbs,
Hughes,
Jacobs,
Johnston (Last Mountain),
Jones,
Kay,
Kellner,
Kennedy (Glengarry & Stormont),
King (Huron),
King (Kootenay),
Kyte,
Ladner,
Lapierre,
Lapointe,
Lavigueur,
Léger,
Lewis,
Lovett,
Lovie,
Lucas,
Macdonald (Pictou),
MacKelvie,
Mackinnon,
MacLaren,
Maclean (Halifax),
McBride,
McIsaac,
McKay,
McKenzie,
McKillop,
McQuarrie,
McTaggart,
Malcolm,
Manion,
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Marcile (Bagot),

Marler,
Martell,
Maybee,
Meighen,
Mercier,
Michaud,
Millar,
Mitchell,
Morrison,
Morrissey,
Motherwell,
Munro,
Murdock,
Papineau,
Parent,
Porter,
Prevost,
Rankin,
Raymond,
Reed,
Robb,
Roberge,
Robichaud,
Robinson,
Ross (Kingston),
Ross (Simcoe),
Ryckman,
St. Père,
Savard,
Séguin,
Senn,
Sexsmith,
Sheard,
Simpson,
Sinclair (Oxford),
Sinclair (Queens, P.E.I.),
Speakman,
Spence,
Stansell,
Stevens,
Stewart (Argenteuil),
Stewart (Hamilton),
Stewart (Leeds),
Sutherland,
Thompson,
Tobin,
Tolmie,
Trahan,
Vien,
Wallace,
Walsh,
Warner,
White,
Wilson,
Woods—156.

MINISTERS' SALARIES AND MEMBERS' INDEMNITIES

Mr. HARRY LEADER (Portage la Prairie) moved:

That, in view of the rigid necessity for economy in all walks of public and private life, it is incumbent upon this parliament to give the country a lead in this matter, and therefore, in the opinion of this House the government should take steps to reduce the indemnities and salaries paid to ministers of the Crown, the leader of the Opposition, members of the Senate and members of the House of Commons by 12½ per cent of the present indemnities and salaries.

He said: I had no intention of letting this resolution drop, but it is perfectly obvious that under the present circumstances, in view of the lateness of the hour, it will not come to a vote this afternoon. I understand that according to the rules of the House if the resolution is not voted on by six o'clock it automatically falls to the last place among the motions, and that might involve the danger of its not being taken up again this year. I certainly do not wish to withdraw the resolution, but I fear this danger; and at this stage, although the subject is one of the greatest importance, I will cut my remarks short if the House is willing to let the matter come to a vote.

An hon. MEMBER: Explain.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. LEADER: I am sure that hon. members wish to give me a fair show. I know that this resolution is out of the ordinary. A motion of this complexion is not usual in the House; resolutions of this kind usually ask for an increase in indemnities. That is what we have been used to.

An hon. MEMBER: Oh, no.

Mr. LEADER: Back on the farm I always thought it was hardly a square deal when I read of resolutions being introduced into parliament asking for increases in indemnities of $200 or $300. When I hire a man for $50 I do not expect him to ask for $75, after he has agreed to the wage I offer. In proposing this resolution, Mr. Speaker, I hope I have the goodwill of hon. members.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. LEADER: I expected that. But if some gentlemen choose to disagree with me I trust that my honesty of purpose will not be questioned and that it will be taken for granted that I am actuated by a desire faithfully to serve those whom I represent.

The necessity for economy and retrenchment is apparent to all hon. members. I believe the government are fairly well seized of the necessity of rigid economy in administration and are working with that end in view. To some extent, however, as I see it, they are handicapped by the taunt, and rightly so, that while they are willing to economize on the other fellow, they still cling to the higher indemnities voted to members and ministers in 1920. Economy is the crying need of the hour. While there are men who by the advantage of birth or sheer ability are not forced by circumstances to curtail their expenditure, the fact remains that the great body of the people are forced to economize.

The Speech from the Throne declared the need for economy. The amendment and the subamendment thereto stressed this need. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I believe that in adopting this resolution we would give a practical demonstration of sincerity in our demand for economy. In my opinion this is the final test. The amount that we would save is perhaps not very large, in fact it is a mere bagatelle as we count money here in Ottawa, but I think the people would rather have a small surplus than a huge deficit.

Briefly, what this resolution means is to cut $500 off the indemnity of each member of this House, $500 off the indemnity of each member of the Senate, and $1,750 off the salary of each minister of the Crown, thereby saving approximately $200,000 a year. But the monetary saving is of the least importance. I maintain that the principle is a very large one and places the government and members in an unassailable position from which to effect economies of a like nature. The burden of salary reductions generally falls upon those who are least able to bear it. Let me illustrate. I remember reading about two years

ago an award respecting the wages of men engaged in the packing plants in Chicago. By that award the first class men, those getting the highest wages, were to receive a reduction of 2½ cents an hour; the second class men, those getting lower wages, were to receive a reduction of 5 cents per hour; and the third class men, those in every instance least able to bear the decrease, were to receive a reduction of 7½ cents per hour. I repeat, the burden of reduced wages generally falls upon those least able to bear it.

I would not for a moment reduce the salaries of those who are only receiving sufficient for a decent livelihood, but I would urge upon the government to go after the higher paid officials, for instance, the higher paid judiciary. We all admire and respect very much our Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin), and it is not in a spirit of antipathy towards him that I make these remarks. But I feel that along this line we might perhaps save considerable expenditure. I have extracted some figures from the speech made last session by the hon. member for Laprairie and Napierville (Mr. Lanctot), and I would ask his pardon if I have encroached on his rights; I think not, however. These figures are in reference to a judge who was a Minister of the Crown, and I quote them to show what he received from the public treasury. He received as salary, $78,147.50—

Mr. RINFRET: In how many years?

Mr. LEADER: As a state pensioner—I shall have something to say about pensions—he received $70,893.33. I think there must be added to that two or three years' pension at $4,666.66 per year.

Mr. LANCTOT: He is still living.

Mr. LEADER: And drawing a pension. He received travelling expenses as a judge to the amount of $282.90. While a member of parliament he received in indemnities $40,555. As Minister of Justice he received $76,636.20. For travelling expenses as a Minister of the Crown he received $3,196.25. For trips to Europe during the war he received $9,000. When he came back he was offered a job—that is the way I would put it—as counsel of the Labrador commission and was paid in advance $5,000. I do not know whether he ever started work on this job, but that is the sum he was paid in advance.

Mr. CANNON: Would the hon. member go on the Labrador coast for so small a salary?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

[Mr. Leader.]

Mr. LEADER: The total amount, Mr. Speaker, is $283,711.18. As I stated before, he is still drawing a pension of $4,666.66. I guess he is a good sort of a man, but I do not think the tax-payers should have been called upon to pay him such an enormous sum, nor should they now be called upon to continue his pension. Yet a man who has received nearly $300,000 from the public treasury is still drawing a pension.

I notice in the newspapers that the people of England are sitting up and taking notice of the extravagant expenditure on pensions. And let me say in passing that I hear rumours of the extension of the pension system in Canada to cover our senators. In England an ex-Minister of the Crown has received £2,000 a year, practically $10,000, for the last twenty-two years. In other words, he has received $220,000 out of the English tax-payers, and they are getting up in arms. Four ex-Chancellors of the Exchequer are drawing $10,000 a year in pensions. If we do not watch out we shall be in the same position as the English people in this regard.

Still more striking are the figures that were given in Hansard the other day in reply to a question as to the fees paid a certain lawyer —W. N. Tilley. I believe he lives in Toronto. We find this man drawing a salary of $400 a day for 198 days, and $100 a day for so many days in Toronto, his home, where he spent his Easter vacation. He received over $100,000 from the treasury, and that had to be made up by the tax-payers. I am giving these figures because I believe the general public know absolutely nothing with regard to these expenditures and as a member of parliament I should like to be able to convey the information to them. Mr. Tilley in the course of events, if he is a good party man, will be appointed to the bench, and after serving as a judge for a while he will retire on a pension. He is a very wealthy man. I would vote any day for pensions to the old folks, but I do object to paying pensions to wealthy men who do not need assistance.

Mr. CANNON: How could he get wealthy if he was not paid?

Mr. LEADER: Mr. Speaker, conditions in Canada to-day, while not as bad as in some other countries, are bad enough. We have in western Canada public schools closed for want of funds. Premier Bracken, according to a newspaper report, is authority for the statement that there are $14,000,000 of unpaid taxes in my province of Manitoba. Now a new method is being adopted there to collect taxes. Hitherto the authorities

were satisfied to take a man's land or house and sell it for taxes. Now they are going to garnishee the wages of the defaulter. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that owing to these conditions, we should share a little of this burden.

The question arises, then: Is there room for economy in our administration? In that connection let me read an article published in the London Free Press—and this will be my only quotation. I am not fully conversant with the conditions in eastern Canada with which this newspaper comment deals, but they are no doubt similar to those in the West. It says:

> Are we over-governed in Canada? We have only eight to nine million people and yet we have a federal parliament and 9 legislatures. The total population of the Maritime provinces is slightly over a million people and yet they have 3 legislative assemblies, 3 lieutenant-governors, 3 speakers and in all three provinces the paraphernalia of the mother of parliaments. Nova Scotia, in addition to a legislative assembly of 43 members, also has the luxury of an Upper House with 21 members. Prince Edward Island, with a population less than Middlesex county, has all the fuss and feathers of a real parliament. It has a legislature of 30 members, with a sessional indemnity of $500 each, and a cabinet of 8 although only 4 are paid. New Brunswick has a house of 48 members, drawing an indemnity of $1,000 per session, and a premier and 6 cabinet ministers.

Mr. MARTELL: Will the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. LEADER: Yes.

Mr. MARTELL: The other night the hon. member raised a question as to who was the representative of Portage la Prairie. Why not divide the indemnity between the two members concerned?

Mr. LEADER: I may tell the hon. gentleman that I have no doubt as to who represents Portage la Prairie, although some may have. It is evident from the article I have read, therefore, that the impression is abroad that we are over-governed in Canada.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: If the hon. gentleman will permit me a question, I wonder if before he leaves his interesting financial details he would give us the expenditure of the Ontario government in law fees during the last few years. My recollection is that it runs to $600,000.

Mr. LEADER: I regret that I cannot answer the hon. gentleman's question. I believe there is extravagance in administration and that we could avoid some of that extravagance. I would like just for a moment to make a comparison of the cabinet of the United States with that of Canada. The United States cabinet comprises ten ministers, each with a salary of $12,000 per year, so that it costs the United States $120,000 for their cabinet. In Canada we have seventeen ministers with salaries of $14,000 a year each, the total cost being $238,000, or almost double what it costs the United States with twelve times as many people.

Mr. CANNON: Is not the difference in number between the United States and Canadian cabinets explained by differences in constitutional status?

Mr. LEADER: That may be, but if the Canadian ministers could show us the surplus that the United States ministers are showing we would be willing to pay them the bigger salary. I am quite sure that the members of the United States cabinet are carrying on their work to the satisfaction of the American people, at the salaries they are receiving.

Mr. MARTELL: Would my hon. friend—

Mr. SPEAKER: I would ask hon. members to be fair toward the hon. member who has the floor.

Mr. LEADER: Now, let us compare our representation with that of the United States. As I have pointed out, the United States has twelve times as many people as we have. Canada will have 245 representatives in the House of Commons after the next election; the United States has 435 members in its House of Representatives. It is true that the United States indemnity per representative is $7,500 while that of the Canadian representative is only $4,000. But the unit of representation in the United States is 210,000 while in Canada it is a little over 36,000. You can therefore see that we have at least six representatives where the United States has one, and that where it costs us $24,000. at $4,000 per year, the cost to the United States is only $7,500. A comparison could also be made with Australia, where there are 75 representatives with a population 35 per cent less than that of Canada. We might also make a comparison with England, where the unit of representation is 70,000. I think, therefore, it is fairly established that our administration is extravagant. The United States Senate has 96 members, or one senator for every 1,000,000 inhabitants, while the Canadian Senate has about 10 senators for every 1,000,000 people. In Australia I believe they have about half as many senators as representatives, so the comparison with Australia is very striking indeed.

Our administration is too costly; there should be a reduction, and I believe the people generally are waking up to that fact. Nova Scotia last year reduced the sessional indemnity from $1,500 to $1,000. Alberta is also effecting a reduction in indemnity this

year; I forget the exact figures, but I believe the reduction is from $2,000 to $1,800. A bill has passed the Manitoba legislature this session reducing the sessional indemnity of members of the legislature from $1,800 to $1,500 per annum. It is evident therefore, that the people are realizing that something must be done along this line, and the purpose of this resolution is to draw the attention of hon. members to the fact that it is our move.

If we accept this cut in our indemnity, we can more than compensate for the loss in money by economy in time. I have been here only a short time, but in my judgment the sessions could be shortened very materially by the co-operation of all groups in expediting the work of parliament. I have no ground for complaint this year; we are moving along much faster than last. For instance, while it took fifteen days to dispose of the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne last year, the time occupied this year was only nine days, and no one doubts that the work was just as effectively done. Moreover, the speeches are much shorter and a great deal better. Another reason why I believe we can save time is found in the fact that the hon. member for St. John city (Mr. Baxter), speaking for his party, I presume, declared a willingness to co-operate with the government in an endeavour to save the time of the House. I believe this can be done, and speaking as a farmer I know it would mean a great deal to western members if we could get through our work in time to superintend our seeding operations at home. I would not for a moment suggest a shirking of our responsibility as representatives of the people; I rather suggest that we concentrate on our duties and perform them with the utmost despatch.

I think that the House should accept this resolution. In effecting a reduction of $500 in the sessional indemnity the amputation might be somewhat painful, but we would all feel much better after the operation. I would point out also that it is not money alone that induces men to go into public life; in fact, we get quite the contrary impression as we listen to the speeches of members when they learn that they have been elected to represent the people in parliament. I question if there is an hon. member in this House who did not on the night of his election say something to this effect: "Ladies and gentlemen, from the bottom of my heart I thank you for the honour you have done me." I remember the right hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Meighen), who was the member for Portage la Prairie, when he was assured of his election for the first time, saying to us: "Ladies and gentlemen, this is the proudest moment of my life thus far." It was such a catchy phrase that I used it myself when the occasion arose. I intended to make some further remarks, but I see it is almost six o'clock. I earnestly commend this resolution to the attention of the House and I hope that hon. members will see their way clear to voting for it.

[Mr. Leader.]

On motion of Miss Agnes Macphail, the debate was adjourned.

At six o'clock the House adjourned without question being put, pursuant to rule.

Thursday, March 15, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST READINGS

Bill No. 73 from the Senate, for the relief of Harriet Ethelwyn Kingsley.—Mr. Rankin.

Bill No. 74, respecting the Montreal Central Terminal Company.—Mr. Rinfret.

REPORTS AND PAPERS

Mr. C. A. GAUVREAU (Témiscouata) presented the first report of the Joint Committee of the Senate and House of Commons on Printing.

Report in conformity with the provisions of section 38B (2) of the Civil Service Act, 1918, (as amended by chapter 22 of the statutes of 1921), setting forth the positions in the public service in Canada which have been excluded in whole or in part from the operation of the said Civil Service Act during the year 1922, together with the reasons for such exclusion and the regulations prescribed and approved by His Excellency the Governor in Council for dealing with such positions.—Hon. Mr. Copp.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

DOMINION STOCK YARDS

Mr. McTAGGART:

1. What are the names and dates of appointment of the Dominion Stock yards agents at Prince Albert and Moose Jaw stock yards?

2. Did either of these men see overseas service, and if not, what special qualifications have they that gave them preference over returned soldiers who applied for the positions?

3. Were these appointments made through the Civil Service Commission?

4. If so, why was the returned soldiers preference clause of the Civil Service ignored, when making these appointments?

Hon. Mr. COPP:

1. Prince Albert, D. A. McKenzie, October 14, 1920; Moose Jaw, Charles N. Stetson, February 1, 1923.

2. Neither of these appointees had been on active service overseas. They proved to have the necessary qualifications for the vacant positions which the ex-service men did not possess.

3. Yes.

4. The returned soldiers' preference clause was not ignored. It provides that in order to obtain a preference, the returned soldier candidates must pass the necessary examination. In this instance none of the ex-service candidates passed the examination.

CANADIAN GOVERNMENT RAILWAY GROUP—SALES TAX

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

By a return tabled on February 28, 1923, it appears that goods purchased by the Canadian Government Railway Group (not for resale) were on December 2, 1922, ruled exempt from sales tax on or after May 24, 1922, such railway group comprising in all some fourteen different railways. The ruling was retroactive and exempted purchases on or after May 24, 1922.

1. What was the amount of purchases made by said railway group between May 24 and December 2, 1922 in respect of which the ruling was made, and what was the amount of the sales tax payable thereon?

2. What is the estimated amount of revenue lost by the department under this ruling?

3. Was the former practice under which the sales tax was collected on purchases by railways irrespective of ownership changed owing to alleged insufficiency in the statute or on other legal grounds or as a matter of government policy?

4. If owing to alleged insufficiency of the statute or other legal grounds is it the intention of the government to bring down further and remedial legislation?

Hon. Mr. BUREAU: I should like to be allowed to answer the hon. gentleman by informing him that since the reorganization of the Canadian National Railways, sales tax is being collected from, or paid by all railways. I hope that will satisfy my hon. friend.

BUSINESS PROFITS AND INCOME TAXES

Mr. CANNON:

1. What amount was collected under the Business Profits War Tax Act for each of the following periods; eighteenth of May, 1916, to thirty-first of December, 1916, and for each of the calendar years, 1917 to 1920, inclusive?

2. What amount of Business Profits War Taxes were due and unpaid at the expiration of each of such periods and what was the number of tax payers in arrears at such dates?

3. Were legal proceedings taken against such tax payers prior to 31 December, 1920?

4. If so, what was the number of such proceedings for each of said periods?

5. Were any promissory notes received and held by the department concerned in respect of such taxes?

6. If so, under what provision of the statutes, order in council, or ministerial authority?

7. How many promissory notes were so received and held by the department concerned and what was the total amount of such notes for each of said periods?

8. Were all of such notes paid when due?

9. If not, were legal proceedings instituted?

10. What amount of Business Profits War Taxes were unpaid on the 31 December, 1921, and what was the number of tax payers in arrears on that date?

1. What amount was collected under the Income War Tax Act for each of the following periods: 24 May, 1918, to 31 December, 1918, and for each of the calendar years 1919 to 1921, inclusive?

2. What amount of Income War Taxes were due and unpaid at the expiration of each of such periods and what was the number of tax payers in arrears at such dates?

3. Were legal proceedings taken against such tax payers prior to 31 December, 1921?

4. If so, what was the number of such proceedings for each of said periods?

5. What amount of Income War Taxes were unpaid on 31 December, 1922, and what was the number of tax payers in arrears on that date?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING: As regards these two questions, I am advised that the preparation of the information asked for would involve a large amount of labour and expense and would consume much time. I hope that on further consideration, the hon. gentleman will not desire to press his questions.

GRAND TRUNK ARBITRATION

Mr. BEAUBIEN:

1. What was the amount paid to Mr. Taft in connection with the arbitration of the Grand Trunk securities?

2. Was Mr. Taft paid by the Grand Trunk Railway Company?

3. If not, (a) by whom was he paid, and (b) what amount?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. $75,000.

2. No.

3. (a) By Grand Trunk Shareholders, (b) see answer No. 1.

THE BANK ACT

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved: That the House do to-morrow go into Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved that it is expedient to revise the law relating to banking, to continue until the first day of July, 1933, the charters of the several banks to which the provisions of the Bank Act apply, to authorize the payment out of Consolidated Revenue fund of remuneration to auditors for special examinations of the affairs or business of banks which the Minister of Finance may require to be made, and to provide for the charge of fees in connection with the registration of securities taken under the authority of the provisions of the Act.

He said: His Excellency the Governor General has been informed of the subject matter of this resolution, and has been pleased to recommend the same to the consideration of the House.

Motion agreed to.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

PRIVATE MEMBERS' DAY

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

That on and after Monday the 19th of March instant to the end of the session, government notices and government orders shall have precedence on Mondays and Wednesdays over all business except questions by members and motions for the production of papers.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): I do not think the government can desire to take both these days immediately. If the motion carries it means that no more resolutions of private members can be considered at all. The hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Clark) has on the order paper a resolution as respects which he was promised consideration, as I am informed. But if this motion carries that resolution cannot be gone on with.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What motion is that?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Indeed, the most important resolutions among the notices of motions have not yet been considered. I refer now first of all to No. 12, the motion of the member for Burrard, which reads:

That, in the opinion of this House, railway rates westward from the prairie provinces should be reduced to an equality with railway rates eastward from said provinces for similar goods and distances.

I should think that one of the private members' days, preferably Monday, should be retained for some little time yet, perhaps two weeks.

Mr. E. J. GARLAND (Bow River): I share the opinions expressed by the leader of the Opposition in this matter. There are on the order paper three or four resolutions dealing with the coal situation, and I think that this House is entitled to the fullest possible opportunity of discussing this question. There are also two or three other resolutions that are certainly of sufficient national importance to warrant this House going into them. After all, we have been sent here for the purpose of presenting to the House and the country the requirements of the various constituencies which we represent, and I do not think it would be wise at this time wholly to abandon private members' day. Perhaps if one day, say Wednesday, were abandoned and Monday retained for a little while until the more important resolutions have been dealt with, it would meet the views of hon. members generally.

Mr. PIERRE F. CASGRAIN (Charlevoix-Montmorency): There is on the order paper a resolution of very great importance, the first one, standing in my name, which proposes the amendment or abrogation of the Bankruptcy Act for the reasons stated in the resolution. On many occasions when the resolution was called I was quite prepared to proceed with it but was requested by certain hon. members who were evidently interested in it, to allow it to stand over until some other day. I should not like the present motion to carry unless I were given a definite assurance that I should be able to proceed with this resolution. I would suggest that the motion of the Prime Minister be amended by striking out the words "on and," so that the motion would read:

That after Monday the 19th of March instant, to the end of the session, government notices and government orders shall have precedence, etc.

This would give me an opportunity to proceed with my resolution.

Mr. J. J. DENIS (Joliette): Under the rules of the House notices of motions by private members have precedence on Mondays and Wednesdays until such time as the government introduces a motion, which is agreed to, to appropriate these two days to itself. It is well known that as far back as confederation—and possibly the system was followed before that time—a fairly reasonable time was allowed to elapse before the government brought in such a motion. When that motion is carried private members' motions can be dealt with only after government business has been disposed of, the result being virtually to debar private members entirely from presenting any resolutions to the House. This year it is my fortune, or misfortune, I do not know which, to have a very important resolution on the order paper. I am anxious to propose that resolution, but if this motion carries I shall be unable to do so. It may be said that I have had ample opportunity to bring it up, but we all know that members have been very busy, and furthermore the resolution that stands in my name is one that calls for considerable preparation. For that reason I have not been prepared to present it sooner. Nor did I think that the government would introduce the present motion as early as they have done. That opinion I based on last year's experience. Last year the session opened on 8th March and it was

not until 5th May that the Prime Minister submitted a motion of this kind to take effect on May 15. During that interval private members had an opportunity to proceed with their resolutions twice a week, and I thought that this year an equal length of time would be allowed for the consideration of such resolutions. Last year we had ten weeks after the beginning of the session in which to discuss our resolutions; on the present occasion the motion to do away with private members' day is introduced six weeks after the opening of parliament. I have been asked more than once during this session by members on both sides of the House when I would proceed with my resolution, and I should be sorry if the fact that I had not moved it sooner—and I could not very well have done so—should preclude any discussion of the important subject with which that resolution deals. Now, I have no advice to offer the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), but I may be allowed to quote his own words in regard to the subject matter of his motion. On 8th April, 1920, Right Hon. Sir George Foster moved, on behalf of the government then in power, a motion similar to my right hon. friend's. The leader of the Opposition of that day, the present Prime Minister, strongly opposed the motion on the ground that private members had not had sufficient time to present their resolutions. Sir George Foster, in reply to my right hon. friend, made this statement:

> Always the experience has been that the leader of the government pays particular heed to the plea that has been made, and in good form and with good grace he allows another week. This squares the matter and nearly everybody is satisfied and amiable and complacent. Now, I am quite willing to do that and to give my hon. friend another week, if he will agree to the motion going through in that amended form.

Hansard then reports the present Prime Minister as follows:

> Mr. Mackenzie King: We shall be thankful for small mercies if we cannot get anything better.

Now, I am asking to-day only for a small mercy in the shape of another week at least. I would move therefore that the motion be amended by substituting for the words "the 19th" the words "the 26th," which would give us the whole of next week in which to bring forward private resolutions.

Mr. J. A. CLARK (Burrard): The suggestion of the last speaker (Mr. Denis) may be all right so far as he is concerned, but for those of us whose resolutions happen be in the tenth or twelfth place it gives rise to difficulties. In my case I have been quite prepared to go on. I put my resolution on the order paper early in the session but have not had an opportunity to proceed with it. And I may say that the Acting Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) assured me that I should be given an opportunity to take the matter up; he said he would see that I got that opportunity. I cannot see, however, how he can carry out that undertaking if private members' day is abandoned. I therefore strongly advocate the retention of private members' day at least once a week for a reasonable period in order that hon. members may have a chance to clear up the resolutions that were placed on the order paper in the early stages of the session.

Mr. Gauvreau and Mr. Johnston having risen together:

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Johnston.

Mr. J. FRED JOHNSTON (Last Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I find myself in about the same position as the hon. gentleman who has just sat down (Mr. Clark). While I have little sympathy for hon. gentlemen whose resolutions have been repeatedly called and allowed to stand, I am not in that position. The resolution standing in my name was reached on the evening of 5th March, and at the direct request of the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), who was leading the House at the time, I agreed to allow it to stand over. I took it from his statement that I would be given an opportunity to present my resolution at a later date. I hope the government will set apart a day for the discussion of what, as the Minister of Finance pointed out at the time, is a very important matter, and under the circumstances I think it would not be fair that we should be debarred from dealing with this resolution.

Mr. C. A. GAUVREAU (Temiscouata): Now I have my chance.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would assure the hon. member that there is no ill will against him on the part of the Speaker. The rules of the House must be applied, and the practice is that when one hon. member speaks on his side of the House two other hon. members from the two groups sitting on the other side are entitled to follow.

Mr. GAUVREAU: I bow to your decision, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate that those on the Conservative side should have a chance, too. I must protest in the strongest manner against postponing the motion of the Prime Minister. All the private members' resolutions were called I do not know how many times—and I am here every day, even Saturdays and Sundays.

Mr. BUREAU: That is zeal.

Mr. GAUVREAU: I think it has been customary in the past for the Prime Minister to fix a date for the discussion of any motion that is very important. If we want to go home before the end of the summer it is time to curtail these motions. Most of them are absolutely nonsensical.

Mr. S. W. JACOBS (George Etienne Cartier): Mr. Speaker, I agree largely with the last words which dropped from the lips of the hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Gauvreau), with the qualification that I do not think they have any application to my own motion. This naturally is a resolution of the most important character and I should not like to have discussion on it choked off by this sudden motion presented by the Prime Minister. I understand that at the present moment it comes in the nature of what is known as a feint attack; there is not really any intention of pressing it, but it is notice given to private members that motions on the order paper will have to be proceeded with in due time. If I am mistaken and the motion is intended seriously, I must make a plea for my own resolution, which refers to Hindu franchise, one of the most important matters on the order paper.

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (North Toronto): Mr. Speaker, not 10 per cent of the time taken up with private members' motions has been devoted to motions presented by hon. members in this quarter of the House; most of the time has been devoted to resolutions introduced by the Progressives on purely academic questions. I have a resolution on the order paper, No. 11, in which ninety per cent of the people of Canada are vitally interested. I have had many representations from municipalities and other public bodies requesting me to bring this matter to the attention of the House, but so far I have had no opportunity to do so. The resolution was called one day, but I could not proceed because the Prime Minister had arranged to give another motion precedence. I should like an early prorogation, but I do urge on the Prime Minister that he set apart an afternoon or an evening for the discussion of this very important question. I think it is only fair to the government that the country should know what it has been doing, and that an opportunity should be given for hon. members to present constructive suggestions on how to avoid a repetition of the disastrous conditions which have prevailed this winter through the lack of an adequate supply of fuel—conditions which will be still more disastrous next winter unless we take proper measures to ensure an adequate supply of coal.

[Mr. Bureau.]

Mr. W. C. GOOD (Brant): Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Prime Minister will accede to the request made by a number of members to extend the time for another week for the discussion of private members' resolutions. There are a number of very important resolutions on the order paper, and I am sure hon. members generally will be very much disappointed if we do not reach some of them. If the Prime Minister does not consent, I hope that the amendment offered will be voted on, for I shall certainly vote for an extension of another week.

Hon. CHARLES MARCIL (Bonaventure): Mr. Speaker, if I may be allowed, I should like to make a suggestion. After an extensive experience in the House I have come to the conclusion that the government would be well advised, if they would avoid this annual discussion, to amend the rules to the effect that when a motion has been called for a third time, and not proceeded with, it be dropped from the order paper. The circumstances quoted by the hon. member for Joliette (Mr. Denis) apply in every case—the government of the day finds itself generally obliged to give one week longer for the discussion of private members' resolutions at the request of various members who have resolutions standing in their name on the order paper. Of the resolutions now on the order paper notices of nine were given in January, and they have all been called since then; twelve in February, and seven this month. These resolutions would all have been proceeded with if their sponsors had been ready. The only exceptions are one or two in regard to which an arrangement was made with the government to take them up on a special date. Therefore I think the only course open to the government to avoid this recurring trouble is to amend the rules in the manner I have suggested.

Mr. T. G. McBRIDE (Cariboo): Mr. Speaker, although I have a resolution on the order paper, I think the time of this House has already been taken up sufficiently by hon. members speaking longer than they had any right to do. I am quite prepared to waive my right. Let us get down to business. I am fully prepared to support the Prime Minister's motion.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Speaker, I need hardly say that the government has no motive in presenting this motion other than to expedite the business of parliament. There is no desire to deprive hon. members of any of their privileges. But I do submit, there is very much force in what has been said about

the number of times that many of these resolutions have been called, and it is hardly fair to the House as a whole that the business generally of parliament should be delayed in order that hon. members who have not taken advantage of their turn when it came should have this further extension of time. However, the government, I need hardly say, has no desire to press this motion unless it is going to carry, and from the discussion which has taken place I gather that possibly it is the consensus of opinion that some further extension of time should be granted—one day possibly, certainly not more than two days. If it would meet with the general approval of the House I would be prepared to amend the motion by changing the 19th to the 26th, thus allowing an additional week.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Hon. Sir HENRY DRAYTON (West York): Mr. Speaker, I am not at all sure that would meet the situation. I quite agree with my right hon. friend that a lot of these motions have been called many times, but I do not think the time of the House has been wasted in consequence; if I remember rightly, we went on with estimates and made considerable progress. Usually, private members' days are taken because the government has some real object in view; that is, there is government business that the House is seized of waiting to be done, and suffering by delay. I see no such business on the order paper at the present time. The government list is not at all long, and we have not any bills down that I know of. The Bank Act amendment bill has not been distributed yet. Speaking generally we have really had no government business outside of estimates. We usually hear about the budget speech before this motion is made; this year we have not heard a word as to the approximate date when the budget will be brought down. Yet the privileges of hon. members are to be taken from them. We do not want to delay progress, but I would point out that motion No. 11, in the name of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Church), deals with the question of the coal supply. That is not an academic question; it is a matter of immediate importance, and an opportunity for its discussion should be afforded. If we are to have only two more private members' days, it means that the debate on the resolution respecting the Senate will take up the whole of one day, one other motion will take up the next day, and the motion with respect to the coal supply will not be reached. We know how futile these resolutions respecting the Senate are. If the government can assure us that the motion on coal will be dealt with, that meets the case so far as I am concerned.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think the subject to which my hon. friend has just referred was considered at some length in the course of another debate in the House, and doubtless in other connections it may come up again. It is reasonable to expect that we can rely on the good judgment of those who have resolutions on the order paper not to take up too much of the time of the House in dealing with them. If hon. members will be seized of what appears to be the general wish they will be short in their speeches and not devote more time than is necessary to their resolutions. Certainly any resolutions in respect to which there has been an understanding should be taken up; where the suggestion has been made that they be held for consideration later, it would be desirable to arrange that they be dealt with. Apart from that, however, it seems to me that if an additional week is given, involving an additional two days for members' resolutions, that would meet the situation. I would like to move, therefore, with the permission of the House, to substitute "26th" for "19th" and to present the motion in that form.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have no objection to the resolution being amended, but I am opposed to it as amended, because there will not be time for reasonable discussion of important resolutions. This, I think, is the earliest that this motion has ever been pressed —I speak only from recollection; I have not checked the dates—and it is done in a session in which the government business has been expedited the most. That is to say, there has been on the part of hon. members less delay of government business than I have ever seen in this parliament. Not only has there been nothing in the way of obstruction, but every facility has been given for reasonable progress, and the progress has been rapid, in a session when there is less government business than there has been, perhaps, in any session for years. There are only the estimates, and there is a bill regarding combines; what else is there? There are two others that are being considered by committees, but that is all we have this session. It is true that if a motion is called and passed by, and the House has then to adjourn, time is lost, but if the House simply gets to another resolution that is disposed of, or if it gets to government business, time is not lost; and that has been the practice this session.

Two additional days for private resolutions will not enable the House to reach the motion of the hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Clark), the motion of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Church), or the motion of another hon. member who sits opposite. In the two days we can get through with perhaps the first and second only, at least with nothing more than appears on the first page. To have the motion carry as with the proposed amendment means wiping out everything beyond the first three or four motions.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am very anxious to meet the wishes of hon. members, though it is a little difficult to oblige my right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) in everything. In his first remarks on the subject he said that if the government would give two more Mondays he would be satisfied.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Two weeks, I said.

Mr. BUREAU: Two Mondays.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I meant to say two weeks, but two Mondays would be a great deal better than a Monday and a Wednesday. In fact, one Monday is as good as about three Wednesdays.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If my right hon. friend will agree to two Mondays I am prepared to amend the resolution in that form. I think that ought to suit us all.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I will agree to two Mondays and a Wednesday.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think if hon. members will look at Hansard they will see that what I said was two weeks.

Mr. BUREAU: If Hansard has not been corrected since, it was two days.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Well, Hansard has not been corrected—at least, not by me.

Mr. BUREAU: I am willing to leave it to Hansard, then.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What I had in mind was that two weeks would be necessary, that is, two Mondays and two Wednesdays. I am not speaking for anybody in respect of motions except hon. members of this group; there are others just as much interested and whose rights are just as clear as ours. And what does the government want? They will get through in plenty of time; I do not know what their object can be. We shall have a very short session, with very little done, and all these matters will have to wait over for another session.

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. BUREAU: It is an occasion of rejoicing to hear that statement with respect to a short session.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I suggest that the motion read, "after Monday the 26th."

Mr. GRAHAM: That will give you two Mondays and a Wednesday.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Strike out the words "on and" in the first line and substitute "26th" for "19th."

The SPEAKER: The motion as amended will read as follows:

That after Monday the 26th of March instant, to the end of the session, government notices and government orders shall have precedence on Mondays and Wednesdays over all business except questions by members and motions for the production of papers.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

EASTER ADJOURNMENT

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. W. A. BOYS (South Simcoe): I would like to ask the Prime Minister if he would intimate to the House the intention of the government regarding the Easter adjournment. I have seen notices in the press of a somewhat extended adjournment, and I am asked questions from time to time by members interested but cannot give them any information. It is necessary that they make their appointments and secure their reservations without delay, and I shall be glad if the Prime Minister could tell us when the adjournment will take place and what its duration will be.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): In the matter of the Easter adjournment the wish of the government would be, as in these other matters, to ascertain what suits the convenience of the House as a whole. The adjournment will be from Wednesday the 28th of March; the 29th, I understand, is a holiday. The government had thought that if adjournment were taken from that date over the following week, until the 9th of April, that would probably best suit the convenience of hon. members. It would permit those who are from the West to go to their homes and give opportunity for consideration during the Easter recess of matters which may come up afterwards for discussion in the House. We cannot hope to please every individual member, but speaking generally, if it meets with acceptance the government proposes that arrangement.

Mr. T. G. McBRIDE (Cariboo): I think the people from the West out in British Columbia should get some consideration. We

are down here and have to stay here until the session is over. What are we going to do during these ten days when the House takes recess? I think there are a great many of us who want to get through the business of the House and get home as early in the season as possible, and I do not see why we should close down that long. I would say not more than four or five days at the outside.

THE BUDGET

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Perhaps I might facilitate the business of the House by asking the Minister of Finance what is the date fixed for the budget?

Mr. FIELDING: I would not like to deprive my hon. friend of the opportunity of repeating that question another day.

WEDNESDAY EVENING SITTINGS

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. GAUVREAU: May I ask the Prime Minister when the government intends to start Wednesday evening sittings?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I would not want to suggest next Wednesday, but I think after the Easter recess we might take Wednesday evening.

ALBERTA COAL

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. GARLAND: I wish to ask the government if a communication has been received from the Alberta branch of the Canadian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy asking for appointment of a federal committee consisting of a mining engineer, a freight expert, and a business expert, to report upon the feasibility of shipping Alberta coal into Ontario? And, what is the intention of the government in the matter?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): A communication was received in my office two or three days ago from a committee of that organization. I have not yet had time to present it to the government.

Mr. JAMES LARKIN

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. WOODSWORTH: According to press reports, Mr. James Larkin has been refused admission into Canada. May I ask the government on what grounds such action is taken?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I have no knowledge of the gentleman mentioned having been refused admission into Canada. The matter has not come to my notice before.

SUPPLY

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

Royal Candian Mounted Police—salaries, $37,225; contingencies, $9,000.

Hon. Sir LOMER GOUIN (Minister of Justice): This is practically the same amount as last year; there is a decrease of $37.50.

Item agreed to.

IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION

Immigration outside service—salaries, $700,000.

Mr. JACOBS: I do not know that I can preface my remarks on the question of immigration now before the House, in a better way than by reading to the Committee an editorial from the Montreal Star of Tuesday, February, 13, 1923. It is very short, and I trust that the members of the Committee will bear with me while I put it on Hansard;

51st Month

It is now fifty months since the armistice. The cessation of war should have been Canada's golden opportunity to increase her population.

Australia and New Zealand seized the opportunity and are benefiting enormously, adding huge capital accretion to the national assets. Canada with folded arms has stood still. The old coalition government attempted nothing, did nothing and did'nt want to do anything. The Liberal government has shut its eyes to the situation, permitted the waste of time of enormous value, then attempts to propitiate the public by promises that mean nothing but delay and suggest nothing but cowardice in dealing wtih the greatest problem that ever confronted the Canadian people.

If the Liberals are to be as inert as the Conservatives or Coalitionists, our country will never take its natural place amongst progressive nations. This Dominion needs a saviour. Its best interests have been neglected.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There has one come now.

Mr. JACOBS: Does the hon. gentleman refer to me? I should not be the first of my race that acted as such.

I was glad to note from the remarks of the Acting Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Stewart) that he did not dignify the proposition which he brought down on Wednesday last by the name of a policy. We have no policy before this country in the matter of immigration. During the tenure of office of the Union government, and later of the National Liberal and Conservative government—as I think they called themselves—nothing was done at all, absolutely nothing; and it gave me a splendid opportunity to make attacks from time to time upon the ineptitude of that government, and I took

occasion to predict that when our party came into power the fog and miasma, if I may call it such, of Unionism would yield to the sunshine of Liberalism.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Before the hon. gentleman gets to that much more appropriate subject, will he tell the House the actual number of immigrants secured during the time he is complaining of?

Mr. JACOBS: I do not think the number of people who came into the country during that period is a fair test of the immigration which was received, because the war held up for a number of years a large number of people who were in Europe, from coming to this country. I do not think it is quite fair that the Union government should claim that all these people who came back including even the soldiers, should be looked upon as regular immigrants.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is none of that kind claimed at all, and the records do not include them. The records only include immigrants who are immigrants, that is, those who have come for the first time to settle in this country. The hon. gentleman knows that. There is none in the House knows it so well.

Mr. JACOBS: If they came in, they came in notwithstanding the protest of the government. I had myself a great deal to do in bringing some of them in. In any event we expected nothing from that government, and we got what we expected. But at the present moment when we have here, in "the seats of the mighty," on the treasury benches a galaxy of all the talents of the Liberal party, I must express my surprise and my astonishment that we are simply following in the way of the Philistines,—nothing is being done at all. We have a commercial proposition put before us: We are going to go into partnership with a company known as the Canada Colonization Association—

An hon. MEMBER: No, no.

Mr. JACOBS: —a company which has no president so far as I know, and has no general manager. It is a company which shows its astuteness in many ways worth while. As I understand it they have received large sums of money through the Canadian Manufacturers' Association. I believe a call was made on members of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association to give their support, in a monetary sense, to this organization. Each member of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association was invited to contribute according to the number of men in his employ to this patriotic movement. In that respect, as I say, they show a considerable degree of commercial ability. To extract large sums of money from the members of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association is in itself no mean feat.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Can the hon. member inform the House exactly how much was extracted from this association?

Mr. JACOBS: Well, it is rather difficult to find out how much money the Canadian Manufacturers' Association and its members contributed to the public weal; I am not in a position to say. I do know, however, that a call has been made throughout the country for support for this patriotic scheme and—

Mr. CHAPLIN: The hon. gentleman said that an assessment has been levied. What proof has he of that?

Mr. JACOBS: I have the statement from a member of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association who was asked to contribute $15,000 to this scheme, that is, in proportion to the number of people whom he employed; and he said he promptly ushered to the door the gentleman who applied. I do not know whether the hon. member himself has contributed any such sum as that. He would probably know and I am sure we would be glad to learn from him what the amount was.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I can tell the hon. gentleman, not one cent. The hon. gentleman said that a levy was made. I object to that statement. I do not think it is true, and I do not think it can be substantiated.

Mr. JACOBS: I did not mean to convey the impression that a levy was made, it was just a friendly application to members who felt that this was a worthy object. Well, after this work was concluded we find that the president of this colonization association, Sir John Willison, retired precipitately from the presidency—why, I do not know. The minister in discussing this matter the other day did not give any information to the House as to why this organization, which will have hundreds of thousands of dollars of the money of the people of Canada, has no president. That is something, I think, which the country itself would like to be enlightened about. Without a president they nevertheless went on—probably they found that they could get along as well without a president; it may be they felt that it would be better for their purposes if they jettisoned Sir John Willison. They came before the Department of Immigration and secured $100,000, with the understanding that they would obtain 200 families

to settle on the land. Well, 200 families do not seem to be a very large number when we consider that during last year as many as 10,000 people have left the farms and towns of Canada in one month to go to the United States. In any event we are to be out our $100,000. I am not complaining particularly about that phase of it: "Any port in a storm;" "A drowning man will grasp at a straw." The minister had no policy at all to bring before the government, he felt that anything was better than nothing; and when the Canadian Colonization Association showed up he looked upon them as friends of his because, to a certain extent, they helped him out of the situation in which he found himself just previous to the meeting of parliament.

4 p.m.

I want to say this, Mr. Chairman, before going very much further: I feel like the father who was about to chastise his child—it pains me more than it does the child. It is not a very pleasant matter for me, a Liberal of many years standing, to get up and snipe my party and the minister from my seat in the House. But this is something that transcends party, this is a national problem. I feel very strongly upon this question of immigration. I have discussed immigration ever since I came into the House. I have delivered what I might claim to be my annual address on this subject to the House ever since 1918. So far my words have fallen on deaf ears; I am a voice in the wilderness. But I trust that in time the government will see that this is a matter which vitally affects every person in this Dominion, and that unless we awake to the seriousness of the situation we may find ourselves before long in the shades of opposition—I was going to say, which we will fill so acceptably, but which we did fill for an entire decade. We will find that our kingdom will have been taken from us, and that some persons considered more worthy to reign in our stead will be occupying the government benches.

Mr. FORKE: Look over this way please.

Mr. JACOBS: I want to tell my hon. friend the leader of the Progressives (Mr. Forke) that if he is prepared to accept my policy on the immigration question, I will go over to his side of the House and support him on that question. In fact, in order to show how seriously I look upon this matter, I would go so far as to join the Labour group in the other part of the chamber if I found they would do something for immigration.

This whole question of immigration has become acute, Mr. Chairman, owing to the conditions which have been brought about in the United States through the closing of their doors to immigration of all kinds. Ever since the American government put the three-per-cent quota into effect we have been suffering from it, and I will tell you why: The United States, for over a hundred years, have had their doors open to immigration. They have received vast numbers of immigrants of all kinds, of all classes, from Europe, and they have incorporated them into their nation and made men out of them. Suddenly the door is closed. People who have been accustomed to receiving hundreds of thousands of workmen find that they cannot get them any longer, and where do they turn? They turn to the north, and in that way our people are being drawn off the farms and from the cities in order to supply the demand for people in the United States. That is why 10,000 people a month are leaving our country and going to the United States where they are attracted by very large wages. I am told that in some of the border cities of the United States carpenters receive from $12 to $20 a day as wages. How is it possible for us to keep our people in this country when they are attracted by such enormous wages on the other side of the line? We in our unwisdom felt that what is good enough for the United States is good enough for us, and we put up the bars in almost the same sense as the people of the United States. We carefully scrutinize, we microscopically examine every workman who wishes to come into this country to take the place of those who go to the United States. That is why our people are being attracted from the farms and from the cities in Canada to the larger fields in the country to the south. Now, if the minister would realize what is going on he probably would not, with a mere wave of the hand, tell us that in this country there is no room for artisans, no room for city labour, but that what we have to do is to concentrate our energies on settling people on the land.

I point this out to the minister. As soon as we have those people located on farms, they find that things, particularly in the West and, in fact, throughout Canada, in the farming line, are not what they were led to believe, and they flock into the cities in order to obtain the larger wages which are given to all classes of labour in the cities.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): Higher wages and shorter hours.

Mr. JACOBS: Yes, the glare of the gaslight, the movies, and the general social life in the cities. That is what attracts people

from the farms. I venture to predict that if you colonize the West within the next three or four years with half a million farmers, it will be a question of only a very short time when a large body of those people will find their way into the cities, on the principle that if you place two bales of hay in front of a donkey, the animal will make for the larger bale of hay. Why do people go into farming? Because they feel they can make a living. They leave the farms because they feel they can do better in the cities. A farmer who makes $1,500 or $2,000 a year on the farm, working himself, his wife and his children from five o'clock in the morning until sundown or even late at night, is entitled to something more than $1,500 or $2,000. But if that farmer, his wife and his entire family were to locate in a city, they could make twice that amount of money, with shorter hours, better conditions and a better social life.

My suggestion to the minister is that at the time when he is seeing to it that people are placed on the farms, he should also see to it that vacant positions in the cities are filled by people who are accustomed to live in the city. In that way, the farmers will not be attracted to the cities, because the positions there will be taken up. But if you have a vacancy in one place and place an opportunity for leaving in another, it is only natural that the vacancies will be filled particularly if it is found more profitable to fill them. If you make farming pleasant and profitable, and if you surround it with all the advantages which life in this country can give, you will attract people to those farms and those waste places. At the same time, if you see to it that positions in the cities are filled by city dwellers, then you have solved the problem. But nothing of the kind is being done, and the reason of it is that, as our dear old friend Sir Sam Hughes used to say in this House: "There is an unseen and hidden hand somewhere that is arresting the progress of the government." He liked to dwell on the unseen hand.

Mr. BEAUBIEN: Would the hon. member be so kind as to deprive the farmer of an opportunity of bettering his condition by going into the city, by bringing in a considerable number of men to fill up the cities?

Mr. JACOBS: The question is one of the survival of the fittest. I am looking after the interest of the country as a whole, not after that of any particular farmer. I believe the farmer in the end is very much happier on the farm than when he comes into the city. He does not see the thing in that way; but after a while, after it is too late, he comes to realize that he should never have left the farm.

[Mr. Jacobs.]

Mr. BEAUBIEN: How could the farmer be so happy when the hon. member has mentioned all the social conditions that exist in the cities and the very different conditions on the farm?

Mr. JACOBS: The farmer must work out his own salvation in that regard.

Mr. BEAUBIEN: The hon. member, then, is trying to work out the salvation of the country.

Mr. JACOBS: It must be made profitable for the farmer to live on his farm. His freight rates must be reduced to such a figure that he can actually live on the farm. I am not altogether a free trader yet; I have not been converted to that school of thought; but we must reduce, to a certain extent, the tariff on his agricultural implements, his implements of production, and do other things of that kind.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): To what extent—two and a half per cent?

Mr. JACOBS: I shall be glad if my hon. friend will come to my room to-morrow, when we can discuss the whole matter fully, and I am sure we shall arrive at a conclusion which will be satisfactory to us both. We have been told that we are going to have farm labourers brought to this country. That is one of the planks in the platform, if I may so call it, of the department. Would the Acting Minister of Immigration tell me what he is going to do with farm labourers if there are no farms? The farmers are scarcely able to maintain themselves on their farms, working with their own families. How then are they going to pay farm labourers if farming is not profitable? Farming is a seasonal occupation. The farm labourer is used for the seeding and for the harvest, and at the end of that time there is, in a general way, not very much work for him to do. He accordingly finds his way into the city. He is not accustomed at first to doing anything else and he forms a queue for the soup kitchen and the bread line, when unemployment is rife, because it is this class of people not accustomed to city life and who do not know how to cast about when times of stress come on, who are filling up our cities and who create the unemployment question. They are the very first people who come into the cities to swell the tide of unemployment.

Then we are going to bring in female domestic servants. I ask the Minister of Immigration how long he thinks a female domestic is going to be employed in service at $20, $25 or $30 a month, when that young woman can go into a factory and get twice

that salary with reasonable hours of living, eight hours a day, and instead of receiving $5 or $6 a week, she perhaps receives $30, $35, or $40 a week. How long can you keep such women in domestic service? Why not say to them: "Come into the country; look about for yourselves. If you want domestic service, enter domestic service. If you want to enter factories, enter factories." But to have watertight compartments such as are sought to be built by the minister, in which it is declared that this person must go into this service and that person into that, is a mistake; it is against the law of nature and all economic law and it will never succeed. The result will be that we shall always be without domestic servants and without farm labourers, and these people will be filling the factories where they can secure large wages.

I have spoken about the hidden and unseen hand. I should like to read to the committee something which will show the African in the woodpile. This is a despatch from Ottawa, dated January 28, and headed:

Tom Moore fears cheap labour here. Immigration policy would open the door to it, he says.

The despatch reads:

Ottawa, January 28.—Speaking here Saturday night, Tom Moore, president of the Dominion Trades Congress, expressed his views on the Canadian immigration policy. An analysis of a statement made by Sir Edmund Walker showed that the immigration policy was really the opening of the door to admit cheap labor, Mr. Moore contended.

While it has been said that Canada wanted settlers for the land, the lid was being lifted by prominent financial men who wanted more settlers to reduce the labor costs, and Mr. Moore urged that the admission of all classes of immigrants would not be beneficial to Canada, for if cheap labor was allowed in to compete with the established citizens, living conditions could not be ameliorated. The speaker reviewed the achievements of organized labor in Canada, stating that great difficulties had been surmounted and the lot of the workingman greatly improved.

I should like to say a word or two in regard to that. In passing, I might say that this gentleman is now a director of the Canadian National Railways.

Mr. HANSON: Who appointed the gentleman?

Mr. JACOBS: I do not think that requires any answer. When this gentleman spoke I rather fancy he spoke as president of the Trades and Labour Council and not as a director of the Canadian National Railways. I do not know whether he has yet converted Sir Henry Thornton to his views, but there is room for conversion, because the last time I heard Sir Henry Thornton speak he was in favour of a strong and vigorous immigration policy not restricted to the farms. I must express regret that a director of the National Railways should declare himself on matters of this kind. It is not fair to the country; it is not fair to those interests that are advocating a proper immigration into Canada; and by reason of the fact that he is a director of the Canadian National Railways, what he says carries more weight probably than it otherwise would. This man is a paid official of the Trades and Labour Council. He is a sort of glorified walking delegate. He is paid for this purpose, and it is his duty to keep wages as high as possible if he thinks that will enure to the benefit of labour generally. But I must express the fear that Mr. Moore, occupying the high position that he does, is not very much of an economist. He ought to know that where wages are inflated as they are now everything is proportionately dear. For instance, the labourer who pays $40 to $45 a month for his dwelling, which is really worth only $15 or $20, pays the higher rate because he cannot obtain dwellings at any lower figure, the reason being that we do not permit people to come into this country to build houses. There is a scarcity of builders in Canada. You cannot get people to build because they are all going to the United States to get the high wages to which I have referred. So that, although the labourer gets $45 or $50 a week for his work, it is, I venture to say, materially less in reality than the $20 he got before the war. Let us look at the situation. The farmer has already undergone the deflation process. He is obliged to sell his products at 60 to 70 cents in the dollar, but is obliged to pay for the commodities he has to buy, such as manufactured products, not 100 cents, but 150 cents, in the dollar. Why? Because we are obliged to pay labourers more than they are worth. And if you do not cut down the prices of commodities by reducing wages, how is it possible for the farmer ever to get on? It cannot be done. Deflation must take place equally and equably all along the line. But where there is this lop-sided deflation you are bound to suffer as you are suffering now in the West. So that Mr. Moore does not understand the economic situation at all; he is killing the goose that lays the golden eggs. We cannot very much longer stand the conditions that are now prevailing. You pay for your clothing, your boots and shoes, and everything that you need more than twice what you paid for them before the war, but you are getting for your products just the same as you got at that time. And that is going to go on so long as we do not get the cost of labour reduced to the same proportion as the prices of farm commodities.

Mr. CARROLL: Does the hon. member say that we should have lower wages in this country?

Mr. JACOBS: I am saying that we ought to have the same ratio of wages for labourers as the farmer gets for his products. The present condition is ridiculous. What is the use of getting $50 a week wages when you have to pay it all out for your upkeep?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Does the hon. gentleman not think that it would be better for us all round if, instead of reducing the wages of labour to what the farmer receives for his work, we raised the farmer's returns in keeping with what labour receives?

Mr. JACOBS: The hon. gentleman ought to know that the prices of farmers' commodities are fixed in the world's market. Liverpool fixes the prices for farm produce; they are not fixed in Canada. You are confronted with the Argentine, with Russia—at least you will be faced with Russia shortly if not now—with Italy and every other producing country in the world; and it is idle for us to say that we can fix prices here. We tried to fix prices through a Board of Commerce and we know what happened. It cannot be done; Nature must take its course; and I leave this thought with hon. gentlemen of the committee, trusting that they will see that there is something in the argument I have tried to make.

Mr. KELLNER: I think that if you reduced the wages of the working man you would decrease his buying power and the farmer would consequently get less for what he sells.

Mr. JACOBS: How could a reduction in the wages of the labourer decrease his buying power if there were a deflation all round? If he gets, say, $30 a week for his labour and has to pay $10 or $12 for a pair of boots for each of his children, himself and his wife, $40 or $50 for his suit of clothes, and $40 a month for rent, supposing he got half that amount in wages, how could his buying power be reduced if all these other expenses were proportionately lowered?—if he paid $20 a month for his house, $20 for a suit of clothes, $5 for boots, and so forth. After all, what is money? It is simply purchasing power; considered in any other light it is nothing. And if the labourer could purchase with $25 exactly what he can get under present conditions for $50, wherein is his purchasing power reduced?

[Mr. Jacobs.]

Mr. KELLNER: Does the hon. gentleman advocate a simultaneous reduction all round, or is the workingman's wages to be reduced first?

Mr. JACOBS: I am now advocating the bringing in of people and letting them fend for themselves. If we had 100,000 persons brought into this country at the present time, does the committee not see how the wheels of commerce would be accelerated? We should have to have dwellings for these people, they would have to be set up in business, and everybody would be doing something until they got to work and produced for themselves. We have more than enough in this country for every one who wants to come and work. But through the narrow-sighted policy of our governments we have interfered with the natural laws governing immigration and we find ourselves therefore in the present deplorable condition. Someone the other evening referred to the alleged lowering of the standard of living. May I refer the member who introduced that question to an address of Sir Clifford Sifton delivered in Montreal on February 26 in which he speaks of the standard of living. He is reported as follows:

"Criticism is made," said Sir Clifford, "that these people have not as high a standard of living as our own people have. A lot of nonsense is talked on that score. They will have the standard of living of pioneers, and what they can get out of the soil. You cannot get the higher standard of living out of that soil I speak of, and you must get the man who will be satisfied with what he can get from it if you are going to settle it.

"That standard of living would probably be as good as that of the men who were the pioneers of Ontario and Quebec. My own ancestors were Ontario pioneers, and they did not worry about standards of living, but cleared the land, and when they had time they built schools and churches and otherwise laid the foundations for the present conditions. They suffered hardships, but they made a prosperous Christian community, and turned out men whose names have become household words in the history of Canada.

Now, with regard to the complaint that we have unemployment so extensively at the present time that it would be dangerous to bring more people in, I would say that this is one of the stock arguments of our friends who wish to repress immigration into our cities. In this connection I may cite a report of a debate in the Ontario legislature on February 13th. I quote the heading as well as the report itself:

Plenty of work on Ontario farms: $35 to $40 a month and board; farmer can't give more. Must get men.

"There is plenty of employment in Ontario but unfortunately there are a considerable number of men who are not in a position to take advantage of the opportunities of employment offered," said Premier Drury yesterday in the House.

It was an interesting discussion bringing out a sharp difference of opinion as to whether there was an unemployment problem or not. Several labor members claimed that there was a pressing problem of men out of work and quoted a recent return that ten thousand people were unemployed.

Minister of Agriculture Doherty, on the other hand, while admitting there were people without jobs, explained that about thirty applications a day were being received by his department from farmers seeking farm help and it was imposible to supply this demand.

The debate started when K. K. Homuth (South Waterloo) read from the Liverpool Echo an interview given by S. Harris, of the Canadian Army and Navy League, that there was no unemployment in Canada at present except those who would not work. He contended that there was unemployment and people should not be encouraged to come to Canada at the present time. "There are a great number of farmers," said Sam Clarke (West Northumberland) "who would be tickled to death"—

The words are his, not mine.

—to get men who could do the work at $40 to $50 a month and their board. But they cannot get them. There will be a 20 per cent shortage of labour on the Ontario farms by April 15. People can get any amount of work out in the country and if the people would only realize that $2 a day in the country is as good as $4 a day in the city, and keep away from the cities, there would be no unemployment.

G. G. Halcrow (Hamilton East) read a reply from the Minister of Labour that the average wage paid by the farmers was $8.36 a week, with board, and continued.

"As far as I am concerned, I would not be willing to leave a wife and family in the city facing rents and high cost of living and go out to work in the country at $8.36 a week. I would rather stay in the city and all starve together."

"Move them all out," Mr. Clarke interjected.

"There is work in this province for every man who is able to do the work that is offered him," said Mr. Doherty. "If the farmers are to get the labour they need we must bring in people who are prepared to work on the farm. The farmers are paying $35 to $40 a month and board, which is exceedingly fair, in fact, it is only because they are sorely in need of help that they are offering this amount, in view of the low prices they are receiving for their products."

I think that is an effective answer to those who say we have unemployment in the cities. We have people idle in the cities, it is true, but if men engaged in seasonal occupations have an opportunity to go out on the farms and earn money I see no reason why they should not seize the opportunity; and if they ignore it, I do not see why we should concern ourselves further with them, indeed, we ought to wash our hands of them altogether. Undoubtedly it is our duty to see that work is provided for them, but not a paticular kind of work or work in a particular location.

Another citation with regard to unemployment. This is an article from the Gazette of February 28th, incorporating a report from the Dominion Statistician. It says:

According to reports received, compiled and tabulated by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics employment at the beginning of February showed considerable revival from the contractions recorded at the commencement of January, when losses incidental to the holiday and mid-winter inventory period, supplementing seasonal declines, had reduced activity to a marked degree. The reaction was somewhat more pronounced than that registered at the beginning of February of last year, and considerably more so than at the same period in 1921. Statements for the month under review were compiled from 6,253 employers of labour whose pay-rolls aggregated 733,063 persons as compared with 707,859 at the commencement of January. This increase of over 25,000 workers caused the index number to gain slightly over three points, standing at 89.5 as compared with 86.3 on January 1, and with 78.9 on February 1, 1922. Practically all the recovery was recorded in the manufacturing industries, (notably in iron and steel), but logging and coal mining also afforded more employment. Activity in transportation and construction continued to decline, although the shrinkage was on a rather smaller scale than in the preceding months.

This would go to show that we really have no unemployment situation at the present moment.

My hon. friend from Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth) referred the other day to the fact that there are 6,000 unemployed people in the city of Winnipeg. We all know that during periods of depression the unemployed from the country districts flock into the cities. Winnipeg has a population of 250,000, and the district round about must comprise, I should judge, nearly 1,000,000 people, when we take in the Red river and the Assiniboine and Saskatchewan river valleys. Out of all those people in that district merely 6,000 were found to be unemployed in the city of Winnipeg—a negligible number.

Now, we must investigate and find out why those people are unemployed. As is well known, we have a large number of returned soldiers, men broken by their military service overseas. It is impossible to get them to remain in any vocation. They wander about, their former life having unfitted them for steady employment. Then we have the human flotsam and jetsam found in all large cities: these people never work. Of course, they have to be provided for in a certain way, but if we are to be deterred from encouraging immigration by there being a few hundred unemployed people in this or that part of the country, why, we shall never have any practical immigration policy.

I feel, Mr. Chairman, that I have already taken up too much of the time of the committee in discussing this subject, but it is one on which I feel very strongly, as my friend, the Acting Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Stewart) knows. He has in various orders in council a number of rules prohibiting people from entering this country. All kinds of what I would call if I were permitted—I have been permitted and I have called them before—fool regulations, nonsensical rules. Those rules do not accomplish the purpose

intended, but they keep out very many people who would be valuable acquisitions to this country. For instance, one order in council declared that no person unless possessed of $250 could enter this country. I understand that this order has been abrogated. But in place of this monetary qualification, another regulation quite as good, even better, has been put in force. After all, $250 is not a very large sum of money for a person to have in his possession. I have known of cases where $250 did a great deal of good, and in fact the same sum was instrumental in enabling many immigrants to pass the immigration officers. Now it is not necessary to be possessed of $250 in order to enter this country. In place of that regulation we have something much more effective as a restriction. No man of the artisan class who is not a British citizen can come to Canada unless his passport has been vised by the Canadian agent before the immigrant goes aboard his ship. That, I admit, is a very effective restriction. If the artisan is a British citizen he can enter, although even a British citizen used to be debarred unless he possessed $250. If he is an American citizen he does not require the $250 either. The United States take in as many Canadians as are prepared to go there; the Dillingham Act, I understand, does not apply to citizens of our country. But when a Canadian who has left Canada and gone to the United States attempts to come back to his own country he is prevented from doing so on the ground that he has lost, as the order in council says, his domicile—and that is what the minister calls a proper rule. Last year we barred 10,000 Americans from entering Canada at the border—why, I do not know; probably for the reason that from the point of view of their occupations or callings there were no openings for them in Canada at the time. Now, there are hundreds and thousands of people who could come into this country and earn a living as well as any of us can, and who would be an asset to Canada. I do not say they would engage in work in factories, or that they are of the artisan class, but they are small traders, small merchants and so on, who may have been crowded out by the conditions in the United States and elsewhere and who want to get a foothold here. People of this class have always made a success in Canada, but they are not permitted to come in. And, who, do you think, decides whether or not there is a vacancy for a member of the artisan class who seeks entry into Canada? The Department of Labour, so worthily presided over by my hon. friend the Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock). When an application is made for an artisan to come into the country a report is asked for from the Minister of Labour. He probably turns the thing over to the Trades and Labour Council, of which Mr. Tom Moore is the president, and in due course we are notified that there is no vacancy for that particular person and that it is not in the public interest that he be permitted to come in. Is it any wonder that I protest against rules of this kind? We have a lopsided system that will never work. We have a watertight scheme that is bound to fail, because it is not natural. I hope the minister will realize that before it is too late.

[Mr. Jacobs.]

Mr. CARROLL: Before the hon. gentleman leaves the question of passports to immigrants from central Europe, may I ask what is the effect of the regulation to which he refers?

Mr. JACOBS: The effect of it is this: the Canadian official has his instructions and he will not visé their passports, and the result is that the intending immigrants cannot get on board the vessel.

Mr. MARTELL: What information is before the Canadian official to show that that sort of man is not wanted in this country—provided he does not know otherwise?

Mr. JACOBS: He has the information supplied to him from time to time by the Department of Immigration.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): May I be permitted to make a correction? I am prepared to sit here and take all this warm medicine, and when hon. members get through I shall have a few things to say. But there is one statement made by my hon. friend that I cannot allow to pass. The instruction given to the agents on the Continent is that there is a place in Canada for physically and mentally fit people from the countries from which we have been accepting immigration. In fact we have been accepting immigrants from former enemy alien countries in cases where their friends were prepared to guarantee that they would be respectable and decent citizens in Canada. But there is no bar on the physically and mentally fit individual who wishes to come to Canada to farm or to seek employment as a farm labourer.

Mr. JACOBS: I admit there are no restrictions at all; if a person wants to go on a farm or become a farm labourer, he gets in without any trouble and in due course he finds his way to the city. What I want to have is a direct route.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Does my hon. friend suggest that we are being lied to on the Continent in respect to getting people into this country?

Mr. JACOBS: What I mean is this: when they get on the farm they cannot make the farm pay; then they drift into the city. That has been the burden of my complaint during the whole of this afternoon. We have tens of thousands of persons of British and Canadian stock who started on farms in Canada and who are now in the cities. It is not reasonable, therefore, to conclude that those who come here to go on the land, subjecting themselves to the rigors of the West, having no knowledge of the conditions or of farming in a large way such as is carried on in that part of the country—at best they have been engaged only in intensive farming or market gardening—it is not reasonable, I say, to conclude that these people will remain on the farms but will find their way to the cities. I venture to say that ninety per cent of the members of this House to-day were born on a farm or at one time lived on a farm, but ultimately wandered away to improve their position in life. The hon. Minister of Immigration himself, started out as a farmer; now he is a statesman. Why did he not stay on the farm? Because he found it more pleasant and more profitable to become a statesman; and here he is. I venture to say that fifty per cent of the people who are now on farms to-day in the Canadian West would, if they had the opportunity, flock into the cities and help to swell the urban population. I know something of what farming is in the West. It may be a surprise to many hon. members to know that I myself was born on a farm.

Mr. HANSON: Is my hon. friend a statesman now?

Mr. JACOBS: Well, I may say that "Hope springs eternal in the human breast."

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend also probably remembers that "Hope deferred maketh the heart sick."

Mr. JACOBS: Well, that may apply to my hon. friend, who is an ex-statesman. I would invite the Minister of Immigration and the Minister of Labour to come to Montreal: I will get together for them a mass meeting of from 4,000 to 5,000 people; we will fill the largest hall in the city. These people will consist altogether of artisans, and the two ministers can get the benefit of their views as to whether there is need in Montreal and other large cities for immigration of the class that I have advocated. Many of the departmental officials to whom I have referred are first-class men and I have nothing to say against them, but in other cases dry rot has set in, and when that happens the official is of no possible use to the department; in fact, he is a drag on the wheel. Such people ought to be superannuated or otherwise removed and live persons put in their places who could give the Minister proper information upon these vital matters. The Minister, I understand, is managing five or six different departments; he is doing the best he can, but after all he is only human and he has to take his information from people who are living in the past, who are in the nineteenth century, not in the twentieth; who do not know of conditions in the large cities. How many of them have gone to the large cities and interviewed the artisan classes or the employing classes to find out just what the conditions are? Where they got their information I do not know, but what I do know is that they have made a very sorry fist of it if they have given information to the minister upon which he has based his so-called policy which he brought down to the House this week.

I trust that I may have an opportunity later in the discussion when questions arise out of particular estimates to speak a little further. For the present I should like to have some reply, effective or otherwise, or an attempt even at a reply, to what I think is an arraignment against the department and something which calls for an answer from it.

Mr. CHAPLIN: The hon. gentleman who has just addressed the House (Mr. Jacobs) admitted that he was a voice in the wilderness. He admitted also that he was sniping the government from behind. To alleviate the force of his blow, after a little sniping at his own party he seeks to draw the Canadian Manufacturers' Association into the fray as being in some way connected with the Canada Colonization Association with which this government have made some arrangement. I repudiate that statement absolutely. The Canadian Manufacturers' Association, except as individual citizens, had nothing whatever to do with it.

Mr. JACOBS: That is correct. I agree with my hon. friend that it was the members individually of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association who were invited to contribute to the Canada Colonization Association.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I am glad to have that statement from the hon. member because that was the suggestion I took exception to.

Mr. MARTELL: That is what he said at the outset.

Mr. CHAPLIN: The hon. member from Nova Scotia might be quiet for a moment. He will have an opportunity later. I would like to put a few questions to the minister regarding this association with which he has made an arrangement, but before doing so I want to emphasize further what I have to say with respect to the organization that has been referred to. I want to read a sentence from a letter of the Canada Colonization Association written within the last two or three months, and you will see then whether the Manufacturers' Association have anything to do with this association and who has to do with it.

Mr. MARTELL: My hon. friend referred to the hon. member from Nova Scotia. I will tell him that the hon. member from Nova Scotia represents a free-born constituency and is not a counsel for the Canadian Manufacturers' Association.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I understand, Mr. Chairman, that I have the floor. The sentence I wish to read is as follows. This association speaking of itself, says:

> It has the approval and support of the Imperial, federal and provincial governments, the co-operation of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the government-owned railways.

There is no word there or in this whole letter regarding the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, but there is word of the federal government, and I think the hon. member who has just spoken might take the responsibility himself, as a supporter of this government, when it admits that it has made an arrangement for the payment of public money to this corporation.

In the course of his address the hon. member (Mr. Jacobs) told us that this company was without a president. I should like to inquire from the minister who are the officers at present of this association, and would also ask him to give us some further information regarding it. Surely we have a right to know with respect to this company, even if it is a charitable organization, which is good enough for this government to make a contract with of the magnitude it has, what is its personnel and everything regarding it.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The president until recently was Sir John Willison. The vice-president of the company is M. A. Brown. The general manager for western Canada is Mr. Howard Everett, and the general manager for eastern Canada, Mr. George Creelman, of the city of Toronto. These are the main officers.

Mr. MARTELL: Is there any one from Nova Scotia a member of that company?

Mr. CHAPLIN: Would the minister tell us who the directors of the company are?

Mr. MARTELL: Is there a Nova Scotian in that company?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I have not that information.

Mr. MARTELL: Will the minister say there is or there is not?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I could not say that.

Mr. MARTELL: Nova Scotians do not deal that way.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Did the minister say he did not know the directors?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I have not that information at hand.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Would it be too much to ask the minister to let the House know at some future time who the directors are?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Very well.

Mr. RINFRET: I admit that my first words will be to express my sympathy towards the Minister of Immigration (Mr. Stewart). Since he has brought down this policy he has been subjected to criticism not only from both wings of the opposition, but also from behind. I venture to say that if instead of framing his policy he had waited until he was in the House and had heard the different suggestions made to him, and had then tried to put them together, it would have been a tremendous task because I have never yet heard in a debate in this House such a merry-go-round of contradictory statements as have been made here regarding immigration. I will take the stand that even if he has not, as is evident, succeeded in satisfying everyone, yet we should have much sympathy with him in the situation in which he happens to be placed, and understand by the very phases of this debate how complex this problem of immigration is,

An hon. member speaking during the course of this debate stated that the main questions of Canadian politics were the railway question and immigration. Some go further and claim that by increasing population in this country the government will go a long way towards wiping out the railway deficit. It will be

time enough, in my opinion, to deal with that phase of the situation when the railway estimates are before the House, but the problem of immigration in itself suggests so many comments that even at the risk of reiterating what has already been said to-day, one feels that one cannot refrain from expressing his own views.

The minister the other day defined the government policy. He stated that in his opinion it was imperative that Canada secure more people. He argued that the financial burden was heavy on the present population, and that increased immigration would lighten it. He also considered it urgent that some selection be made of the immigrants who apply for admission to this country, and he volunteered the opinion that we should not have too many immigrants for the cities on account of the unemployment situation. With that summary statement I will say that personally I find very little fault. The reasons for an increased immigration are perfectly obvious. We live in one of the largest and richest countries in the world. One who travels across this country from ocean to ocean is astonished at the immense possibilities of Canada. It is a country vast as a continent, but its richness lies dormant in the soil beneath for want of the required number of miners, tillers and workers to bring it to light, and if immigration was imperative before the war I contend that it is even more so now under the present conditions.

We have inherited an enormous war debt. In 1896 our net debt was only $225,738,079. In 1911 it had grown to 326 millions and some odd thousands, and in 1922 it stood at $2,366,861,252. In my opinion it has grown at a rate out of all proportion to our population. It is urgent, not only to increase the number of tax payers in this country, but also to increase the production of wealth and the potential paying ability of the community as a whole.

Now, let us look at the figures of our population. From 1911 to 1921 the increase by immigration to this country was 1,975,393. The natural increase in population was 1,836,407, giving what should have been a total increase of 3,811,800 persons. Yet the net increase during that period was only 1,562,851. In other words, as has been stated before, not only did we lose the total number of immigrants that came into Canada during those ten years, but also 273,000 of our natural increase. I will say at once that I am not placing a definite value at all on these figures. I am one who thinks, in common with many others, that the figures of the last census are not correct. For example, we in Montreal contend that the population of that large city has been underrated by the census figures to the extent of fully 100,000 people. But taking the facts as they are, it is very clear that we need more immigrants if we hope to maintain our population at the figure at which it should stand.

Some say—it has been said in this debate—that we need not spend any money on immigration because all the immigrants we induce to come to Canada leave us, and therefore the money is misspent. But we have no proof at all, Mr. Chairman, that the 1,800,000 people who left us during the ten year period referred to had been immigrants. On the contrary, I claim that if we had had no immigration at all during those ten years the conditions that brought about the exodus from this country to the States would have had their effect to a certain degree, and instead of reporting an increase in population—however small it may look to us—we would probably have had a decrease. And touching this subject I will say, that although I have much sympathy in theory with the efforts made towards repatriation I do not entertain any great hope that that phase of the government's policy, even with the co-operation of the provinces, will have very much effect. I think it is much harder to entice any citizen to come back to this country than to prevent him from leaving, or than to replace him by another citizen through the medium of immigration. Therefore I think it is obvious—and we might in the confusion of opinions expressed in the course of this debate agree, at least, on this point—that we should try, in some way, to increase the number of our immigrants. But it is also true that we must exercise some care in their selection.

As to the country of origin let me say very frankly that this, to my mind, is of much less importance, than the character of the individual immigrant. We may get good settlers and we may get bad settlers from any country on the earth. It is quite natural that we should try to secure a large number of immigrants from the British Isles. It would also be natural for us to try to secure a number of immigrants from France and Belgium. Here let me say that it is very hard to get any immigrants at all from either of the last two countries mentioned. It is well known that even in normal times Frenchmen do not emigrate to other countries, that they are very strongly attached to their native land. If that is true in normal times, how much more true must it be in this period of after war reconstruction. The French government itself is very anxious at this moment to keep its

French children on the soil of France in order that the efforts towards reconstruction be brought to their full fruition. Furthermore, we all know that there is a decrease of population in France due to the falling off in births, and that there were very heavy losses during the war. It is also well known that any immigration propaganda in
5 p.m. France is prohibited by the government of the republic. Such propaganda was barely tolerated before the war; now it is very strictly prohibited. Therefore, I would like to state, in all frankness, that although we are very desirous of securing settlers from France and Belgium, it would appear to be a very hard task, and for my part I would not feel inclined to blame the government too severely if the stream of immigration from these two countries does not flow to Canada more copiously than it does at present.

Mr. SHAW: Do I understand that the laws of Belgium prohibit emigration from that country now?

Mr. RINFRET: I was alluding more particularly to France. I will frankly admit that I am not positive as to what is taking place in Belgium. I am inclined to think, however, that it would be somewhat easier to procure immigrants from the latter conutry, more especially in view of the fact that the population of Belgium is very dense. Nevertheless, it is a fact that it has always been very hard to attract immigrants from both these countries.

Mr. BROWN: There is a large number of Belgians in the West.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): That immigration is under government supervision.

Mr. RINFRET: I frankly admit, for I believe in being frank about these matters, that I have much sympathy with the proposal made by the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St George (Mr. Marler) as regards immigrants from those countries with which we were at war during the great conflict. Such immigration, however, must be under regulation; we must be very careful in admitting such immigrants to this country. Again I say I have no prejudice at all against immigrants coming from any country in the world; I attach much more importance to the character of the individual than I do to the country of origin.

As regards the question of regulations, I will not go into it fully as my hon. friend from George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs) has done. Nor will I say that I endorse all that that hon. member has said. But I would suggest, in a general way, that the regulations be made less rigid in their application, and that the authorities use some discretion in regard to individual cases. I place little faith in any stringent rule which is not intelligently applied and carried out with discretion.

I must say also that I was much surprised, during the course of the debate, to hear so many hon. members opposite object to the immigration of farmers and farm help. I think they are the very immigrants that we do require and that there is unlimited space for them in Canada. The average farmer succeeds very easily in feeding and maintaining his family. The exodus from the rural parts of Canada is not due, in my opinion, to inability to secure subsistence; it is due to the lure of the city, which exerts its influence on well off and very prosperous farmers.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): Does my hon. friend suggest that all the incoming immigrants require is space?

Mr. RINFRET: They require space where they can get busy, where they can live and subsist. The hon. member for George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs) just a moment ago read a report of a sitting of the legislature at Toronto, which report, in his opinion, went to show that we needed immigrants in the city and that we did not need them on the farms. Yet what did he read, but simply this, that farmers in Ontario were all asking for help? He was blaming the men in the cities who needed work for not going on to those farms to help those Ontario farmers. I think every line of the report that he read was ample proof that, in that part of the country at least, if men were needed, they were needed as farm help by Ontario farmers. I am not so sure that we need immigrants in the cities. It is all very well to say that at present there is little unemployment and that most people who really care to work can find work. I know very well that some people will refuse work under any conditions. I will also agree that others will claim that they are entitled to work according to their willingness and taste, their own opinion as to what should be their standard of living; but I claim there are to-day, especially in large cities, quite a number of men who cannot find any employment whatever. We have heard the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George, for whom I have great respect, venture an opinion somewhat in opposition to that, and the hon. member for George Etienne Cartier has said the same thing. I should like to agree with them. Perhaps we

may agree on this point. Every Saturday morning when I am in my office in Montreal, I have about a hundred callers asking for work. If the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George or the hon. member for George Etienne Cartier will tell me where I can send those men, I shall be very grateful to him. In agreement with the government policy, I would strongly object to any immigration effort which would tend to increase the number of unemployed in the large cities of Canada. We want immigrants for the farms; but we have an over supply of population in the cities, and the very fact that there is a tendency to leave the farm for the city is no proof at all that the policy is wrong. On the contrary, does it not show that we should do our utmost to send as many men as we can to the farms and to restrict as many as we can from entering the cities?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): How is the hon. member going to prevent them from entering the cities?

Mr. RINFRET: I agree with the hon. member for George Etienne Cartier when he says that you cannot prevent nature from following its course; but I think by taking the necessary precaution to ensure that any immigrant coming into this country is a farmer or has farming aspirations, we shall go some distance towards that goal. The fact that something is hard to prevent, is no argument at all that we should not attempt to prevent it. It is, on the contrary, ample argument that we should have a policy that will do the utmost to secure that result.

Mr. MARLER: My hon. friend will, perhaps, remember that I said I agreed with assisted immigration as regards agriculture, but I would allow immigrants who present themselves voluntarily to come to the cities.

Mr. RINFRET: I agree with that. I think my hon. friend is closer to my views than some hon. members opposite, and I am glad to record that.

The minister says that he intends to spend money in advertising this country and letting everyone know of its great possibilities. That is very sound and to that I do not object. But he also intends to spend pretty large sums of money with special organizations whose business it is to secure immigrants. He has contracted with the Canada Colonization Association for ten months at a figure of $100,000, provided that they procure a minimum of 200 families during the ten months. I believe that is their proposal. Taking the average family at five, which I believe is a reasonable figure, that will mean a minimum of a thousand settlers who will cost this country a hundred dollars per head. That is paying a very high price, and unless the minister is able to get a much larger number than the minimum stated, he is hardly getting a commensurate return for the money spent.

There is another proposal to spend $600,000 in connection with the British Empire Settlement Board. I understand that board has been working in connection with the Australian government, and while the reports that I have read may not be accurate—I say again you get reports on this matter which are very contradictory—I do not see that the results have been very favourable in Australia. The immigrants which this board has been able to send to Australia have been moderate in numbers and rather low in quality. I believe in attracting immigrants in the ordinary way, but the amount seems very large.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What number does the hon. member say that Australia got?

Mr. RINFRET: I have not that before me. I was speaking in a general way.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is the hon. gentleman's information as to the morale of the immigrants which Australia got?

Mr. RINFRET: Perhaps the hon. gentleman, when he speaks in this debate, will discuss that point.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend made an assertion.

Mr. RINFRET: I think I qualified the statement. I do not object altogether to the large sum of money; but it should not be spent unless we are sure of having good results. I have quite a large amount of confidence in the present government. If I were sitting on the other side of the room, I would probably be more inclined to be cautious. But I am voicing the opinion in a general way regarding the Settlement Board and the Colonization Association, that this is not the best way to secure immigrants for this country.

Mr. MARTELL: Does my hon. friend know who are the members of this company with which he alleges a contract has been entered into by the government? If it is Sir John Willison who is connected with it, I do not wonder at the hon. member's doubting.

Mr. RINFRET: The Settlement Board or the other company?

Mr. MARTELL: The company with which a contract was entered into on the basis of 200 families.

Mr. RINFRET: That is the Canada Colonization Association.

Mr. MARTELL: Who are the members of it?

Mr. RINFRET: I do not know. The government has contracted with the company at a certain figure. I am giving my opinion as to the principle of any such contract, no matter who are the members of such a company. I say, in a general way, whether it be the Settlement Board or the Colonization Company, I take little stock in the work of any such company which indulges in wholesale bargaining for immigrants at a certain figure, for a certain consideration, whether their idea be to get paid for the work they do, or to free another country from a certain surplus of population that they do not want, but that they would like us to absorb. I think that the immigrant who is attracted to this country because he thinks the place is worth while, and comes of his own will, is on the average a better prospect than any immigrant who has been influenced and attracted into the country by companies whose interests are merely to live up to a contract, or who possibly are engaged in relieving other countries of an overflow of population. I would direct the attention of the minister to this more especially, and ask him if he is going to apply his regulations at all rigidly—to be much more stringent with any flow of immigrants sent out at so much per head by any settlement board or company than with the average immigrant who comes on his own responsibility because he has discovered that Canada will very likely prove a fine country for him to live in.

No matter where these immigrants may come from, I say that we should see to it that they shall become good Canadians. What is assimilation?—asked an hon. member during the course of the debate on this question. Centuries ago a Roman pro-consul put a similar question to the multitude: "What is truth?" Now, we all know what assimilation is; we all know what the word means. It means not only that a person coming into this country should be able to speak or should learn one of the current languages of the country, but it also implies the obligation to interest himself in the country's general welfare and become a part of its social and economic life. Any body of immigrants, call them Doukhobors, Mennonites, or by any other name you choose, who retain their peculiar class identity after their arrival in this country and who continue to lead a separate and distinct life from the great Canadian body, falls short, in my opinion, of all that is implied in the term "assimilation." Differences, racial or otherwise, are numerous enough in this country without our adding to their number.

Now, it is often charged that hon. members' utterances on this subject lack consistency and preciseness. Quite a number of questions have been put to every speaker, questions very kindly in their phraseology; and I have done my best to answer such questions. Some, I admit, I could not answer. Possibly that has detracted somewhat from the logical sequence of my speech; and it might have been more advantageous to a proper conclusion of my remarks had I been allowed to travel a continuous and uninterrupted route. However, before I resume my seat I should like to sum up my remarks briefly. We need immigrants, but we should not pay too high a price for them. We need them on the farms and not in the cities; and they should be subject to regulations moderately and discreetly enforced. We should advertise this country, too, as well as improve its living conditions, so as to retain within its borders the citizens we already have. In the expenditure in connection with the Canada Colonization Association and the Empire Settlement Board, I have little faith; and I trust that the government will promptly discontinue such expenditure if it fails to bring proper—and unexpected—results.

Mr. IRVINE: Most of us appreciate the courage displayed by the hon. member for George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs) in attacking members of his own party, and particularly the Minister of Immigration (Mr. Stewart). But I was not very deeply impressed with the policy which the hon. gentleman would substitute for that offered by the minister. I think the hon. member went out of his way a good deal to find justification for a criticism of labour in Canada, and he characterized the policy of the Minister of Immigration as a watertight compartment. I am sorry I cannot say as much for his policy; in fact, it was leaking all over. I wish to show in a few sentences how he misrepresented the policy of labour with regard to immigration.

If I understood the policy as outlined by the minister and by those who have supported him, I should say it seeks by immigration, first, to reduce taxation, secondly, to increase production, and in the third place to bring prosperity out of the economic chaos in which

we find ourselves at the present time. We all agree that these are noble purposes; the intentions back of them are very good; and I think we shall have to extend our sympathy not only to the minister himself but to the Cabinet as well in dealing with the situation that faces Canada to-day. We fully realize that the government did not create these economic conditions which they seek to alleviate through an immigration policy; we frankly admit that they are not responsible for them in any way and that they cannot materially affect them by legislation at this time. We must recognize their problem as one that calls for the consideration not only of the Cabinet, or of the minister or of any party, but of parliament and of the people of Canada as well. The government are in a wilderness of economic difficulties to-day, no doubt because of following to some extent what I would call a vague and unanalyzed tradition.

It has been stated by some of the speakers that have been supporting the policy of the minister that, following the assumption of power by the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Canada experienced a great period of prosperity; and it is assumed that, by continuing an immigration policy similar to that which was in force during the regime of the late right hon. gentleman, a corresponding prosperity will ensue. Now, there have been periods of prosperity so-called and periods of depression. These alternate; and a period of depression is simply a sign of the coming prosperity, and vice versa. But prosperity does not come merely because an immigration policy of any kind is in force. It is not detracting in any respect from the greatness of Sir Wilfrid Laurier to say that his immigration policy was not what constituted the prosperity attributed to his regime. There are many economic factors that enter into these cycles of prosperity. There is such a thing as a world situation to be considered, where the producers of a country can find a market for their produce. There is manipulation of credit, by those who control the financial system of a country; there is inflation as well as deflation of credit, reflecting itself in high prices or in a slump in prices, as the case may be. Then there are favourable crop conditions, and hundreds of other circumstances to be taken into consideration. So that we must not assume, merely because prosperity happened to obtain during a certain political regime in Canada, in which an immigration policy was fostered, that we shall therefore usher in again a similarly prosperous period by the adoption of another immigration policy of the same kind.

I submit that there is no connection between an immigration policy and prosperity, except that prosperity may attract immigrants whereas immigrants do not necessarily bring prosperity in their wake. The government are evidently aware of the unfavourable economic conditions that prevail, and have attempted to bring forward an immigration policy by which in part they seek to remedy these conditions. The government are conscious of enemies of the state as for instance unemployment, high prices of commodities, high taxation, and an enormous national debt—these enemies are besetting the nation, and the government is striking at them. I think it is striking in the dark, assisted ably by the hon. member for George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs).

Now, it is all very well for us to criticize, and I think most of the criticisms we have listened to so far have not contained much of constructive value. I purpose to advance the ideas of labour with regard to immigration, and I hope that the government will at least listen to my suggestions, if they do not follow them in detail. I scarcely anticipate that the hon. Minister of Immigration will adopt the policy of labour in toto, but I do hope that he will give it consideration. Speaking for myself, and attempting as best I can to interpret the opinions of labour on immigration, I want to state that they are not opposed to immigration. The attack made by the hon. member for George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs) would lead the House to believe that the policy of Labour in this country was opposed to every kind of immigration under all circumstances. It is true that we oppose certain policies of immigration that do not make for permanency, policies which do not take proper care of immigrants after arrival, policies which have been inaugurated with an absolute disregard of conditions prevailing at the time. These are the reasons for our opposing immigration on certain occasions, but our opposition is not to be regarded as permanent.

That all hired labour outside of Canada must be secured through the employment service of Canada is one of the requirements which the labour organizations of this country demand from the Minister of Immigration. And it is not difficult to see why they should urge this requirement. I understand that last year certain companies in this country requested that several thousands of miners be immediately shipped in from Belgium to work our coal mines. That request was investigated by a certain organization in this country, and it was discovered that there were already enough miners here to take care of all our

requirements; in fact there were more than were necessary to operate our coal mines. In such circumstances it surely would have been folly to bring from Belgium a thousand or more miners who had specialized in that particular line, and thereby less fitted by that very specialization to take up other vocations, even if opportunities offered themselves. That is one reason why Labour is opposed to certain policies of immigration under certain conditions.

We want an immigration policy that, first of all, will contain in itself the elements of permanency when put into operation. Much emphasis has already been laid upon the fact that Canada is an immigration sieve, that we take in immigrants on one side and drop them out on the other, that we are losing to the United States and perhaps to some other countries more immigrants than we take in, notwithstanding the expenditure which has been made to attract them here. The problem for Canada, according to the Labour view, is not so much one of immigration as one of emigration and colonization. How, then, do we propose to colonize? Here are a few suggestions which I would submit for the consideration of the minister dealing with this question.

First, I submit that a colonization scheme should be devised to settle our vacant lands close to railroads. That immediately brings us face to face with the high price of lands. How are we going to settle immigrants who come here with very little money on lands that are close to railways? These are the high-priced lands, the lands that, somehow or other, have been secured by favoured individuals in this country. The minister said that he thought approximately $1,500 would be a very fair beginning for an immigrant to settle upon the land. How far would $1,500 go in purchasing land valued at the lowest possible price at $20 per acre, some of it as high as $50 per acre very near a railroad? How is that immigrant going to begin with $1,500 to pay high interest charges on his purchase, to equip himself with the implements necessary for farming, and to feed himself for at least a year? I tell you what would happen—

Mr. MARTELL: I would ask my hon. friend, why should the taxpayers of Canada pay one cent to any person to come into this country? If people want to come, let them come so long as they are not physically unfit or Bolshevist. It is better to keep one good Canadian here than to bring in fifteen hundred foreigners.

[Mr. Irvine.]

Mr. IRVINE: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member has stated my position about as clearly as I could state it myself. I am not advocating that we pay money to bring people to this country. I am trying to show, as the basis of my opposition to the present immigration policy that after paying money to bring them in we cannot keep them here.

Mr. MARTELL: We should not pay anything.

Mr. IRVINE: What will happen with a $1,500 beginning is that the immigrant will have to look for work in the city to pay the interest charges on the farm which he will never be able to own. Fifteen hundred dollars will not go very far in purchasing land. So some scheme must be found to free our land for the use, first of all, of the people who are here now landless; and secondly, for those who may subsequently be brought in. In pursuing this idea we should have an examination of all lands listed, and there should next take place an expropriation of all lands held at unreasonable prices. I have used the term "expropriation." Let me modify that and say, let us tax that land in order to free it. Such a procedure will increase the revenue of the country, while at the same time forcing the land from the hands of the exploiter and into the hands of those whom we are bringing into this country to increase production.

In the next place, we request that assistance should be given for the building of farm homes either to the labourers on the farms that we propose to bring in or to the farmers themselves.

Now, it may be asked: Whom should we first colonize; when lands have become available? In answer to that question—assuming of course that we are going to introduce single tax and free the land quickly—I submit it as a reasonable proposition that it is better for us to begin to colonize the people who are already in Canada than to go outside for others while our own people are walking the streets. If we cannot colonize the people that we already have, by what process of reasoning does the Minister of Immigration presume to be able to colonize new comers? That is a question which I should like him to answer when he replies to all the tirades of criticism to which his policy has already been subjected. If, then, it be a sane and good policy to put people on the land, we want first of all to colonize our land with the people already here, those in the unemployed ranks at the present time, and those who may be employed but who would rather go on the land if they saw an

opportunity of making a living there. I am not going to deal with farming conditions. These, I presume, will be dealt with by the hon. members representing the farming interests of this country, and dealt with well, I have no doubt.

Colonization opportunities, I insist, should first be offered to all residents in Canada, and the employment service offices should be used as recruiting offices in this connection. Let me for a moment in this respect refer to the child immigration policy of the Minister of Immigration. I think he proposes to encourage the bringing in from other countries of children somewhere around the age of fourteen years. I may not be quite correct in stating that age. However, let me point out what happens to the children of Canada, and ask the minister if we should not try by some means to keep our own children alive before we begin to import others from outside countries. The number of children who died in the respective provinces last year before they were a year old was as follows: Prince Edward Island, 180; Nova Scotia, 1,311; New Brunswick, 1,299; Ontario, 6,763; Manitoba, 1,533; Saskatchewan, 1,814; Alberta, 1,391; British Columbia, 602; Quebec, 11,389. This is an enormous death rate among children, yet we are to go over to Great Britain or elsewhere and bring in others. It is true that those we intend to bring in are older than those referred to in these statistics, but if we could keep this large number of children alive they would make far better citizens than any children we could bring in, even if we went to Scotland for them. It was recently found in Alberta, the great farming country that is to be laid open for these immigrants, that 1,500 children were suffering from malnutrition. If we cannot feed our own children now; if we cannot keep alive the children we have brought to life in this country, why should we seek to bring others in from other countries?

I understand that it is the law in Ontario that children shall go to school until they are sixteen. Does the minister want to bring in children at the age of fourteen and put them to work—that is what I call cheap labour—with farmers, thus violating or helping to violate the law of the province and lowering the educational standard of the community? If not, what provision is he going to make that these young boys and girls coming from Great Britain, leaving the opportunity of getting an education there, shall, in spite of doing chores and becoming the servants of farmers, have an opportunity at least to get as good an education as they would have got had they stayed in their native country—indeed, as good as any other child in Canada gets under the present law?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Every child coming into Ontario or any other province from an outside country who is under the age for leaving school will come under the provisions respecting school attendance.

Mr. IRVINE: In accordance with the law?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Mr. MARTELL: Does the hon. member not think that Canada can get all the people of all sorts and classes she wants without spending money to bring large numbers here who will starve or be drugs on the Canadian market?

Mr. IRVINE: I am glad that the sentiments I wish to express are echoed from the government side. I shall come to the advertising in a few moments; for the present I am trying to submit a constructive policy embodying the expressed opinions of organized labour in regard to immigration.

We believe that some organization should handle the colonization scheme that I have suggested. I would add to that suggestion that the Soldier Settlement Board or some similarly qualified organization should be charged with the work of surveying and reporting upon available lands for settlement in all parts of the Dominion, keeping in view the fact that it is our own people we first want to colonize. If we succeed in doing that, it will be a good argument for the getting of more people to colonize. All this might be summarized in that well known and well worn phrase, "Back to the land." Getting back to the land ought to begin here; if we follow some such scheme of colonization as I have suggested and get our own people on the land, we will not need to advertise for others to come in from outside.

Our manufacturers to-day are highly protected, on the ground, as they say, that they are infant industries, and so on, and that they want to be sure that their investments are safeguarded. All that labour is asking in regard to immigration policy is that their interests may be, not protected, but given some consideration. Labour desires that it shall have the right to live, not that it shall be degraded and destroyed by any immigration policy whatsoever. If the Canadian Manufacturers' Association can claim protection from this parliament for their machinery and their investments, it is surely fair and reasonable that labour should ask parliament not to advocate or advance a policy that would imperil the rights of labour to get

work and life. But in all probability labour would be deprived of these humble rights if we followed out the policy outlined by the Minister of Immigration. If every immigrant who comes to this country is a benefit to Canada and a potential producer of wealth, it surely goes without saying that each unemployed worker in the country at the present time is of equal value, and if we cannot utilize his value now, it is doubtful whether we would utilize the value of those other prospective immigrants after spending two or three hundred thousand dollars in bringing them here. So our first problem from a labour point of view is to put our own people to work. What that may involve I am not at present prepared to say. I know it involves the whole economic problem of our day, but if we cannot solve it to some extent we should not make it worse by following the policy of immigration outlined by the minister.

Let me conclude by summarizing the suggestions of Labour:

> Begin by creating facilities for emigration of our own population from industrial centres to the farms thus relieving congestion in the urban districts; deal effectively with the problem of finance and credit to eliminate usury and exploitation to-day existing; liberate the workers from the fear and results of unemployment and establish full opportunity for profitable employment; export in their highest manufactured form raw materials and natural products obtainable in Canada; release the natural resources held out of use for speculation by private interests and provide equal opportunity for all for their fullest development; encourage scientific and industrial research to discover commercial uses for many articles to-day considered valueless.

With regard to advertising for immigration, let me quote an advertisement which appeared in the London Times and which came from the Minister for Immigration for South Africa. If the minister would advertise like this, I think we would not object to the spending of a little money for advertising. It reads:

> Migration is again to the fore. Tens of thousands among all classes, see no future unless it be overseas. Their problem is where to go, and what to do there.
>
> If they have sufficient capital, the Union of South Africa is the country to settle in, farming is the career to take up. It is a likeable country, and in its farming there is a living to be made, and scope for progress.
>
> Capital is however necessary. The migrant will require at least £2,000 for even a modest start. South Africa is therefore not open to mass migration, but that does not make it less attractive to those who have capital. This is being increasingly realized;—

Mr. MARTELL: Does my hon. friend know who it is over in England who selects the immigrants that we do not want?

Mr. IRVINE: My hon. friend, being closer to the Minister of Immigration, is in a better position to answer that question than I am. I am certainly not asking for any selection of immigrants, but I am saying that from such an advertisement as I have quoted, it is not likely we shall have any great rush, and if we have no great rush of immigrants to this country we shall not have the resultant difficulties we have had during the last few years. I want to finish this quotation to show that South Africa has taken a different course with regard to advertising from that which we have followed in Canada:

> This is being increasingly realized; the stream of migrants to the union of South Africa is comparatively small, but it is select and continuous.
>
> The people who in recent years have gone to the union of South Africa are people not only of means but of judgment. They went only after weighing the prospect. What satisfied them may merit investigation by you. Is it not worth looking into?

Now if South Africa is getting the immigrants that have judgment and capital, I submit that in view of the present economic conditions in Canada the only immigrants we could hope to get would be those without judgment, and I do not think it would be good policy for us to spend $200,000 or more in trying to get into this country immigrants who have no judgment.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): Mr. Chairman, I want to say frankly that I rise to oppose the minister's immigration policy. My great objection, of course, to the minister's policy is his endorsation of the Canada Colonization Association. I am very sorry that the minister has apparently taken a place in this great national colonization scheme that is lower than that taken by the Colonization Association. I had hoped that at least he would be the leading figure, the chief authority in the whole matter. I have an article here that was released for evening papers Winnipeg and west of Winnipeg, Monday, September 11, 1922, and also for morning and evening papers east of Winnipeg, September 11. It starts as follows:

> The Western Canada Colonization Association, in close co-operation with the federal and Imperial governments and the Canadian railways have worked out a well matured land settlement policy, which is to be put into effect forthwith.

That in the first place is my objection to this whole scheme. The date of announcing this policy was in September of last year. Just about that time we had harvested one of the largest crops that had ever been grown and matured in Canada, and it seems to me, reading between the lines and considering the whole question, that the people who were interested in this scheme remembered the good times we had in Canada as a result of the crop of 1915. I remember reading how in southern Alberta the farmers went to various loan company officials who refused to

accept payment of mortgages in full. Possibly in this case the Canada Colonization Associatoin was expecting a return of that sort of prosperity and was ready to climb on to the band wagon. At least, that is the impression I have received from reading their literature and putting that together with the date of the announcement of the policy. However, "the best-laid schemes o' mice an' men gang aft agley," and it must have been so in this case. We have not had a return of prosperity since the tremendous crop that was grown and matured in western Canada last year. In fact, I doubt if the country is as well off on the whole as it was one year before.

I want to examine further the manifesto of this association. In the leading paragraph we have the problem and the solution stated, as follows:

> The British and Canadian governments have joined with the Canada Colonization Association and the Canadian railways in a co-ordinated land settlement plan covering all the provinces. An efficient colonization machine is being set up and will begin to operate forthwith. Colonization in Canada has been at a comparative standstill ever since 1913. Yet nothing is clearer than that effective land settlement on a comprehensive scale is the only available solution of the country's pressing economic and financial problems. By increasing the farming population and agricultural production throughout Canada, we shall lower freight rates, stimulate business, lighten the burden of the national debt to every individual family, lessen federal, provincial, and municipal taxation, and go far to eliminate the serious annual deficit on the National Railways.

The scope of the plan is comprehensive enough. It promises a great deal, promises what no group of men anywhere can guarantee. The first promise it makes is that it will bring back prosperity. That is a very general statement.

It is also claimed that it will lower freight rates. Now anyone who studies the question of freight rates in Canada during the last ten years will, I think, come to the conclusion that increased population does not necessarily mean lower freight rates. Of course, there may be circumstances to take into consideration; the circumstances during the next ten years may be altogether different from those during the last ten years.

Mr. MARTELL: Can the hon. member tell me who is the Deputy Minister of Immigration and where he is at the present time?

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): No, I have not been investigating that matter. This national scheme of land settlement, presided over and controlled very largely by the Canada Colonization Association, according to this manifesto promises a great deal. Some of the things that it promises will, I think, be fulfilled, but considering all the statements made in this manifesto I think it shows a great lack of real consideration for the welfare of the intending immigrant.

I have no objection, in fact, I am very anxious like any other Canadian to see our railways prosper, and the country as a whole, but unless we give the intending immigrant every consideration, and a great deal more than he will obtain under this land settlement plan, we can never have an ultimately successful immigration policy. The first thing we learn, according to this manifesto, that the settler is going to do is to lighten our burden of debt. That means that the settler will have to assume a certain portion of our national debt when he comes into Canada as a settler. Though I am not a prophet, and have never professed to be, I would not mind guaranteeing that that promise regarding the incoming settler will be absolutely fulfilled regardless of what government or governments may be in power for the next ten or fifty years.

Regarding the lowering of freight rates, I do not think we have any real justification at the present time for saying that the mere incoming of immigrants will lower freight rates.

Mr. MARLER: Will the hon. member not admit that if the railways get increased traffic they will have greater earnings, and that consequently we may ask for a reduction in freight rates?

Mr. KENNEDY: (Edmonton): That is a different thing from what the Canada Colonization Association is preaching in this manifesto.

Mr. MARLER: I asked the hon. member a question. Does he not admit that?

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): That it is possible? Yes. I certainly do. I wonder if the benefits that are supposed to accrue to the people of Canada, or to the people who are already here are passed on, or if the intending immigrants are informed as to both sides of this question. I remember in the Highlands of Scotland, away back in the year 1900 and a few years following, the very roseate literature that we used to get on immigration. I remember that on the front page of these pamphlets there would be a picture of a tar-paper shack, and two or three pages further on an illustration of an experimental farm and generally, beneath the picture was written "After a few years." Of course, railways and other conveniences found mention. I believe, however, notwithstanding the literature issued in the Old Land by the Department of Immigration that the works of Ralph Connor exercised the greatest force in interesting the people. I want to say further that

in any literature sent abroad, either by the government or by this or any other like association, the effort should be to tell the truth as nearly as possible, and not seek to create a false impression. When the advantages which may accrue to settlers coming to Canada are dilated on there ought to be, side by side with that statement, some account given of the disadvantages which the new arrivals will have to face.

The men who were behind the present scheme when it was announced—and I suppose that their spirit controls its operations even at present, at any rate to some extent—were not farmers, and yet they were associated in a movement to induce farmers to settle on the lands of western Canada. The president of the association at that time was Sir John Willison who has written a book entitled Reminiscences, Political and Personal. Now on page 10 of that work we find the following:

> But one may love the woods and the fields and not like farming. I got away from the farm as soon as I could, and I have not wanted to return. Nor have I ever heard that there was any desire that I should. It is often said that a good farmer has been spoiled to make a poor lawyer or a poor doctor. Whether or not I am a good journalist, no one who knows will suggest that I was likely to become a good farmer. The fashion changes. It is a sure word of prophecy that the movement towards the cities has spent itself. Moving pictures, rural mail delivery, good roads, motors, bath-rooms, house furnaces, and many other devices to save labour, enhance comfort and relieve isolation, make the country ever more desirable, and better prices give the farmers an increasing but still inadequate return for their labour. In a democracy rooted in the soil lies the sanity and stability of human institutions. But we cannot all be farmers, and to many of us a call comes that will not be denied. Whether we go to town or country, still blessed is he that findeth himself.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): When the committee rose at six o'clock, I was dealing with this national land settlement plan as advertised in the western papers on September 11. The plan is, according to the language of the advertisement, to drum up settlers in the United States and also in Great Britain, though I understand the association is not operating in Great Britain at the present time, to bring them to Canada and to settle them on the land. The first thing that must be ascertained with regard to a settler is whether he has enough cash to start on a quarter section of land. He is to be settled on unoccupied land. The vast majority of such settlers will, of course, come from parts of the country which have been fairly well developed, where they have barns, houses, fences, water supply and other necessary things for the successful operation of a farm. To take men of that type with what little stock they may bring along with them, to place them on unoccupied quarter sections and to ask them there to make a payment of two dollars an acre and to sign an agreement that they will pay the balance in thirty-two years with interest at 6 per cent, even though under the agreement they have not to pay any principal for the first two years, is something of a problem.

The weakness in that scheme lies in this. Supposing a settler comes from some one of the fairly well-developed western states to Canada, and buys land on the recommendation of the association or any officer of the government. He can hardly be said to be doing that of his own initiative. From my knowledge of farming and of the real estate business in general, as it has been and is being carried on in western Canada, I think more mistakes have been made through men buying farms or lots on the recommendation of others, be they real estate agents or otherwise, than in any other way, and this has been a great detriment to the country. To bring settlers in from the United States, regardless of the organization that is instrumental in bringing them in, or from Great Britain, should any come from there, and avail themselves of the services of this Canada Colonization Association, and to tie them down, or as Sir John Willison says, to get them rooted on the land with an initial payment of $2 an acre and an agreement to pay the balance in thirty-two years, before they have had time to become fairly well acquainted with the seasons and the general conditions prevailing in the country is, to my mind, a big undertaking and one of the principal weaknesses in this scheme.

Life on the farm in western Canada, especially, is a life of loneliness in many cases, and if there is one thing above everything else a settler needs, if he is to make good, it is self-reliance and personal initiative. If settlers are brought into this country by a shepherding organization, many settlers will very likely be brought in who would not on their own personal initiative have come in, and the result will be, I am afraid, that we shall have a larger percentage of failures under this scheme than possibly we could have had under any other plan. I came to this country something like twenty years ago; I have gone through the various stages of homesteading and so on, and my experience has

been that the easiest thing in all those twenty years was to emigrate and that the hard experiences came afterwards. If we are going to settle 15,000,000 acres in western Canada under this system, I am afraid we shall have a very much larger percentage of discontented settlers than we have at the present time. It is much easier for a settler to become discontented and it is much more likely that he will become discontented under this plan under which he is advised to buy land by an organization such as this, than if he came of his own initiative and took up land because he wanted that land and because he was led to want it through his experience in and knowledge of the country.

We are advised further that this association, through its officers, is going to set up what it calls "community clubs," which, apparently, are going to look after those settlers after they come to Canada in order that they may not drift to the cities. It will be very difficult to prevent them from doing that, and that phase of the operations of the organization is practically worthless. After the settlers have been established in communities and they have those local community clubs organized, I find in this circular what the clubs will do:

(a) prepare a chart of its particular district which will indicate occupied and unoccupied farms.

And so on.

(b) assist the officials of the Canada Colonization Association in securing listings of land.

(c) Report on vacant lands and land valuations in each district.

Apparently, after these community clubs are established in various districts, they are going to be used to further the interests of the Canada Colonization Association.

(d) Induce local farmers to write their friends "back home," advising them of the advantageous opportunities for land settlement in their neighbourhoods.

I am afraid we have in this something that might become a rather dangerous principle. The settler pays his $2 per acre down in the first place, and then he signs an agreement to pay the balance in thirty-two annual payments with interest at 6 per cent. After he pays down his initial $2 per acre, he gets two years without paying any principal; but I am afraid that to take hold of a raw quarter section and to grow anything more than feed for stock during those two years, will be more than the average settler can do. Although the ordinary farmer is not a man who is very ready with his pen or fond of writing letters, it is possible that some of them might be induced, through a promise of an extension of time on some payment that might be overdue, to write to their friends back home. I am afraid we are being asked to endorse something that is not in the best interest of the settlers who might come to this country through the agency of the Canada Colonization Association.

It is stated that the landowner will pay the Canada Colonization Association $2 per acre. There may be some dispute in regard to this. This manifesto would indicate that the owners of vacant lands would pay the association $2 commission. It is open to dispute, however, as to just who will pay that $2. It may be that conditions will be such that land cannot be raised in value an extra $2 to meet that commission; but from a knowledge of real estate practices in the country I am afraid there is a chance that in a great many cases this is what will be done. We have not solved the problem for the settlers in bringing them in in this way; and I will go further and say that encouraging settlers to come in this manner, who would not otherwise be likely to come, is not a very good guarantee for their future success as farmers, at least in western Canada.

There are others, however, who are going to benefit from this organization. Thousands of absentee owners of unoccupied lands along the railways are tired of paying heavy taxes and super taxes on these unproductive holdings and would gladly dispose of their property at prices and on terms that would facilitate purchase by incoming settlers. The absentee landowners will be benefited. I also find that the American as well as the local land men will be provided with business. I find here that the former Minister of Agriculture of the province of Alberta will shortly tour the British Isles speaking in support of British agricultural emigration to lands in Canada. The statement is made, too, that others will be employed by the Dominion government and the association in an endeavour to work up this great land settlement plan. The association, it is said, has a subscribed capital of $1,500,000. It does not show in this manifesto how much of this has been actually paid up. So far, I do not know; and I am wondering whether anything more has been paid in in cash than has come from the federal treasury. The expectation of the officers in charge of the organization is that between $30,000,000 and $40,000,000 will be earned in commissions in the next ten years, to be disbursed in the working out of this plan; and it is further stated that the plan is non-profit sharing. Well, there are various ways of sharing profits, and I think that profits are often paid in salaries. And, of course, if they are paid in salaries and good salaries in some cases, dividends may

not be necessary. I have no confidence in this plan, and I would much rather have seen the minister control the whole immigration policy himself through his department and its officials.

A good deal has been said about the value of British and American immigrants to Canada. We have been given to understand a great many times, not only on the floor of this House but also in agricultural papers throughout the country, and from other sources, that these settlers could bring to us a knowledge of intensive farming which we need very much in Canada. I do not quite agree with that view. I believe that we do need a little more intensive rather than extensive farming in Canada; but I do not believe that the new settlers coming in from the United States or Great Britain are the people that are going to show us how to carry on this farming. I believe that the demonstration is more likely to come from the men who have been through the mill in the past few years of our country's history and who know the mistakes that may have been made. What are the conditions on farms in the Old Land? On farms of 100 acres there you have good fences, good stone buildings, and every convenience at hand. You will find possibly five persons on such a farm besides the tenant, who generally goes around managing the business. Who could not farm intensively under such conditions? Do you think settlers coming from the Old Country are going to apply those same intensive conditions here, where one man would have to tackle a whole quarter section himself, in addition to building fences, herding stock and putting up his buildings, possibly all at the same time? That is a different matter. The Old Country settler coming out here and settling on land under this plan might find, after he had done his day's work, that he had no good pasture to put his stock in for the first summer, and he might be driven to the necessity of merely hobbling his horses and turning them out at night while he rolled himself under his tent or retired into his cabin, whichever he might happen to have, in the hope that Providence might be kind enough not to allow the mosquitoes to drive them away before morning.

Mr. MARLER: Does the hon. member approve, or does he not, of inviting British settlers, agriculturists, to come here?

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): I approve of inviting British settlers to come, but not under this plan, which would place them on the land before they had any knowledge of the country.

[Mr. D. M. Kennedy.]

Mr. MARLER: Would it be impertinent to ask the hon. gentleman whether he could suggest a better method of getting them here?

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): Just allow them to come; they will come if conditions are fairly reasonable.

Mr. MARLER: That does not answer my question.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): Let the hon. member state his question again.

Mr. MARLER: Under what conditions would my hon. friend suggest inviting settlers to come here if they are not competent to take up farming of this description?

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): Let us inform these people just how conditions are here. We have immigration agencies in the Old Land. I suppose there are still immigration agents in Glasgow, Edinburgh, London and such places, and they could give the people a fair knowledge of the facts, placing before them both sides of the situation. They could come if they wished, and I think there would come as many as we can assimilate and settle under present conditions. But when you undertake to drum them up, according to the language of this pamphlet, you have a different problem altogether on your hands.

I am very much interested in this question of immigration, and nothwithstanding anything I may have said against this plan, I am in favour of seeing a reasonable number of immigrants come to this country. But I am opposed to this plan because I think we are putting the cart before the horse; we have not finished with the colonization plans we have had under way for the last number of years, in the West at any rate. The most recent undertaking of this kind was the soldier settlement scheme. I happen to represent a constituency that possibly has the largest block of land settled in the last ten years—I refer to West Edmonton as the constituency and the Peace River country as the settlement. We have in that country Britishers, Americans, French Canadians, Germans, Russians, Hungarians and all the other nationalities now represented in Canada. And I want to say to hon. gentlemen that I do not see very much difference in all those settlers. As one hon. member said this afternoon, it is not so much a question of nationality as of character; there are good and bad people in all nationalities. But those settlers are having a hard time. There is a large German settlement in the Peace River country. I must say that they are very good settlers, and they were good citizens during the war.

Mr. MICHAUD: What about the other settlers, were they good citizens, too, during the war?

Mr. KENNEDY (West Edmonton): Yes. These German settlers have had an agent in Mexico lately to see what the prospects are down there, because they have been so greatly disappointed in the railway facilities promised them and which they require so urgently. From 1918 on a large number of soldier settlers came into the Peace River country. They took up homesteads, of course, back from the original centres of settlement. In 1910, 1911 and 1912 the good clean prairie land was picked up, and a great many of the soldier settlers are back on the poplar-covered land.

I do not think we have yet done our duty by the settlers in this country. A great many of them who came in from the United States have informed me that wherever they went during the years previous to 1911 and 1912 they were met by immigration agents of the various railway companies advertising the country and describing the proposed railroad through to the Pacific coast, and inducing them to come in in the belief that before they got well established all those railway facilities would be provided.

Now, I suppose it may strike some hon. members that the Peace River country is so far away that we should not use it as an example. But we have settlers also in West Edmonton who are located right along both sides of the Grand Trunk Pacific and that branch of the Canadian National Railways running northwest from the city of Edmonton, and among these settlers are many ex-soldiers. It may surprise the committee to be informed that settlers in the Peace River country are just as well off as those located along the Grand Trunk Pacific fifty or seventy miles from Edmonton; but this is undoubtedly the case not only as regards those settlers located in the brush lands but those who have settled in the more open stretches. And one of the main reasons why I am opposed to the present immigration policy is that I do not think we have done our duty by the settlers who were induced to come into the country by promises of railway and other facilities. I do not suppose the government is prepared to spend a great deal of money for the construction of branch lines in western Canada. My constituency is not the only one that needs such accommodation, but we have been very anxious to get a railway built from Grande Prairie south to the Canadian National railway, thus giving us a short cut to the Pacific coast instead of hauling our produce two thousand miles and more to the east. However, unless we get relief of that kind I fear we are going to lose the settlers who have gone in there and tried to establish themselves during the past ten years. Therefore I cannot see the wisdom of drumming up settlers in the United States while we are losing the men who came in on the strength of these promises ten years ago.

Mr. JACOBS: Is it not a fact that about twenty thousand settlers have left that district?

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): No, not yet. Ten thousand probably have left during the last four years but there was a population of 18,800 when the last census was taken. There are still about three million acres of settlement in that district, and the population, as I have said, is approximately about twenty thousand. The land is just as fertile as any in Canada. I repeat, the reason I am opposed to spending money to drum up settlers at the present time is because we can get the same results by retaining the settlers we have already if we are able to give them the railway facilities that they so urgently require.

Now, it may seem unreasonable to say that this government must fulfil all the promises and pledges given by immigration agents ten or fifteen years ago. I know it is difficult to pin down a corporation to redeem the promises made by an agent who may have acted more or less without instructions. Similarly it may be hard to pin down the government at the present day to redeem all the promises made to these settlers in days gone by to induce them to come into the country; but the settlers are there, and if we are willing to spend a few million dollars to bring in more settlers, surely it is the part of wisdom to spend money to retain the settlers that we have already on the land. It will take the new settlers at least five years to become acquainted with the climatic conditions of the country and be as efficient farmers as those already settled there, while the latter have their equipment and are ready to go ahead under reasonably favourable conditions. I would make that constructive suggestion to the minister and government in the hope that he will be able to adopt it.

I hope also some means will be found to assist the returned soldiers located on these brush lands to clear their holdings. Most of them that I have seen during the past summer will pay about twice as much to clear their farms as it will cost to buy new land under the method of clearing by hand. I think in some instances mistakes were made. However, there is a way of clearing this land by fire, and I hope the department

will be able to see its way to help these men to clear their lands by this method. It will cost in some cases $50 an acre to clear land in the ordinary way, where it can be done for less than a dollar an acre by fire. Consequently I think the system would be well worth consideration by the minister. It was tested two or three years ago not very far from McLennan on the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia railway, and proved very successful.

In conclusion I wish to read an article from the Farmers' Advocate of Winnipeg, dated October 10th, 1922, which states:

> It is true that a great many farmers think that the bringing of immigrants will be a fruitless endeavour. Naturally enough, they argue that the policy will not be beneficial to Canada because the established and experienced farmers of this country are having a hard time to dodge the sheriff. This fact, however, has no real bearing on the question of future immigration. If it had, the logical thing for us to do would be to discourage immigration until farmers were agreed that farming held rosy opportunities for new settlers. We know perfectly well that if we waited for this decision we would wait in vain, for, speaking in a general way, farming is never universally profitable. Farming, especially in the West, is a perennial game of chance with the elements and experience has taught us that agricultural prosperity is very seldom general. Certain methods of farming sometimes pay where other methods fail. Certain districts get good crops when other districts have crop failures. Immigration cannot possibly aggravate this condition, for, as we have said before, a good immigrant is never a charge upon the state or the farmer.

Now, if the conclusion of that paper that we can never make farming profitable is well founded, that is a great tragedy so far as this country is concerned. If that is the final conclusion of the wisdom of this country, where our universities are turning out trained economists by the dozen every year, there is something radically wrong with our educational system. I believe that by co-operation we can yet reach a system under which we shall have something nearer equity throughout this Dominion than we have at present. I believe also that if the industries of Canada, would be willing in hard times to assume their share of the sacrifice with the industry of agriculture, even to the extent of going without dividends when farmers all over the country were operating at a loss, we should have a better country and be able to assimilate all the good immigrants we could obtain from the United States, Great Britain or elsewhere.

Mr. ST. PERE (Translation): Mr. Chairman, Canada, we hear everywhere, is an empire in itself, both as to size and natural resources, having, however, no more than the population of a province. Immigration would therefore be the sure cure for most of the ills from which the Dominion, at present, suffers. Double the population and you thereby diminish the debt by half; double the population and you will supply the National railways with the positive means of reducing the accumulated deficits.

Canada, Sir, seems to be in the same situation, to-day, as that in which the United States found themselves in 1880, with this difference, however, that our country did not leave the gates as wide open, so that a selection was more thoroughly made to eliminate the greatest number of possible undesirables.

The Canadian parliament has already passed legislation in regard to what constitutes an obstacle to the admission of immigrants to Canada. Section 38 of the Immigration Act bears the stamp of good common sense, but it is important in its present circumstances to have a better knowledge of its purport. Subsection "C" of the above section is of special interest for residents of large cities, for it gives the government the power to check all immigration of foreign labourers in these times of industrial unrest.

It is a common saying that work is picking up in cities. This is in a certain measure true, but let us not be led to believe that the working class have all the bread necessary. Being a representative of a large labouring constituency whose citizens are neither Bolshevists nor Soviets but rather genuine workers whose only aim is to have employment, I am sorry to state and especially to witness that many of them, notwithstanding all their good will and the help they receive from people enlisted in their cause, cannot obtain regular work the year long. Therefore, let us not import foreign labourers while the industrial uneasiness lasts. The hon. member for Fort William and Rainy River (Mr. Manion) gave us to understand the other day that we must admit immigration of labourers able to perform certain work which our people refused to do. I have no knowledge of the work he refers to, but I do know that, in the city of Montreal, no labourer has refused any hard job, such as pick and shovel work, etc., when their own and their family's bread was at stake. Let us not rush in the matter of favouring a certain class of immigrants. Sir Clifford Sifton, an ex-Minister of the late Laurier administration, objects even to the proposal of a wholesale recruiting of British workmen as immigrants:

> "This scheme is absurd," he says, "and if we admit 10,000,000 British people within ten years, at the end of the same period, 7,000,000 will have crossed the American border, because it is impossible for our government to bear up with the expenditure that such a movement would entail. In that space of time we can hardly accommodate 500,000 and it is all we ask

for. Moreover we must especially lay stress on the type of immigrant and without any hesitation refuse admittance to all those who would be incapable of becoming good farmers and honourable citizens. We do not need artisans, workmen and tradespeople. We neither care to admit Clyde mechanics or labourers of the south of England. He goes one step further than his rival from Cambridge and states that the idea of turning into good farmers these workmen is a dream, that these people hate country life, and will never settle there. It is also useless to carry on immigration wholesale as certain people propose to do. To emigrate is an individual question, and what one must seek is the individual who answers our wants and to whom we can offer reasonable means to work on a farm which is government property first, but which will later become his own.

The Minister of the Interior thought it proper to specify that his department will especially look after the immigration of farmers and farm labourers. An order in council, dated May 9, 1922, provides that an immigrant desirous of working on a farm, possessing a knowledge of the work to be done and especially assured in advance of a place, may be admitted to Canada. Paragraph 2 of this order in council should be strictly adhered to, if we wish to avoid abuse, for the bona fide farm hand could quickly become a common labourer or docker, as soon as he tires giving to the land the best of his energy.

Our large towns have already too many unemployed; let us watch that their number be not increased by applying strictly paragraph 2 of this order in council.

I am fully aware, Sir, that all do not agree with my views on the subject and I respect their convictions while holding firmly to mine. The hon. member for George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs) gave us, this afternoon, a splendid description of the conditions of the working class in cities so as to support, on solid grounds, his claim in favour of an open door. According to him, we might think that we had returned to the prosperous days of the Laurier administration. The workmen, he says, earn good wages, pay high rents and nothing seems to justify the demand made by organized as well as unorganized labour against the import of foreign labour. I have never taken the habit of playing to the gallery, my electors have not sent me to Ottawa following a campaign made to rouse labour against capital, but I owe it to them, in all justice, to expose before this House their true conditions. The working class of the electoral division of Hochelaga are mostly skilled hands who had in the past plenty of work at the Angus shops, the Vickers dock yards, the locomotive works, and the large shoe factories, and so forth. The trade depression which followed after the great war has thrown out two-thirds on the street and the remainder hardly work enough hours per week to meet the expenses of the family budget.

I have consulted with business men of my division and nearly all agree to say that the unemployment crisis and the lowering of salaries places them in a dilemma. I must however acknowledge much to their praise that since the beginning of the crisis they have generously come to the rescue of these workmen who had been their good clients during the days of prosperity and that they have continued to make advances to them on the strength of their good name. Let the hon. member for George Etienne Cartier go to the trouble of making a small inquiry; he will verify that our textile workers are far from having an easy time, and I may add without fear of contradiction that the conditions which prevail at home are practically the same as those of other working divisions in Montreal. Providence must have been specially kind to the hon. member for George Etienne Cartier and his division; I therefore congratulate him and his electors on the enjoyment of a degree of prosperity that the other divisions of the great metropolis envy.

So as to further strengthen his arguments, he has graciously invited the hon. Minister of Labour to a monster labour meeting where the workmen shall give proof of their entire satisfaction of the present conditions. I know, Sir, that contradictory meetings are out of date, but I would ask him to invite at this labour meeting all those of the other Montreal divisions, so that we may discuss on the spot, if it is necessary to open, to-day, the gates of Canada to foreign labourers. I fully know that a negative vote would soon kill such a suggestion. Some one may suggest that the farm labourers should come out and settle down in cities. Perhaps, but there would certainly be a way to prevent them by special legislation that would hold on the farm those who were admitted in Canada under the express condition to give themselves up to farming. This rule, however, would only apply in times of industrial crisis as the one we are experiencing. I am therefore opposed to the open door policy as are all the English, Scotch, Welsh and French-Canadian workmen of my electoral riding.

England and Wales have made serious efforts heretofore to provide a living for 618 people to the square mile. The unemployed are more than a million and more than a million pounds sterling have been spent to keep them from the horrors of famine. To alleviate this social scourge, the British government intend to spend £2,000,000 so as to

remove a great number of these unemployed to the different dominions.

I am of opinion, Mr. Chairman, that only those immigrants desirous of living on the farm should be, at present, admitted to Canada, and what is more, be granted a little money to keep its people at home.

So as to relieve the industrial centres already too congested, the advantages of land settlement offered to foreign immigrants should also be offered to Canadians. I know, sir, that the government has already done a great deal in that way by settling the veterans on the land. In so doing they but wrote another page in the history of Canada; for the soldiers of the Carignan-Salières regiment, those of the Scotch regiments who took part in the battle on the plains of Abraham, were the first in our country to drop the sword for the plough.

If it is good policy, sir, to encourage immigration on the farm, we must of all necessity encourage them to remain on Canadian soil. Statistics show to our regret, that most of the immigrants entering Canada between 1881 and 1922, have practically all left the country to emigrate to the United States. Sir Clifford Sifton refuses to blame the different governments that have succeeded one another, or put it down to the tariff, for the emigration of our people to the neighbouring republic. He acknowledges that with the exception of the French Canadians and a few others wishing to better themselves, those who left us were not worth much to Canada, and, they would have become, in a very short time, parasites.

The hon. Minister of the Interior intends to do a great deal to "repeople" Canada by encouraging a farming class of immigrants to this country who could buy farms on easy terms and by being given help from certain provinces so as to give to this campaign a more conclusive and practical object. The government gave proof of national spirit by organizing a special campaign encouraging the return to their native land of those French Canadians who left to establish themselves in the manufacturing centres of New England. If our friends on the opposite benches only wish to recall the fact, it was under the Conservative administration that the exodus of our people began. An hon. member belonging to the Progressive party, who is certainly not aware of the spirit of justice and equity which prevails in Quebec in regard to the distribution of government grants, asked the hon. Minister of the Interior, if the funds expended for the above-mentioned campaign would be applicable to the English speaking Canadians. If so, there would be no grounds to be scandalized if we so insist on the repatriation of the French Canadians, because as pointed out recently by l'Ecole Sociale Populaire, in a communication to the Minister of the Interior, should not the province of Quebec which has been paying for the last twenty-five years for the recruiting of foreigners destined to other provinces, keep its people?

Canada has been up to now, if we are to put faith in statistics,—and statistics are occasionally reliable—a sieve for immigrants brought here at our expense. Henceforth, our immigrants should be possessed of a different spirit and their only desire before coming across to our country, should be to live here forever. I know, Sir, that we shall never be able to prevent all our immigrants from resisting the powerful attraction of the great country to the south of us; however, so as to diminish the attraction of that great magnet, let us make life easier for all the citizens of Canada by a wise and judicious administration. The government has decided to allow a certain class of immigrants to enter the country. Very well, but to keep them here we must first train them. The recruiting agent should certainly show practical results in the country where he is called upon to work, but we must give him an agriculturist as an assistant who can advise the future settler on the character of the arable land, in the province where he intends to settle. Let not the immigrant come here and tempt fortune in a haphazard way.

What are to be the means employed to bring this campaign to a successful issue? An intelligent and truthful publicity carried on by agents speaking perfectly the language or the dialects of the country where they are sent to work.

Is the Civil Service Commission capable of selecting such agents? I refuse to believe it. The selection of such agents should be left to the minister, because qualified applicants may be easily found.

Mr. Chairman, shall this immigration be to the benefit only of the western provinces? I do not think so. Let us consult the statistics of last year; the immigrants that settled in Ontario were more than 38 per cent, in the West 42 per cent and in the East about 18 per cent. While the other provinces were losing almost all their immigrants, Quebec, during the last twenty years, has kept the 500,000 immigrants it received plus 146,000 the natural increase of its population.

The government's project, as recommended by the hon. minister is very acceptable, since

he provides in the majority of cases for the reimbursement of the money which he will have paid out to draw settlers to this country. The collateral securities that the immigrant will have to put up in certain instances will shelter the government against any loss. Let the government watch over the selection of those who are to settle here. The worthy immigrant may become intolerable and the latter may change and become undesirable.

Let the repatriation of our people take precedence over all the other means to "repeople" Canada. Let a thorough examination, both in regard to moral and physical fitness of the future citizens of Canada, be made at the embarkation port, and let us be especially assured that the applicant possesses the spirit which will allow him to accept the ways and customs of our country. Let us not commit that great blunder that befell a governor of a large French colony, who wanted "his black subjects to accept progress against their will."

Our new settlers should be before and above all assimilable and we should not be obliged to alter entirely their notions in order to have them co-operate with us.

The primary requirements to be heeded, sir, are those in connection with human activities: when to act, how to act and in what limits to act?

A wise and prudent answer to each of these questions, will contain the whole policy of our government on the subject of immigration.

A scrupulous attention given to the selection of the new seeds which it is the intention to sow on Canadian soil will produce presently a new wheat whose maturing ears, under this same sun of liberty and tolerance, will ripen into a truly Canadian nation. Such united efforts witout favouring sectionalism as regards the interests of the different provinces of confederation, will promote the progress of our beautiful Canada and enable it to fulfil the sublime destinies that Providence has reserved for it on this continent of America. That, sir, will be the eager aim and desirable outcome of a sound policy of immigration.

Miss MACPHAIL: Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the debate on immigration which has now been going on for some time. Some one made the statement to-day that possibly ninety per cent of the members who sit in this House were born on the farm; it would be interesting to know whether that estimate is true. If it is, I can only conclude, after listening to what a great many of the members have had to say, that some of them at least have very short memories; they have forgotten what living on a farm means. I thought from the speech of the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Marler) that he did not understand farming until he said that a person with a sound brain, much courage, and two pairs of capable hands could make a living when he turned his attention to cultivating the soil. I concluded then that the hon. member did understand farming. I was glad that the hon. member representing another Montreal constituency (Mr. Jacobs) spoke to-day because he made life on the farm and the difficulties which just now attend it so very plain that he saved me the trouble of doing so.

I believe that the real difficulty in Canada to-day is that there is too much difference between the standards of living of urban and rural people, and I believe that if we could re-adjust the rewards of life and effort we could solve the whole problem. Because the way to deal with the immigration problem is not to bring in new settlers, but to spread the present population more evenly over the country, in that way relieving congestion in the cities and avoiding the scarcity of population in the rural districts. I think that one of the things that makes people fight shy of working with their hands in this age is that as a nation we do not sufficiently respect those who toil with their hands. We have almost forgotten the biblical injunction that we were to earn our living by the sweat of our brow. I am amazed—and I feel that I would not be fair to myself, to my people or to the members of this House if I did not say so—I am truly amazed at the sentiments that are expressed by some of our well-groomed luxuriously living friends. They evidently have not had their brow wet with sweat for some time, or if they have their hands were not soiled with work on that occasion. I want to say right here that I respect more a person who knows what a good honest day's work is, a person who works with hand as well as brain, and who works so hard that he or she goes to sleep aching with weariness, than I do those people who disdain the very idea of toil and try to make it appear to the world that they do not understand what actual work means.

Mr. BUREAU: So say we all.

Miss MACPHAIL: I think that that is at the very basis of this problem in Canada.

In connection with this immigration scheme one hon. member recommended bringing in servant girls to Canada to work in homes, to do the work that the woman of the house would do if she did not have a servant. But that girl is not considered the social equal of

those for whom she works. Why not? If her character and her brain are as good is she not the equal in every way of the woman of the house who hires a servant simply because her husband is in a financial position to enable her to do so? I think it is time we were trying to even up social standards and not make such a difference between those who work with their hands and those who work with their heads—work exclusively with their heads, I mean.

I do not see why there should be such a great anxiety to bring into Canada more farmers and more farm labourers at this particular time. The farmers are already, with the help of the experimental farms and the many things that have taught them how to produce abundantly, producing more than they can get rid of. There is no shortage of production, and yet it is sought to bring in more people into Canada to further produce when we are unable to consume what is already grown. This must have the effect of throwing upon the markets of the world a surplus which must be consumed somewhere.

9 p.m.

I am very much opposed at this time to any large expenditure of money for immigration purposes. I believe that the immigration offices which have been kept open for years should remain so, and that immigrants,—fit in body and mind—that offer to come here should be accepted; but that any great scheme of what I might call artificial immigration should be launched at this time is, I think, a mistake. A great deal has been said here about farming conditions in western Canada, but very little has been said about farming conditions in Ontario. Consequently one would judge that people on the farms in that province were having a very pleasant time. That is not true. Farming in Ontario is right now passing through very strenuous times, and suffering more than it has done for a great many years. I received a letter, not more than a week ago, from the director of our organization in the township of Proton, Grey county, and in it he said that farming in Proton this year would not return them 3 per cent on the money invested. He also stated:

> All that is keeping us on the land is the fact that we cannot get off.

This letter did not come from a fanatic but from a man who is a successful farmer, as successful as farmers can be under existing conditions. I have heard it said many times that we have passed through the worst of the economic distress. I hope that is true, but I do not believe that it is. If the revival of trade in Canada is to depend on the increased buying power of the agriculturist, I feel quite sure that that revival is yet some distance in the future. The unsettled condition of Europe has very much to do with poor prices for farm products. The depreciation of the currency in many European countries which prevents them from buying food which we so abundantly produce, and the high tariff against us which prevents our sending our foodstuffs into the United States, all make it look to me as though a revival of good times in Canada would be very slow in coming. If that be true, then why are we going to spend this year a vast sum of money, an increase of a good deal over a million dollars, to bring settlers to Canada to put on the land, to live under conditions which the people who have been on the land during good times cannot live through? If we want to help things in Canada, I would make this suggestion to the Minister of Immigration (Mr. Stewart) amongst the many dozens of other suggestions he has received. If he wants to cheapen living and to make life more livable in Canada, I would suggest that he import more manufacturers, doctors and lawyers and cheapen the cost to the producer, so that when we take sick we shall not have to spend so much in order to have a doctor come and see whether we are going to die or not, and when we scrap with our neighbour over something, the lawyer will not get the property of both.

Mr. JACOBS: That does not happen in Quebec. It may in Ontario.

Miss MACPHAIL: I know we have some very gracious lawyers from Quebec. I am glad to learn that they would not do such a thing.

Mr. BUREAU: The same is true of the doctors. They would not see people die.

Miss MACPHAIL: I really think this is not the scheme of the common people, neither the farmers nor the labourers, nor the ordinary working business people. I really believe this scheme has been carefully prepared by those most interested in immigration, by those who would reap the reward of the labour of the immigrant. They have always been interested in immigration and they will always continue to be. I think it is quite possible that railway and steamship magnates, financial knights, land corporations and the government which they control, have more to do with this scheme than the people. The United Farmers' convention, in December of last year—and I am proud to call myself a representative in the House of Commons of Ontario agriculture—passed this resolution:

Resolved that this convention is utterly opposed to any system of state-aided immigration of agricultural workers or prospective land owners until economic conditions are so changed as to ensure the retention on the land of a fair proportion of those born there.

The whole question of immigration is one of economics. If you can make farming conditions in Ontario, in Quebec—because the farmers in Quebec are not very well represented in this House—in the Maritime provinces and in western Canada, livable, so that the people who work long hours, who have hands which bear the marks of much toil, who are faithful, who have courage, can, as a reward of their toil when applied to the land, have a fair amount of the good things of this life, whether those good things are in pleasure, in enough property to keep them in comfort in their old days, in culture or anything else—when that is true, that is all the immigration agency you will need; and until that is true, until farming in Canada is able to hold the best blood that is born on the land, you can spend all the people's money you want to spend in bringing people out and putting them on the land, but the best that are there will leave until conditions are rectified.

Mr. NEILL: I will leave to members from the prairies to discuss this question more immediately in relation to the farming industry there, because they are so much better qualified to do so. I will only say that I do not at all approve the suggested arrangement with this colonization company.

There are two minor matters to which I wish to allude briefly. The first is this, and so far as I know it has not been mentioned by any of the speakers. The Minister of Immigration (Mr. Stewart) told us, in fact we know that there is in vogue to-day a system whereby the railway agents of the Canadian Pacific and the Canadian National become agents of immigration to the extent that they solicit applications from farmers for labourers, and then they gurantee immediately and speedily to supply that labour from Britain or Europe. I object to that because the government have gone to a good deal of expense to inaugurate a system of employment bureaus,—and they have shut down private employment bureaus—the idea being that wherever any scarcity of labour existed, application would perforce be made to the nearest government bureau and they would keep in touch with labour conditions throughout Canada. If there was a shortage of labour in one place and a surplus in another, they would be in a position to supply,—to feed the labour out—where needed. If a demand arises, as it so often does on the prairies, for labour which is of a mere seasonal character, they are generally able to supply it from the farms or towns of Ontario where that labour could return. But under this system, these railway agents act as immigration agents and the result will be confusion. Suppose the employment bureau has decided that a certain amount of labour of an agricultural character is required and they have provided for that. They suddenly find that these so-called railway immigration agents in the prairies have got orders for a certain number of farm labourers and they have rushed them in, in excess of those that have been provided for by the bureau. The system is not a good one, in any case; the people who solicit emigrants in the Old Country or Europe should not be those who have a direct pecuniary interest. Very often these agents in the Old Country are paid so much a head, and experience has shown that this is not a desirable practice. This system of having railway agents act as immigration agents is calculated to promote confusion with government bureaus, and the labour organizations strongly protest against it.

The other thing I want to draw attention to is the fact to which the minister alluded yesterday when he said: "We have no immigration agent in Norway". If there are in the world any people who make suitable settlers, they are Norwegians. I hardly put them second to the inhabitants of the British Isles. The latter are superior because they are familiar with our language, but beyond that, Norwegians and Swedes are in many cases better fitted to be pioneer settlers in this country than men from the British Isles, because in Norway and Sweden conditions in the rural districts are very similar to the bush districts of Quebec, northern Manitoba and British Columbia. Therefore, those people take more quickly to conditions existing in Canada when they come here. They make sturdy industrious settlers of the finest type, and they are very readily assimilated; in fact, the second generation cannot be distinguished from our native-born. They are a distinct advantage to our nation because they improve our blood. It is a notorious fact that nations in the northern part of Europe, brought up in a hard climate and under severe conditions, are of a more virile type than the peoples of southern Europe. We were told last year when this question was under discussion, that we had an agent at Bucharest and another at Warsaw. I would suggest that they be taken away from Bucharest and Warsaw and put into Norway and Sweden, and we would

get a better class of settlers from those countries.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I am sure the hon. gentleman did not hear my remarks correctly yesterday. What I said was that we were prepared to go into both those countries the moment their governments would allow us in. We quite appreciate everything the hon. gentleman is saying. The moment we have that permission we will go in, but so far we have not that permission.

Mr. NEILL: Does the government of Norway object?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Mr. NEILL: I have a clipping which I took out of a local paper and which is headed:

Norwegian fishermen on their way to the Coast.

I may say that the Norwegian makes the very best class of fisherman, next shall I say to the Scot. It says here that:

Twenty Norwegian fishermen bound for Vancouver and Prince Rupert to engage in fishing at these points passed through here to-night.

Now, that is a forerunner of the fishing immigration that I anticipate, and I think I can justly anticipate it in consequence of the steps the government is taking in deference to the report of what is termed the Duff Fisheries Commission to reduce the number of Jap fishermen. It is claimed out there by the cannery men that ruin stares them in the face if they cannot have the labour of the Japanese; and yet within a few weeks of the publication of this report we find Norwegian fishermen on their way to take the place of these Japanese. And there are many more who will follow.

Now, that is all the criticism I wish to offer on the so-called policy as some hon. gentlemen sneeringly designated it, of the Minister of Immigration. I will go further. I will say that I congratulate the minister—and I say it in no spirit of sarcasm at all—not altogether on the policy that he has brought down but on that portion of it which he has not given to us. I say that, I repeat, in no spirit of cheap sarcasm, because I believe he has done a better service to this country in omitting a good deal of the policy which it was reported he would bring down. We heard a great deal about a much heralded immigration policy that would be introduced by the minister, but we did not hear anything about it from the minister himself. We heard it from a carefully arranged system of propaganada which was used to educate the public and incidentally to educate the minister himself into the idea that we should have the bars flung down entirely and a huge bold immigration policy put into force. First of all, those who were anxious to see such a policy put into effect ran to the minister and told him, "We must have this policy because it is needed in the interests of the country." Then, they ran to the public, through the medium of the newspapers and other sources, and told the public in bated breath, "Oh, the minister is going to bring down a grand, broad policy"; and they return to the minister and tell him that the public expects this policy and he must come through. But I give the minister credit for having withstood the influences that were brought to bear upon him. That the pressure was great we have only to listen to some of the speeches that have been made here to be convinced; and we learn as much from the press during the past six months.

There is no question that there was a skilfully arranged propaganda to force the minister into such a position that he would have to bring down practically an open-door policy. There are a number of people, perhaps I might call them unthinking people without implying any reflection on their intelligence, who have not thoroughly studied this question, and who have a vague idea that after the Liberals got into power in 1896 there ensued a wave of prosperity. The Liberals have preached that so often that no doubt a number of people believe it; and I think they almost believe it themselves. Associated with that fallacy also is an equally vague idea that the prosperity that prevailed at that time was correlative to the big immigration policy that was in operation in the years immediately subsequent to 1896. But we must bear in mind what the conditions were at that time. It is absurd to say that because something was successful then it will necessarily be successful now, when conditions have changed. What were the conditions then? There was absolutely free land, and abundance of it, close to the railways, and the markets of the world were crying for wheat. There was at least one transcontinental railway being constructed and later on there was another which took up the surplus labour that was not disposed to go on the land and become farmers. But what are the conditions to-day? There is no free land now. Land has been quoted at $18 to $25 an acre, and while that might not be costly under some conditions, it is surely costly in comparison with land which was got for nothing and which my hon. friends to my left say they can make nothing out of to-day. Hon. gentlemen to my left declare that out of that land which was free originally, a living cannot be derived to-day.

I am justified therefore in the assertion that land is costly now. Besides this, it is remote; because if it is eighteen miles from a railway, my hon. friends to my left state—and I have every confidence in their correctness in this regard—it is beyond the limit at which you can profitably haul wheat to the market. So that summing up, there is no free land to-day, what land there is available is costly, it is remote, there is no railway construction, and there is practically no market, or at any rate a restricted one for wheat. And I shudder to think what the conditions in the prairies would be to-day if we had to compete with the wheat that used to go to the European market from the south of Russia. If that wheat were being unloaded on the market to-day the conditions in the prairies would be a good deal worse than they are.

An hon. member on the opposite side, the name of whose constituency I regret I have never ascertained, but whose charming personality will never be effaced from my recollection, spoke about the unseen hand, the hidden interest. He also mentioned something about an Ethiopian in the woodpile. Well, I too seem to be able to smell an Ethiopian in the woodpile; but it is a different woodpile, and a slightly differently coloured Ethiopian. I maintain that there is good reason for the assertion that the real insistent demand, what I might call the original demand, for this bold immigration policy of letting down all the bars comes from but two sources. It is true it is put forward by many other bodies now, no doubt many were innocently intrigued by the skilful propaganda that has been carried out. There are many men who firmly and honestly, I think, believe that we should have such an immigration policy and who had nothing to do with the origination of this propaganda. But I am firmly convinced that the real insistent demand for this flood of immigration—cheap labour is really the term—comes from but two sources with which I will briefly deal. The first one is the transportation companies, and that applies as well to our own railways and steamships. I have here a cutting from a paper of last October, which says that the transportation men, a number of high officials of the railways and steamship companies waited on the Hon. Charles Stewart, and presented to him a memorandum urging the adoption of "an aggressive immigration policy." The companies represented at the conference were the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Canadian National Railways, the White Star Dominion Line, the Cunard Line, and Anchor-Donaldson Line, and no doubt they represented other interests allied to them.

Now just consider the way in which these people submit this demand of theirs to the minister. They do not come and say "We represent a transportation company or a steamship company and we want the job of bringing over immigrants." Not at all; they were not so crude. It is the naivète of the thing that amuses me. They come and tell the minister, "We, acting on the high principle that what we suggest is in the best interests of Canada, demand in the name of Canada this bold immigration policy." This is very much on a par, I think, with the action of a delegation that might come to this House as representing, say, the interests of the brick manufacturers. Suppose such a delegation should say to the government that they demanded, in the name of the good of Canada, that we should pass a law, by reason of the danger of wooden houses being easily destroyed by fire and because of their short duration, that all houses should henceforth be made of brick. Now, what would be the first idea that would suggest itself to one's mind? Why, one would say, "You are not a good witness; you are an interested party. You may be acting for the good of Canada, but we have a shrewd suspicion that your mind is more filled with bricks than with any high principles about the interests of Canada."

The parallel, I think, is complete. It would be better, we should say with the Scriptures, to let another man praise thee and not thine own mouth. If the transportation companies want to bring people over to this country it is their legitimate right to do whatever they can to secure for themselves that traffic. But when they presume, in the alleged interests of Canada, to dictate to the minister what policy he shall adopt, that is entirely another thing and they are going beyond the bounds of reason.

The other body which, I claim, is at the back of this demand for a bold immigration policy is the large corporation of employers in Canada. Their ideal of a proper industrial condition is that there should be always a large surplus of idle population, a sort of bank of idleness, a bank of reserve labour from which they can draw when they need labour and obtain it without much competition and which, when they have used it to meet an emergency, they can put back on the shelf for the general public to warehouse against the time when it may be needed again. They want such a bank of labour which they can draw upon at their convenience and foist off upon the public when they are done with it.

Now, that used to be a popular idea and the world saw nothing wrong with it, but times have changed and the world has learned

that we cannot afford to do that—we cannot afford to allow large numbers of men to remain idle for long periods. It is too costly and too dangerous and can no longer be tolerated. We used to think that labour paid the price of that storage—did we not?—but we know now that we pay for it. We pay for it in the mental and physical deterioration of the workers for one thing. We pay for it as well in the cost of the doles, amounting up to millions. In the Old Country those unemployment doles amount to many millions every month. They are forced to do it over there or there would be a revolution. We are forced to do it in Canada to meet the ever-pressing demands of the unemployed, and we pay in that way as well as in the other way I have indicated.

We pay in many directions, and we pay perhaps most of all in this direction—in the economic degradation of our workers. Mr. Chairman, I have never had the misfortune to stand in a bread line, I am glad to say, but I have been perilously near it. I have been for weeks unable to get work in spite of the most assiduous efforts, and I realized then, as one only can from personal experience, how rapidly and how insidiously the deterioration of a genuine worker goes on under those conditions, especially for single men without home ties—conditions which people would hardly believe. The tendency to deteriorate is rapid. Those in the lower stratum, those with small education, eventually turn or tend to turn into hoboes. We do not have many in Canada, but they have hundreds of thousands of them in the States, caused by just such conditions as I have outlined. There was an investigation held some years ago, and testimony taken, and it was shown that many of those hoboes were honest workingmen originally, but who had drifted into the hobo life, and having once acquired the habit it stays with them. Those men a little higher up, men with a little more education and brains, are not so apt to become hoboes as they are to live on their wits and prey upon the public. They say, "Well, the world owes us a living," and they become parasites on society. That is another way in which we pay, and pay very dearly, for this warehousing of labour for the benefit of the corporation employers until they may need it.

There is another way we pay for it—in the increase of the smouldering discontent of the labouring men in Canada to-day. A lot of people think that because a fire is smouldering it is not very harmful. A fire may be smouldering but extending, and when it bursts out into conflagration it will be a great deal worse than if it burst into flame at the outset. And our economic methods to-day are tending to increase the smouldering discontent of the working men. It is all very well, Mr. Chairman, to airily dismiss it as Bolshevism. Bolshevik is the term applied nowadays to anyone who opposes you politically. But it does not follow that these men's opinions are Bolshevism; they are not. I would rather call it—and I speak of what I know because I have been amongst these men—I would rather call it the settled unalterable conviction that a large body, a majority in fact of the people of Canada are not getting a square deal from the minority, the ruling and employing classes. I do not say that that conviction is justified—it may be so, but at least it is only so in part. But it is there, and it has to be reckoned with, and these long periods of unemployment in mass formation, so to speak, are just the sort of thing that incites and increases this sentiment.

For these reasons and for many others I am strongly in favour of our going slowly in allowing ourselves to be made the vehicle, not to say the tool, for piling up a large surplus of idle labour for the corporation people to play with as they may require it. Industry if it tried—but it does not—might often improve industrial conditions of labour. By seeking a way of readjusting their business somewhat they could often cut down these periods of seasonable unemployment, but they do not do so because they find it much cheaper to yell about a broad policy of immigration to get the public to bring in these immigrants, and then we common people, the ordinary bourgeoisie, so to speak, have to pay the price of keeping the men idle when the corporations no longer need them. In the States there has been the same propaganda. For the last six or seven months the corporations there have howled about how badly they needed labour, just the same as they howled here in Canada, but apparently the plutocrat does not seem to be on top just now in the States because we find that during a recent session of Congress the quota of immigrants allowed from any given country was cut down from three per cent to two per cent; and not only that, but the basis was changed. This two per cent is calculated upon the immigrants of one year, a year much earlier than before, and the result is to still more greatly reduce the quota of immigrants. More than that, Congress passed a measure absolutely excluding all Asiatics, which again reduced immigration. Surely with that object lesson

before our eyes this is no time for us to pull down the barriers and have a free-for-all immigration. But enough of that subject.

Now, Sir, I just want to suggest two new ideas. I do not think they are really new, but they may be to some hon. members. And of course the fact that they are new will lead many hon. members to look at them askance and with suspicion; it would not be for the first time. Twenty-three years ago I remember advocating in the legislature of British Columbia that the then system of taxation was a poor one and that a better system to adopt would be that of the income tax. I did not find a man to back me up in what is now a commonplace. There was an hon. gentleman sitting opposite me, a member of the cabinet, and a very wealthy man. He looked at me with horror and turning to his desk-mate he said, "Do you hear that man? He ought to be in gaol." That was the sentiment twenty-three years ago. I am sorry to say that my dreams have been over-realized—we have three income taxes now! But perhaps these new ideas, these weird suggestions I am going to make may twenty-three years from now bear practical fruit. I have in my hands a pamphlet giving the transactions of the Commonwealth Club of California. I wish to be as brief as possible and shall only touch on the beginning and end of this article. It is a very excellent society. It takes up subjects of importance touching the welfare of the commonwealth of the United States, and it employs or procures the very best brains to deal with the subjects taken in hand. I may say that one of these men is the ex-superintendent of the Census Bureau of the United States. This will show the standing of the men engaged by the club. The pamphlet sets out a thesis, and goes into the argument, and ends up with the conclusion. The thesis is this: "That immigration does not increase the population of a nation." That is perhaps a new idea. The members go very thoroughly into the matter indeed and I wish I had time to elaborate the argument. It is plain and simple, and it is backed up by the soundest reasoning and accurate figures, and is handled by men who apparently have no possible axe to grind This is the conclusion reached:

> The law of population that has led to a decline in the American birth rate substantially equal to the number of immigrants admitted is in operation to-day just as rigidly as in the past. It will govern the century to come just as it has governed the century that is gone.
>
> The question for the American people—

And for the Canadian, too.

> —to decide is whether the land shall be peopled by the descendants of those now here or shall pass in large part to those who will come from other lands.
>
> Except for brief periods,—

And this is the crux of the whole thing.

> —immigration will not increase the population above the figure it will reach without immigration.

Rather startling, is it not? But it is so.

> The influences that determine population are inexorable; and if we admit those from other lands we shall decrease by a like number those who will be born of those now here.
>
> The question for cold-blooded consideration by the American—

By the Canadian.

> —of to-day is this: Do you want the soil inherited by your son or by the son of one who now toils in a foreign land?

The argument is, you only change the population. If you bring in a thousand to-day, of course, there will be a thousand more to-morrow; but in long periods, calculated by decades, it is proved conclusively that you only change the population, you do not increase it. And the result is that instead of having in America, the American and Nordic stock, you have the Slav and the less desirable immigrant from southeastern Europe. That is another reason we might well consider in connection with this question of whether we can make a fortune by free for all immigration.

Mr. McMASTER: Will the hon. gentleman permit a question? Why is the immigrant from southeastern Europe undesirable?

Mr. NEILL: For many reasons. In many instances he is not an agriculturist; he runs to small businesses and to city life. The principal reason, however, is that he is born in a southern climate and has not the vitality and the virility of the men from the north of Europe. He does not assimilate; he remains in colonies of his kind. Where we find the Norwegian soon calling himself not Jonsen but Johnstone, and may be governor of the state or a candidate for the presidency, the other man remains in his own environment and is more or less a city dweller.

I was going to say that for the reasons I have enunciated I appreciate the moderation of the policy brought down by the Minister of Immigration. But I do think he has made a slight mistake in his dealing with the prairies; I think he has, in a measure, put the cart before the horse. The idea seems to be to bring in a lot more farmers and that farming on the prairies will then be prosperous.

I suggest that the other method be adopted; make your farmers prosperous on the prairies, and the immigrants will come of their own accord. It may be urged that that is a trite saying: "Yes, make them prosperous, but how?" My friends to the left, the Progressives, say, by a free trade policy. I think, Mr. Chairman, they do not say it with quite the assurance or with quite the emphasis they did last year. I may be wrong in that, and if so I offer my apologies, but I do not think they are quite so insistent upon a policy of free trade as a panacea for all their evils as they were a year ago. At any rate, if it were to be at all successful it would have to be complete free trade; anything less than that would be so trivial a reduction in their costs as to be immaterial. Very well; we will allow for the sake of argument that if we have absolute free trade we benefit the farmer, but at the expense of the eastern portions of Canada, of the manufacturers of the East. That is too big a price. I do not want to be a party to ruining the eastern provinces for the benefit of my prairie friends. On the other hand, it is equally unthinkable, equally fatal for us to allow the prairie provinces to be depopulated—because that is eventually what must take place if they do not get relief.

Mr. GOULD: The hon. member is making a presumption that is not correct. I do not know that the group of which I have the honour to be a member has ever taken the stand on free trade that he presupposes; neither is it on record on any of our platforms or incorporated in any of our teachings that we support that principle. It is something that has been thrown at us; it is not something we have subscribed to in any particular.

Mr. NEILL: I am very glad to hear my hon. friend's statement. I would answer it by referring to the pages of Hansard.

If, then, we cannot agree on free trade, what is the remedy? Unfortunately the obvious remedy is an impossible one—reciprocity with the United States. That is out of court for the present; we cannot achieve it however much we may desire it. But there is another remedy that I suggest, and it is even more iconoclastic than the one I enunciated before about the population. Let us meet the United States people on their own ground. If they say they are going to have high protection, then we must say that we are going in also for protection. But if we do that, we should go in for all-round protection applied not only to the manufacturer but also to the farmer of the prairies. The question then arises, how can you protect the farmer when his goods are exported? The suggestion I make is that in view of the long railway haul, the only one in the world applying to the production of wheat and therefore handicapping the prairies to a very serious extent, we should adopt a system on a sliding scale of bonusing the wheat of the country and thus put the prairie farmer on the same level as the eastern manufacturer. I know my friends will hold up their hands in holy horror and say that that is an unsound economic principle. But I do not care anything about theories or principles of that description. I never studied economics, but I learned in a hard school that where there was a grievous evil, a practical remedy should be applied to it. I suggest this as a practical remedy. Germany a few years ago, speaking in terms of the life of a nation, was almost solely agricultural—more so even than Canada is to-day, but by the adoption of this system; by the payment of bonuses to her native or imported industries, she had a long chance to become the economic mistress of the world. Had she not gone mad in 1914 she would by this time practically dominate the world in matters of trade. That is the system I suggest we should use to-day. It may be all wrong; it may be against economic principles —but suggest a better one if you can! Now, speaking for my own district—because I would not presume to state the views of other parts of Canada—I believe the "middle of the road" policy, as he called it, of moderate immigration suggested by the minister will meet with the approval of my constituents. I will go further—and here I speak only personally; I think it will conduce ultimately to the best interests of Canada.

Mr. DENIS (St. Denis) (Translation): Mr. Chairman, the immigration question is to my mind the most important of all those which have been debated during the present session.

The hon. Minister of the Interior has given us a masterly outline of the policy which he proposes to follow in this respect. I must offer him my sincere congratulations and at the same time promise him my entire support. Our country, although in its infancy, has before it a most brilliant future. It has known days of prosperity as well as days of depression. At present, it has a population of over 8,000,000. Its territory is very extensive. The natural resources are abundant, in fact inexhaustible. The soil is very fertile and large areas only await vigorous hands to yield crops sufficient to feed the whole of Europe. Although our industries are somewhat

at a standstill, owing to unstable trade conditions, they are gradually picking up as the market becomes firmer. Our labouring class reduced to unemployment through the shortage of work are experiencing a rather serious crisis; however we notice a change for the better in their conditions. Nevertheless, I think it would be a great mistake at present to believe and especially to state, even on the floor of the House that the labouring class are satisfied with their present conditions. I congratulate the government for closing the gates to all the labouring class of immigrants. Its duty at present, is to better the living conditions of the workman by supplying his family and himself with the means of existence; as long as the normal economic situation is not reestablished we must not open wide our doors but keep them well closed.

I consider, Mr. Chairman, that the first duty of a good government is to furnish to all citizens the means of existence, it would be an unnational and unpatriotic policy to bring in immigrants belonging to the labour class, when misery still reigns in many homes as a result of unemployment. What we want, at present, in this country, are settlers, real settlers, it matters little whether they be English, French, Belgian, Italian, Jew or Scotch, as long as they can be assimilated, are sound of body and mind, are not bolshevists, anarchists, nor socialists, are thoughtful of the moral and religious conditions and obedient to the laws of our country.

For the last few years, Mr. Chairman, farming, if I am to believe the doleful stories of our hon. friends the Progressives, does not give the same returns as it did previous to the war. I am of the same opinion; however, although the condition of the farmer is very precarious, I think there is some exaggeration. That the western farmer's plight is more serious than that of the eastern farmer, I am ready to acknowledge. The hon. Minister gave us the true solution when he said: If we wish colonization to progress in the west, we must avoid past mistakes and not sell to the new settler more land than he can cultivate. The hon. Minister considers that 160 acres of land constitute a large farm; it is, indeed, ample for a settler if he desires to farm it with good results. That there may be other reasons than those I have just given, that contribute in making farming in the West a poor paying proposition, such for instance as the high price of labour, the high freight rates and lack of transportation facilities, I admit; but I think the keynote of success for a farmer is to make the most of every inch of ground at his disposal and that all his efforts must be concentrated with that aim in view, bettering as much as possible his method of farming and adapting it to the conditions of his land so as to husband its power of production indefinitely.

I do not wish, Mr. Chairman, to detain any longer the attention of the hon. members of this House, however before closing my remarks I would ask the hon. Minister to use discretion in his choice of immigration agents. Each country has its particular ways and the agent must necessarily be familiar with these conditions. I doubt very much if an agent having only English at his command and unacquainted with the particular ways of the people would be a success in Belgium or in France. Every agent must be fitted for the position, if we wish that the money we are going to vote be profitable to the country.

In the past, Sir, the government made use of the agents of transportation companies. I think it was a great mistake, for these agents were more interested in increasing the number of passengers, so as to show large increases in their business, rather than bring into the country desirable settlers. What we are in need of are settlers capable of being assimilated, sound of body and mind, desirous of entering our country with a view to settling down and become part of the great Canadian family and contribute to its prosperity.

Mr. MacLAREN: During this debate there have been innumerable views put forward regarding the subject of population and of immigration. The only common ground that I have observed in the debate is that there should be an increase in population, that it is of great importance and of value to the state. It has been put forward that increase in population may be secured by increase in the birth rate, decrease in the death rate, diminution of the exodus and by immigration.

As regards the first point, an increased birth rate, I do not know that I can give the minister any very valuable suggestions on how it can be secured, but I would wish to make use of a phrase which has occurred several times during the debate, and that is to let nature take its course. As regards the diminution of the death rate, that is necessarily a slow process. To attain it is a process of gradual education throughout the country, and that is now going on. We all recognize the advance that public health is making in the country. I do not think it reasonable to expect the advance in public health and an improvement in the death rate to occur in more than a gradual way, and that is now going on in as satisfactory a way as we can reasonably expect. There-

fore, the minister cannot look to that as any substantial basis upon which to increase the population.

Then we come to the checking of the exodus from this country. What can the government do in this particular? I do not think that I can suggest anything to the government to secure this beyond what they could do if they saw fit. It would be a declaration to the country of a fixed determination to carry out a protective tariff policy. Now, while this at the present time is somewhat in force, it is not frankly put before the country. It is not put forward by the government as an article of their faith. The difficulty arising from this is that the country lacks the stimulus to the expansion of trade and industry that it otherwise, I believe, would secure. That being the case, and I presume that it will not be the policy of the government to make any such declaration, it comes to this, that the minister and the country will have to fall back upon immigration. I grant you that in any case the policy of immigration must be a very large and important factor under all the circumstances. Whatever the tariff policy of the government may be and whatever the death rate may be, I believe we must still look to immigration as a very important part of any policy to increase the population of this country. That being granted I ask, what principle should we adopt in carrying out our policy of immigration. I believe the principle we should adopt is to bring these people into those districts where they are needed, where the industries and occupations are suffering from a shortage of men to carry them on. That should be the true principle underlying our immigration policy, and I think that is the principle the minister proposes to carry out. The hon. member for George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs) this afternoon advanced the view that we should bring in immigrants, doubtless artisans and mechanics, and place them in the cities. In this way the labour market in the cities would be supplied and the tendency to drift from the rural districts into the centres of population would be lessened. It does not seem to me, however, that that can be regarded in any way as sound advice to the government, first of all because artisans are not needed to the same extent that farmers are; but in any case the adoption of such a policy would produce a condition of unemployment—without the advantage of populating the country districts. I therefore think the true principle is to attract to our country men of a class of occupation that we lack in Canada.

[Mr. MacLaren.]

As regards the volume of immigration at which we should aim, I am not one of those who believe in crowding the country too rapidly. There is no advantage in it; quality is always better than quantity. I think the minister would be well advised were he to admit immigrants in generous numbers but under regulation and always governed by the idea of quality, the purpose being to procure suitable men who will be of substantial value to Canada.

Having advanced this view I would now ask: How are the immigrants to be distributed throughout the Dominion? That is an important question and one that, in my judgment, has not been given the attention or received the consideration in past years to which it was entitled. What has happened? The large proportion of immigrants arriving in Canada has been directed to the West. That was quite natural because the field of settlement lay there. The free lands were there, the movement was along the line of least resistance, and therefore an enormous number of immigrants proceeded to the West. I do not say the West received too many immigrants; I do not think it did. I do say, however, that other portions of Canada have not received the attention which was their due. It was an advantage to the whole of Canada for a large number of immigrants to go to the West, but other portions of the country should also have received attention.

The minister has referred to the various ways in which he proposes to deal with the different portions of the Dominion. Now, the needs of the country vary very greatly; so do the previous occupations of the immigrants. Their aspirations are also widely different. It is well that they should go to different portions of the Dominion, as prompted by their own wishes and in harmony with the needs of Canada. This is a matter in which we are keenly interested. This phase of the question has not received that attention from past governments that it was fairly entitled to, and we hope that the minister will now be able to make good this past deficiency. I am afraid, however, from what I heard him say this afternoon that his policy will not meet this situation. I will give my reason for that opinion. The minister has outlined an elaborate programme for the West. What is proposed to be done with respect to the East? The minister has an official in the United States who is occupying his time in repatriating Canadians to the province of Quebec. As regards the Maritime provinces the minister states that he has an official in London who is familiar with the needs of New Brunswick, that is Mr. Bowder. Now, Mr. Bow-

der has been in the employ of the Dominion government in London since the first of November, having been taken on on a ninety days' certificate. He had previously been in the New Brunswick office in London for some considerable period and remained there until that office was closed. After having served the ninety day period, an extension of another ninety days was granted. It does not seem to me, under the circumstances, that any very great regard has been shown for an officer holding such a responsible position. I do think that an official capable of doing effective and reasonably valuable work in connection with the province of New Brunswick should hold a position of a more definite and permanent character than Mr. Bowder has been given.

10 p.m.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I may tell my hon. friend that we have made application for his permanency. Of course, that will be settled by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. MacLAREN: I am very glad to hear that. I know that Mr. Bowder made application to be appointed an immigration agent and that the Civil Service Commission took the position, on the advice, I think, of the Department of Justice that as he was a resident of Great Britain he could not be appointed an agent. Perhaps the minister will have an opportunity of looking into this matter further.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): My hon. friend's statement is news to me; I had not heard that. Does my hon. friend say that the Civil Service Commission would not appoint a Britisher to the office?

Mr. MacLAREN: The circumstances are these: I happen to know Mr. Bowder; I have taken an interest in him for several years. I received a letter from him dated London, February 8, 1923, in which he states:

> I have been employed, on instructions from the Minister of Immigration and Colonization in the Dominion Emigration office. London, as a temporary employee on a 90 days certificate, which was renewed for a similar period again on the 29th ult.—

And so on. He tells me that he has applied to be appointed an immigration agent and asks me to interest myself in the matter. When I received his letter, I wrote to the Civil Service Commission, and this is the reply from the secretary of the commission under date of February 22:

> I have your letter of the 20th instant enclosing some correspondence from the above named—
>
> W. R. Bowder,
>
> —who is anxious to obtain employment in connection with Canadian emigration work in the Old Country. His letter has special reference to vacancies now being filled by competition under the auspices of this commission in Great Britain. In this connection he mentions in his letter that he had been promised advice in the event of a vacancy occurring but that he received no notification of the above-mentioned vacancy, but had his attention called to it through an advertisement in the Gazette.
>
> In reply, I am instructed to say that Mr. Bowder's application is on file in this office and would not be overlooked in the event of an opportunity offering to consider him, but in the particular case under consideration, namely, the present vacancies in Great Britain, the commissioners have decided that applicants resident in England cannot be admitted. This decision was reached on the advice of the Department of Justice in view of the large number of candidates apparently possessing the qualifications required and resident in Canada.
>
> I may add that information to the above effect is being sent to Mr. Bowder.

Mr. Bowder, I believe, has lived both in England and in Canada, and his residence at present in London grew out of the fact that he was in the New Brunswick London office. Perhaps the minister will have an opportunity of further investigation upon that point; but I would submit that an official holding such a position and suitable, as I think Mr. Bowder is, should have the status, the influence and the permanency of a permanent immigration agent.

I was trying to describe what I thought was too scanty consideration of the Maritime provinces in connection with the immigration policy. There is another point. I instanced the fact of there being in the United States a Dominion official whose duty is to secure and repatriate Canadians to the province of Quebec. The minister has told us that there is an official from Halifax who is now at Boston and who has a similar function. Perhaps the minister can inform us if this official at Boston is co-operating with the New Brunswick government.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes. I suggested to him when meeting him in Chicago, I think, in October last, that he should go back to both provinces and get full information as to the requirements in these provinces.

Mr. MacLAREN: If there is co-operation obtained especially with the local government, that may be of advantage; but I see this difficulty, that he is representing two provinces, or perhaps three, and if that be the case, I do not anticipate that we, in New Brunswick, will get very great results from that arrangement. At the present time, there are in New Brunswick hundreds of vacant farms. I would suggest to the minister that he consider whether there could not be in reference to New Brunswick a somewhat simi-

lar arrangement on a smaller scale to that which he now has in reference to Quebec, under which arrangement there will be an official whose duty it will be to secure the return of former New Brunswick residents to New Brunswick. One would certainly rather see them all go to Quebec than not come to Canada. One does not wish to take any limited view; but we want to take the view that there is something coming, and I should like to have heard the minister say that he had a little more definite policy for each province. There must, of course, be a general policy; but if the minister would say we hope to do something for Quebec, something for Prince Edward Island, something for Nova Scotia and something for New Brunswick, we would feel there was something tangible in his policy. At the present time I feel that New Brunswick will get very little out of the policy as we have heard it enunciated. I may be mistaken about the matter; I shall be very glad to confess my mistake if the minister's policy should prove to be different; but I believe if we can secure a more important appointment in the government's office in London, if we can have an official who will care especially for the repatriation of New Brunswickers from the United States and who will co-operate with the New Brunswick government, we shall make a substantial advance, something that is worth while.

As I said, there are in New Brunswick hundreds of vacant farms and while, naturally, it is easier for the Dominion government to concentrate more on the parts of the country where they have lands of their own, surely the duty of the government is to care for all the provinces. It is probably more difficult for the government to do that, but that is not sufficient reason why the needs of the provinces should be overlooked. I do not direct these remarks especially at the minister. He is only enunciating his policy, but what I have heard does not satisfy me that there is enough in it to make it a success for New Brunswick. What I am referring to more particularly is our past history, and statistics will show that immigration to New Brunswick and, I presume to the other Maritime provinces due to the Dominion government's policy, has been extraordinarily small. I believe the minister can get more value for the money he spends in bringing men to take the vacant farms, than by putting the money into some of the other schemes he proposes to put it into. Perhaps the minister would be good enough to go further into this.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): What my hon. friend is asking for has been promised

[Mr. MacLaren.]

the New Brunswick government, that is, that Mr. Bowder would be operating in the Old Country, and that they would have a man who would work in their interest. They did not discuss the abandoned farms with me; but I wrote the particular agent who is operating in the United States in the interest of New Brunswick to keep closely in touch with the New Brunswick government and to try to fill the necessities as they arose of the province of New Brunswick. The same applies, of course, to Nova Scotia.

Mr. MacLAREN: I think, with the minister, that is a vital matter. The local government will necessarily be familiar with the situation; its co-operation is essential, and there is no difficulty in obtaining the co-operation of any provincial government. There may be as regards expenditure of money, but that is a different matter.

The other point to which I wish to refer is this. I should like the minister, when he is replying to the many suggestions that have been made and the views that have been put forward, to tell us what arrangements are being made regarding the distribution of farm labourers and domestic servants. I understand that it is the policy to bring these two classes into the country in addition to farmers, and with that I am fully in accord. I think these are three classes of people who should receive the preference. Domestic servants and farm labourers are not the classes that would come from the United States. We cannot look to that country for them; we must go beyond the seas, and I hope especially to Great Britain. Are there any plans as regards the distribution of domestic servants throughout the country? Will these immigrants and the farm labourers be distributed throughout the Dominion?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I cannot wholly support the remarks which have been made expressing sympathy with the minister in regard to his policy, or rather his lack of policy. I cannot fall in line with the statements of my iconoclastic friend from British Columbia (Mr. Neill) who spoke a few moments ago except in so far as they deplore the attempt that has been made, and which has been wholly successful, to induce the minister and the government to adopt what will eventually become an absolutely open-door policy. If that is not the aim of the department why the appalling increase in the estimates this year?—why an increase of $1,316,400? In the past you can trace where in a decade hardly more money was spent than we propose to spend this year in the increase alone.

I shall have something to say in regard to that feature of the question in a moment. But I want to assure the minister of one thing, and that is that I am absolutely in favour of justifiable immigration. And when I say justifiable immigration I mean immigration that is purely voluntary and absolutely selected. In other words, it will be essential to maintain in European countries, whence immigrants can come, and in the United States, a staff of men inspecting medically and otherwise those who propose to come of their own volition.

The present policy—it seems that is the only word we can use to express ourselves in regard to the statement that has been presented by the minister—bears, as the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill) and others who sit behind the minister have said, the earmarks of pressure from some Ethiopian, or something of that kind. I entirely concur in that statement. Indeed, we cannot do otherwise than believe it. We find in a despatch printed in a western paper, forwarded from Ottawa, the statement that the inspection of intending immigrants before they depart from European ports to Canada is to be continued, and I want to congratulate the minister and his department on their firmness in this matter. But why should it be necessary for the minister to declare himself on behalf of Canada in this regard? It is because the transportation companies had asked that this system be dispensed with, according to the despatch. If this is true I want to brand it as one of the most appalling attempts that have ever been made in this or any other country to secure tonnage, for we can call it nothing else, for the steamship and transportation companies at the expense of the unfortunates who may be deported.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I have no brief for the steamship companies, but in fairness to them I should tell my hon. friend that there came from them no such request at all. There are a great many despatches that are issued from the capital and I may say that I knew nothing about this one. But the steamship companies would much prefer inspection on the other side of the water, and in fairness to them I think I should make that known.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I am glad to hear the minister say so. But if that is the case there has been a great change of heart on the part of these companies since his predecessor, Sir Clifford Sifton, held office. Speaking before the Toronto Board of Trade not so long ago, Sir Clifford Sifton said that the shipping people were very hostile to attempts made to confine immigration to certain desirable people. The report says:

> They did not care what kind of people—

I want you to note the words.

> —were brought to Canada. All they wanted to do was to bring the people here.

I sincerely trust that that attitude on the part of the transportation companies has been overcome. I have listened with the greatest attention to the minister and have carefully noted the declarations of the government from the outset this session, and I have not heard a single word that would encourage me in the belief that the administration now in power in this country is about to launch any definite policy of amelioration or alleviation of conditions as they exist today in the agricultural districts. Undoubtedly, the programme of propaganda that was carried on during the summer must have inspired the hon. member for Comox-Alberni to the outburst he was guilty of a little while ago which I certainly enjoyed. But some of the propaganda is illuminating. We find that open-door immigration is urged upon the department in order to settle up vacant lands lying idle. And these are the reasons given:

> For example, the settlement of one township of land now lying vacant and undeveloped would mean the construction of quite a group of new farm residences, barns, outbuildings, fences, etc., with a resultant demand for lumber, hardware, cement, and other building materials. It would mean an additional school or two. Farm machinery of all kinds would be required. New roads and possibly bridges would have to be constructed calling for more road machinery, steel, cement, culverts and labor. The manufacture of these things would call for the profitable investment of capital, the employment of skilled workers in the work of manufacture, and of unskilled labor in the production of needed raw materials. In the haulage of raw materials to the factories, and food and clothing for the factory workers, and the finished products from factory to consumer, the railways would secure much needed traffic, and, as the township became producing, return traffic to the markets of the world.

We do not read one solitary word about what is to happen to the settler when he comes here; it is all filled with what is going to accrue to the great manufacturing and transportation interests. An hon. member (Mr. Marler) the other day rather intimated, perhaps unintentionally, as I am quite willing to believe, that we painted the picture of deplorable conditions in the West in too lurid a fashion. I assure him that, on the contrary, we do not paint it nearly as bad as it actually is. I have not yet heard a single member on this side of the House tell of the things which I could show the hon. gen-

tleman, if he cared to witness them next summer, day after day in my own constituency. Let me try to give him an example.

Mr. MARLER: Let me ask the hon. gentleman a question. Are the western prairies worth while bringing immigrants to, or not?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Will the hon. member explain just what he means by that question?

Mr. MARLER: Yes, I would like to know, is it possible for selected settlers to make a livelihood on the prairies providing they possess average intelligence?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Mr. Chairman, under present conditions on the prairies I say it is absolutely impossible—absolutely impossible.

Mr. MARLER: Then it is absolutely no use to bring immigrants to the prairies at the present time?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Absolutely. That is what I shall endeavour to demonstrate before we get through. In my opinion there is no use spending millions lavishly to bring people to this country when those already here cannot make a living. An hon. member on the other side of the House said to me one day recently that the peasant from south-eastern Europe who will dig himself into a hole or live in a sod shack is the kind of man Canada wants. Well, even those poor devils are just as badly off as the rest. If you bring them in they will stay a little while and then leave us.

Mr. MARLER: Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that everyone is insolvent in the three prairie provinces?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The actual condition is so close to it that we might as well call it so. In the province of Alberta out of 80,000 farmers 20,000 are absolutely insolvent, and the majority of the remainder are approaching that state rapidly. Thirteen million dollars will be required this year alone to renew farm mortgages in that province. In the southern portion that comes under the operation of the Drouth Area Relief Act no less than $25,000,000 of debt has been administered by the commissioner in charge of that act. That was the amount of indebtedness turned over to him to endeavour to apportion among the various creditors, but which has of course not been paid.

Mr. MARLER: Will my hon. friend inform the committee who created these particular mortgages and for what reason? Was it on account of over-buying or anything of that description? Possibly not.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Let me inform the hon. gentleman of this fact. Shortly after the war was over a policy of financial deflation was commenced and carried out with the most ruthless brutality by those who alone can carry out such a policy. The immediate result was deplorable. Let me give my hon. friend an example of my own. In the fall of 1920 I think it was—I speak from memory and am not quite certain that my dates are absolutely correct—had I been able to thresh and dispose of the crop I would have been able to pay all my debts. But I did not get it threshed that year until October, nor did my neighbours, and by that time the rapid toboggan of prices had commenced, and when we actually got our grain to the market not only were we unable to pay our debts out of the proceeds but we had to carry over heavy liabilities to the following year. Pressure was exerted by the banks—very gently at first, but very steadily, and we had to meet it. Subsequently our debts piled up and mortgages had to be taken out. Just to meet the mortgage interest and renewals alone that amount of money which I have mentioned was required. This is official information issued by the government of the province of Alberta.

Of course deflation has not been the only factor. Drouth has had something to do with the trouble, but this does not apply so greatly to the north. A particular instance I wish to cite is that of a very good friend of mine living in the district of Hanna ordinarily a fairly good district. He is interested in the work of parliament. I thought I would send him a copy of Hansard, and this is the letter I received from him in acknowledgement:

> I received the first copy and my wife and I are very thankful to you for sending us Hansard this year. I assure you we appreciate it very much. In view of our financial condition we had discussed very seriously what item of our household expense we could dispense with or retrench in order to get Hansard as we wanted it very much.

Is it not lamentable that they had to squeeze and corner to find $3? That is not all. He also took the opportunity of telling me something about the conditions there. I know them fairly well but not in any detail. I may say that this man is one of those who works from daylight to dark, he never spares himself, and does not drink alcohol or smoke. He is a married man with a small family. He writes:

> The financial position in this locality, as indeed I believe in all Alberta, is very serious. Farmers are unable to meet their taxes and consequently the schools are closed.

Those are the facts, Mr. Chairman.

> The banks have told us that not one cent will they advance until the indebtedness of the municipality to these institutions has been met. In Dowling lake municipality we have only three schools running at the present time and in two of these schools the teachers are waiting for their salary until it becomes available. God only knows when that will be. Loan companies are compelling practically every farmer who is in arrears with his interest to become nothing but a tenant on land which we spent the best years of our life opening and developing, and now instead of owning the land we become tenants. I sold a 50-lb. hide last month for $1.80, 45 pounds of hide, 5 pounds dockage. The same day I bought a little pair of shoes for our little girl, the cheapest I could get, weight about 5 or 6 oz., price $3. Where is it all going to end?

That is the desperate condition these men are in. No one can appreciate who does not live among them the suffering, the misery, the depression, the despair they go through year after year. And the day has gone by—I think the House was warned of it last spring—when the hopeful effort of former years will be put into the preparation of the land for this season's crop. I had the honour of going around my constituency last summer speaking at meetings. Sometimes I had to take long drives at night time, and on three different occasions in the southern part of that country we met people driving towards the United States border by night. On one occasion a party was stuck in a sand hole with a Ford car piled to the top with blankets and bedding. These are the conditions. Does any hon. gentleman think we can take an inexperienced immigrant from any part of Europe, put him out in that country without capital and expect him to make a success of farming? Do hon. members think that men with a capital of from $1,500 to $2,000 can go out there and make a success of it? They may remain a little while, but if present conditions exist—there is the root of the trouble—and if an attempt is not made to curb the exploitation of these people by the combines and by the transportation companies—which my hon. friend from Pontiac (Mr. Cahill) spoke of as bleeding this country white, and I agree with him, if such enormous sums must be paid out in dividends to the shareholders of the Canadian Pacific railway and other corporations every year, then I say there is little hope for the West. It would be far, far better not to bring settlers into that country.

Mr. MARLER: Does my hon. friend suggest that the Canadian Pacific Railway shareholders should go without their dividends? I merely ask for information.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): As long as the great mass of the people who are helping build up this country are not getting any dividends whatever, although they are doing far harder work than the shareholders of the Canadian Pacific Railway, I would say most emphatically, yes. I think we should endeavour to curb the profits of these corporations and allow the people who are working to build up the country to get some gain for their hard labour.

I cannot understand the attitude of some hon. gentlemen who talk of progressing from the farm to the city. Is it really progression? Should it be regarded as such? Why do we hear hon. members say that the ambition of the young, of those who want to get ahead, is to leave the farm and go to the cities? Why should it be so? Yet we find in the delightful pamphlets sent out by the Department of Immigration the most glowing prospects that await the immigrant who engages in agriculture. Listen to what we send to Europe. We say:

> Come to this country. The call of the West is no vain call. It beckons the courageous, the thrifty, the industrious, from the Mother Country particularly, to a life that is essentially democratic and independent, to an industry that assures the most encouraging returns, the basic and the noblest industry in the world—agriculture.

And yet we are told that it is progression, that it is only the ambitious that leave agriculture and go to the cities. There are many more similar statements in these publications, and I think the minister would be well advised to go over them very carefully. I find the grossest misrepresentation in these statements. The poor man in a foreign country; the English or Scotch crofter, the Irish hill peasant, who read this sort of thing and saw that picture on the cover would think this was a land of milk and honey and golden grain; that there was nothing to it but to come here, get a quarter section, and become a millionaire. I suggest that the minister revise these descriptions. I could paint a different picture, and it would be more truthful than this is.

Mr. McMASTER: And less encouraging.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Exactly, and it would be my intention that it should be so, under present conditions.

Mr. JACOBS: Was the hon. member himself attracted by one of these pamphlets?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I was. But unlike many other immigrants I went to the agent and discussed the matter very thoroughly with him. The first thing he told me was "You will not need hob-nailed boots in Canada, and you do not need to take any tobacco over there, because they grow it,"

and a number of other interesting facts. But he did not tell me a single thing about what I would have to do when I came here. All he told me was—and I took his advice—that I should go on a farm and learn farming. That is what I did.

Now, let us come back for a moment to the statement of the minister. It is extraordinary to find such a difference of opinion existing between the hon. gentleman and one of his predecessors, whom I quoted a moment ago, Sir Clifford Sifton. Speaking at this meeting of the Board of Trade, Sir Clifford said—and I would commend these words very seriously to the attention of the minister as well as to the consideration of those hon. gentlemen on my right who are so anxious that the government shall take advantage of the Empire settlement scheme:

> I want to express an emphatic opinion about the class of settlers we do not want. It is said that there are millions of town dwellers, artisans, small shopkeepers, labourers, etc., who are anxious to come to Canada. Everyone will sympathize with their condition and desire that they should find a place where they will lead a happier life. It is said there are millions in Poland—

I notice the minister has Poland on his list.

> —who want to come to Canada. These people are essentially town dwellers and you cannot make them anything else. We do not want them under any conditions. We know perfectly well you cannot make agriculturists of them. They come here and swell the ranks of the unemployed; they will create slums; they will never go on the land; they will never add anything to the production of the country; and it will be the most fatal mistake in the world if they are allowed to come into Canada at the present time. There is talk about getting people from the manufacturing towns in England and Scotland. We do not want mechanics from the Clyde, turbulent, riotous, and with an insatiable appetite for whiskey.

The poor beggars would die of drought in this country.

> We do not want artisans from the southern English towns who know absolutely nothing about farming. There is nothing in these schemes suggested for educating them and making farmers of them and then bringing them out to fight the battles of the pioneer's life. Take a bookkeeper say from Liverpool and bring him out and put him in a shanty near Prince Albert. Leave him there for a winter. It is cruel. He would starve to death. It is an intolerable crime to bring out these men and try to make pioneers of them. The pioneer has to be of the toughest fibre that can be found. Do not let anyone persuade you that you can get people from the towns and make farmers of them. If you do you will have a problem worse than the one you have now. We have had cases where English mechanics have made a great success on the land, but they are the exceptions that prove the rule. It takes two generations to turn a town-bred population into an agricultural population, and I do not think anything but dire starvation will make them do it. We have not got time for that job. We have not two generations to spare.

The minister suggests that these people are not brought here unless they are farmers or say they are going on the land. Well, I may inform him that I came here as a farm labourer, and I do not know whether they will put me in jail for it now or not, but I did not know fall wheat from barley; I did not know the hames from the tugs on a horse's harness. That is a little note of warning to the hon. minister; no questioning will prevent people from coming here if they want to. I do not think it is wise that people should be brought here under the Empire settlement scheme or any other scheme under present conditions. We see in the press at various times expressions of opinion as to the type of settler we want, the settler who will make a good citizen, who will go on the farm and make an effort to stay there. Sir Clifford Sifton does not think so; his idea is the very opposite of my own. He wants to bring into this country the peasant, "the sheep-skin clad man with the large wife and the large family, with the strong back and the short legs, built close to the ground, to dig his living from the soil and be content with what he gets." I quote from memory; those may not be the exact words, but they are the import of what he said. That statement went all over this country. Here is another quotation from Sir Clifford:

> There are hundreds of thousands of hardy peasants, men of the type I have described, farmers for ten or fifteen generations, men who have always worked from four o'clock in the morning until dark, and have never expected to do anything else.

Now, you may get that type of man here, but I am glad to say that the West has made and will make this change in him: he no longer is content to settle on the land and work from four o'clock in the morning until dark. He is no longer content with what he digs from the soil—that is, with what he gets for what he digs from the soil. In a short time he becomes discontented; he joins the U. F. A. local and learns why he is where he is and who are making profits from his labour; then he ceases to be the pleasant kind of peasant that those who now control things would bring in here to debase agriculture with. Any plan of that kind cannot but be faced with failure.

I am glad to see the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) here. He has not been in the chamber for a little time. I say I am glad he is here, because a paper which I have under my hand reports him as having said something that is rather significant. I want hon. members to pay close attention to this. This minister, speaking out of his great fund of wisdom, gained, no doubt, from his long years of experience in farming, is reported as follows:

> Mr. Motherwell suggested that many of them—

Those who went west to take up homesteads.

—looked to the day when "someone with more money than brains" would buy them out.

Will any hon. member not bow to the wisdom of the Minister of Agriculture? I have no doubt that there are farmers—indeed I have met them—who say: "Oh, you must not oppose this colonization scheme; you must not oppose immigration. Why, I might be able to sell that rotten half section of mine, and you will spoil the deal on me. Let us get them in. We have to get rid of this land and get out of here." It is a sad fact that there are only too many who are in that frame of mind.

Let us turn for a moment to the Empire settlement scheme, in respect to which there is an enormous item here, for some $600,000. But before I leave Sir Clifford Sifton I would like to read what he says about assisted immigrants—and I would commend his words, his thoughts, his experience, to the present Minister of Immigration. I know he is anxious to learn from the men who preceded him, and who have learned in the hard school of experience what may be expected. He said:

I am opposed to the system of assisted immigration. The class of peasants I speak of do not want to be assisted.

I also am opposed to that, but not for the same reasons. He is opposed to it because he says the peasant class he speaks of do not want assistance. I am opposed to it because I think this whole British Empire settlement scheme is simply one for relieving the pressure on those who control in England to-day. We find Lloyd George speaking before he became the ex-Prime Minister in the northern part of England at one of his very large meetings, and we find the press report the next day said:

While the Premier was referring to the unemployment situation the sounds of hundreds of men outside the building singing "The Red Flag" and cheering could be heard clearly. A force of mounted and foot police were kept busy moving the demonstrators away.

Again we find Sir William Joynson-Hicks speaking not long ago in London and saying that it would have been better for England to have voted the sum of £50,000,000 to have bought land in the dominions and to have deported the unemployed to these lands than to maintain them in England at the present time under the expensive system of doles and poor law relief, which he estimated to have amounted already to £100,000,000.

There is no question whatever that money was voted and a policy enunciated and developed for the one purpose of getting rid of their unemployed. Let us see if we have any evidence of that. A meeting was organized and held in London by the National Constitutional Association, presided over by Lord Ampthill, to urge the government to take immediate action towards the solution of the unemployment problem by means of Empire settlement and development. We find also Colonel L. C. Amery, Secretary of the British Admiralty, and a gentleman whom hon. members in this House will remember, saying that in the immediate condition of Great Britain, faced by urgent financial problems of congestion and growth of population in excess of increased building and social remedies, from the point of view of social welfare it was immensely desirable that the immediate problem should be eased by migration to another part of the Empire.

We find at that very same meeting at which Col. Amery spoke another reason given for this Empire settlement scheme, a most amazing, a most illuminating, one, but upon which I do not wish to dwell long upon. This was a meeting of the International Conference for the Reaffirmation of the World's Moral Ideals held in Caxton Hall, Westminister, Lord Parmoor presiding. Reference was made to the widespread irregularity of sex relations and Sir Joseph Ward, High Commissioner for Australia in England, expressed the opinion that immigration within the Empire was itself one of the fundamental remedies.

These are the reasons, I believe, for the Empire settlement scheme. But we can go further if you wish and see the jobless parades in England and numerous other demonstrations that add to strength of my belief. There are two other illuminating instances that I want to call to the attention of the House. The Bishop of Birmingham speaking on immigration, said that he regarded immigration as one of the means for the reinvigoration of the British race. I want you to get the words—immigration was to be for the reinvigoration of the British race. I do not need to assure hon. gentlemen in this House that Canada is not, in spite of the Bishop of Birmingham, a sort of sanatorium for the rejuvenation of the British or any other race. It takes, as was said a little time ago, a very rugged and vigorous type of settler even to exist in this country, and the run-down people of Britain cannot be made vigorous or be made over again by sending them to Canada.

Again we have Sir Rider Haggard's testimony. He said that the dominions were

seriously under-populated—and no one will question that. He said further that he did not favour sending out the nation's youngest and best. He preferred the family migration, or the block settlement system. He believed it would be cheaper for the government to bear the whole cost of sending out emigrants, and even to buy the land on which they settle, than continue the present system of doles and poor-law relief.

The only thing I have to say with regard to his remarks is this. Emigration may be an excellent method of getting rid of the English poor, but I am afraid that that class would not be very suitable here. These men who suggest buying land in Canada or some other of the dominions might just as well buy land in Greenland and settle these people there. Their chances of success would be just as good, and the land would be a whole lot cheaper. Even at that, Mr. Chairman, the members of the British House of Commons are not altogether easy in their minds. In spite of the delightful literature that is sent over there, and the glowing language, I have no doubt, of those who speak on emigration in England, the members of the British House of Commons are doubtful as to the suitability and feasibility of this thing. Sir Mitchell Cotts, a National-Liberal, discussing this matter in the House of Commons, December 6th, 1922, suggested that a party of members of the House of Commons should visit the Dominion and watch the settlement of immigrants here. I wonder why they thought that was necessary? We know why it was necessary. Too many, as an article in the Journal not long afterward said, had fallen into the hands of land speculators who had exploited them to their own advantage. Too many had found it impossible to make a living out here. I have in my own district a number of Englishmen of a very fine type, from Yorkshire. They came there many years ago and homesteaded with myself. These men, every one of them, hate the day they came in here, and they are Britishers, not foreigners. Their wives regret their coming and are continually talking about the lovely place they had back home in Yorkshire. One of these men worked for the Earl of Ripon, and he is everlastingly talking of the glorious times he had on the Earl of Ripon's estate.

Mr. McMASTER: Is not that generally true of English people, even if you put them in a part of the country such as the Eastern Townships in Quebec, where things are not nearly as bad as in Alberta?

[Mr. E. J. Garland.]

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I have no doubt the hon. member asked that question for the purpose of making that statement. It may be quite true.

Mr. McMASTER: No, I asked for information.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Although I have lived for almost two years in Sherbrooke county, Quebec, I know nothing about the part the hon. member speaks of. The part I lived in is devoted almost entirely to mining. But the hon. member may be quite correct. I do know some splendid young English settlers in the West, and splendid English families, who are striving hard but are in a condition of desperation. I would be glad to take any hon. members of this House out with me this year and show them in my own constituency these things I am talking of. After all, Mr. Chairman, this thing of spending millions of dollars on immigration can be characterized as indirectly bonusing the transportation and steamship companies. That is what it amounts to. It is advertising in foreign countries and securing tonnage for them. The people of this country are not going to stand for it any longer.

Again, when we bring these people over here, we cannot keep them. I need not stress that point as almost every speaker who has preceded me in this debate has pointed out how rapidly immigrants are leaving this country. If further evidence is wanted I would refer hon. members to the fact that President Harding of the United States, supported by many members of congress, has been discussing seriously the bringing in of an Immigration Registration Bill. The reason given is this: Growing out of complaints of the Commissioner General of Immigration of increased activity in the efforts to smuggle immigrants through from Canada, and from Mexico, into the United States over the international boundary, congress is showing a disposition not only to grant ample funds for the enforcement of the immigration laws, but there is also serious discussion of an alien registration law. We are, Mr. Chairman, simply being used as a back door for those who want to go to the States and do not wish to or cannot enter the country directly. I have no doubt that when the quota plan from foreign countries enforced by the United States is used up we will have a tremendous influx of settlers into Canada. There will be no question about it. They will come in but they will not stay here; they will, if they can possibly do so, cross the border into the United States. Representative L.

B. Rainey, of Alabama, in a recent speech, urged larger appropriations to prevent the smuggling of emigrants from Canada into the United States. And may I point out, the minister knows it as well as I do, that every disgruntled settler, every man who leaves this country in a dissatisfied or discontented frame of mind is not the kind of man who will speak well of this country; he will try to prevent other people from coming here.

I have great hope, Mr. Chairman, that in the future conditions will be changed, but I doubt very much if they will be brought about very rapidly by the present government. I see no indication of the activity that is desirable on their part. The conditions are much as they were a year ago. The government have had a year but appear to have no policy for remedying present conditions Hon. members from the Maritime provinces have cast a few joking remarks in our direction. I am quite sure those remarks were made in the best of humour and were not intended to be sarcastic. But it is well to point out to them that conditions in the Maritime provinces do not appear to be much better than conditions in the West judging from newspaper reports. I find in the Shelburne Gazette a despatch from the Bridgewater Bulletin containing the views of its New Germany correspondent. I think the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) knows the district very well. The despatch in question is as follows:

> Our New Germany correspondent sends us the following item: "Charles Lohnes and family are removing to the United States. This is one of the many families of this town and vicinity who are leaving. It is lamentable to see our country being drained of its best native blood. The Methodist congregation alone has lost fifty of its members through removal within a very brief time."

Again we find the following from Nova Scotia:

> The exodus of young men and women from Nova Scotia to the United States was spoken of at length and deplored and Mr. MacKenzie suggested high taxes as a cause. It was his opinion that no more unskilled labour should be introduced into Nova Scotia until present farm production was being absorbed.

I just give these few extracts in passing. I would now like to deal with the general question of immigration in this country past and present. I was particularly interested in the speech delivered by the Acting Minister of Immigration and Colonization before the University Club, Ottawa. As reported in the Citizen of January 19, he said amongst other things the following:

> Particularly affected by these conditions was the farmer. Farming would not again be profitable until the commodities which the farmer had to purchase came down to the same price level as the commodities he had to sell. The same applied to other lines but to a lesser extent.

I quote next the following:

> Agriculture, Mr. Stewart said, was the basic industry and all other industries were permeated and affected by it.

Further on I find this:

> All of Canada's free land, Mr. Stewart said, was so far from the railroads as to be hardly practical to farm and the Canadian government would have to make the present railways pay before starting on extensions.

But the most delightful statement in his whole speech—and I ask hon. members to listen most attentively because these are the words of the minister who has come before us to-day and asked for an increase of $1,316,000 odd—is the following:

> Extreme conditions of deflation in the farming communities of the West had resulted in the impossibility of making the farm pay there. "What is the use," asked Mr. Stewart, "of bringing people to the country if they cannot exist."

Is there any justification for voting money for such a purpose after an admission of that character by the minister himself, made in public in this city? But let us go further and see if there is any justification whatever.

I was interested enough in this question to seek information on it, and I secured from the Bureau of Statistics the figures of the population of Canada in each of the census years from 1871 to the present day, also the figures of the immigration into Canada in each of these ten year periods. I am sorry to say that the bureau was unable to supply me with the figures showing the natural increase, that is the number of births over deaths, in these periods, until we come down to 1901. But I again inquired and I found that I would be justified in using 15 per 1,000 per year as about the average rate of increase. It sometimes varies, last year I found it was 16.4, or something like that, but with that information I have worked out the following: In 1871 the population of Canada was 3,689,257. The immigration into Canada in that year was 362,893, a total, not making any allowance for natural increase of 4,052,150. The census year of 1881, that is at the end of the ten year period, shows a population of 4,324,810. Working out the natural increase I find that it should amount to 553,350. I do not make any allowance whatever for the increase from year to year but simply take the population at the commencement of the decade, and estimate it on that only, not on the increase, so that I am well within the figures when I give you 553,350 as representing what

should have been the natural increase. In other words when the population in 1881 should have been 4,605,500, we had an actual loss of 280,690. It cost us $2,309,496 in those ten years to lose that much population. We come down to the period between 1881 and 1891. At the commencement of that period we had a population of 4,324,810. The immigration during that decade amounted to 920,351, or a total of 5,245,161. But the census of 1891 shows that we had a population of 4,833,239, or a loss, without making any allowance whatever for natural increase, of 411,922. If we make allowance for the natural increase 648,600 and add that to the immigration and the increase in population, we find that our loss would amount to 1,060,522 in the decade between 1881 and 1891, and it cost us $2,861,383 to lose them. Now let us come down to the decade 1891 to 1901, and I am making no apology to hon. members for putting these figures on record. I think it is absolutely essential, I think the time has come, when the public should know the facts as to the results of immigration expenditures and policies in the past in this country. At the commencement of that decade we started out with a population of 4,833,239. By immigration we secured 288,286, or a total of 5,121,525. But the census in 1901 showed that we had 5,371,315, or a gain of 149,790, if you make no allowance whatever for natural increase. If you make an allowance for natural increase you find we have a loss of 475,160, or almost half a million. Let us come down to the decade from 1901 to 1911. By the way all the figures I have given before excepting those of the natural increase, are from the bureau. The natural increase I have figured out myself, but from this on, I give the bureau's own figures all the way through:

11 p.m.

Population, census of 1901	5,371,315
Natural increase, estimated, 1901 to 1910 inclusive	853,566
Immigration in that period	1,715,326
Total	7,940,207

But the population, census of 1911, shows 7,206,643, or a loss of 733,564, and it cost us $8,402,599 to lose them.

Population, census of 1911	7,206,643
Natural increase, 1911 to 1921, inclusive estimated	1,150,659
Immigration in that period	1,812,836
Total	10,170,148

The census of 1921 showed that we had a population of only 8,788,483, or a loss through emigration of 1,381,665, and in that decade it cost this country $14,234,242 to lose them.

[Mr. E. J. Garland.]

We might look at another simple little fact. It is perhaps, an idle one to waste the time of the committee with, but I amused myself this morning in figuring it out. In 1871, we had a population of 3,689,257, and if we had kept that population and just added the immigration to it, we would have all the numbers that we have to-day, making no allowance for natural increase.

Those facts are striking. The total that we have spent on immigration into this country is $30,207,894, and we have not a single soul to show for that. We are now proposing to spend $3,386,190 in this one year to bring more immigrants into this country. If anybody ever heard of a more insane proposal in what is supposed to be a responsible House, I should like to have him tell me of it.

I have but little more to say except to offer some suggestions. If it is the determined policy—and I hope it will not be—of this government to continue with this Canada Colonization scheme and these other "broadening out" and "opening wide" policies, I would ask the minister to pay attention to a despatch that appeared in the Financial Post. The hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Marler) thinks that is a very reliable paper, and I have no doubt he will not question the authenticity or reliability of this despatch. It is "from our own correspondent Montreal"—also from his city. It states:

> Most of the group of eastern business men who subscribed $1,200,000 to the work of the Canadian Colonization Association have suspended their financial support. Some of the larger subscribers who had made substantial payments on account of their subscriptions, have declined to make any further payments into the funds of the association until they can be shown definite and tangible results. There is no lack of appreciation of the necessity for an aggressive, constructive immigration effort but there seems to be lack of confidence in the association in its present form and it is felt that to continue to accomplish the fine work of settling the vacant lands of western Canada reorganization is necessary.
>
> Around $175,000 has been spent to date, it is understood, and no settlers have been definitely located. One case of good work has been accomplished, the listing of available vacant lands in a central bureau of registry, but the excellent uses that such a listing might be put to have been overlooked, it is stated by some of the erstwhile supporters.
>
> When the scheme was first launched under the name of the Western Canada Colonization Association it was easy to raise money. Corporations of various kinds were making large profits. It was a period of easy money. These corporations were ready to contribute large sums to any project for the good of Canada and the association got subscriptions totalling $1,200,000 from a comparatively small group of Canadian industrial and financial leaders and the companies they controlled.

I find in the annual statements of the various companies that we regard as large

corporations no great falling off this year. Life insurance companies, transportation companies, steamship companies, railway companies, all show record years. The banks show their dividends as usual. But let us continue this despatch:

It was proposed to get an additional $300,000 from the general public. Much of the money was spent in an advertising campaign. The nature of this advertising campaign, by the way, was the first thing that made the larger group lose confidence in the backers of this scheme. The advertisements in themselves were fine and apparently no organization to follow up the feeling of goodwill created by the advertising. The larger subscriptions that might have followed were, therefore, not obtained.

The eastern supporters, too, began to lose faith when it was seen that the West was not giving as enthusiastic support as the East. Originally it was thought that at least 25 per cent of the money would come from the West.

You see, they were very moderate and gentle with us. All they wanted was 25 per cent from the West. They knew conditions.

But instead eastern business men were left to bear almost the entire burden. "If the West had no faith in the scheme," the eastern group argued, "there must be something radically wrong with it."

But the supporters continued to pay over their money until they began to feel that nothing was going to come out of the expenditures. No results were shown. One by one the big supporters dropped out, following the example set by the most important props. It is understood that the association has been carrying on for the past few months with money from the Dominion government which alone of all the supporters continued its payments.

If that despatch is true—and I have no doubt the Minister of Immigration will know if it is true or not—an explanation is certainly due to the members of this committee. If this government intends to go into a real estate scheme of this kind when all the other supporters have dropped out of it, that shows a lack of business sense that is absolutely deplorable, and must cause loss of confidence in the government amongst the people of this country.

The whole question, I think, boils down to very much what other hon. members on this side of the House who have spoken, and, I believe, what one or two on the opposite side have said. I have never listened to a speech that I have enjoyed or appreciated or admired so greatly as the one delivered by the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Cahill). It was a courageous speech, direct to the point and absolutely realizing conditions. I wish hon. members would ask that hon. member where he got his information. He will tell them that he had lived in Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, for some years. He knows conditions. That is the difference. Some hon. members, who live in Montreal and in other places, and who stand up in this House and talk about immigration are perfectly sincere, perfectly in earnest; they think this is in the best interest of Canada, the best thing in the world for Canada; but they just do not know, that is all.

I do not think that this government is justified in this expenditure; I do not think it is justified in asking the committee to vote these large amounts. All these increases should be cut. I do not suppose we can get the whole expenditure for immigration wiped out, nor would I advocate that this be done. We should keep a protective barrier against Canada's shores to those undesirables I have referred to. May I say that until the government has fully investigated the present industrial conditions and has definitely established a well-planned remedial policy which will substantially alleviate conditions in this country it is not desirable that there should be any further expenditures of public moneys on immigration except in so far as such expenditures are absolutely necessary to protect Canada's shores. I hope that the Minister of Immigration will have a consultation with the other members of the government that will enable him to arrive at some solution of this question. We do not want to move for the reduction of items in this House. The government, we realize, is faced with difficulties; and no doubt pressure has been brought to bear upon the minister. But I would ask him seriously to consider the advisability of himself proposing a drastic reduction in these estimates, say to the full amount of the increase.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the House adjourned at 11.15 p.m.

Friday, March 16, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURAL CONDITIONS

Mr. ANDREW McMASTER (Brome) moved:

That the third report of the special committee appointed to inquire into agricultural conditions be concurred in.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): This report, which was read yesterday or the day before, calls for the appointment by the government of a royal commission to inquire into the grain trade, and adds a recommendation that this com-

mission be given powers by the federal authorities and also by the provincial legislatures. I have grave doubts as to the wisdom of the latter proviso. Some of the legislatures concerned, perhaps all three of them, are sitting. But, in the light of the decision of the Court of Appeal of Manitoba regarding the powers of the commission which was appointed by the late government and which was arrested in its work, I am not clear as to what powers which this government is not amply authorized to confer the committee desires to place in this commission. I do not know what the provincial powers are that the committee has in mind. It seems to me that the proviso is going to delay the work of the commission, a commission which, it will be recalled, I urged to be appointed in my speech on the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. What is the need of that proviso? Would it not be better to eliminate it and appoint a strong commission amply armed with federal powers—for our powers of investigation are very wide indeed—rather than put in the way of the commission impediments that may result not only in delay but possibly in disaster?

Mr. McMASTER: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has exhausted his right to speak. Perhaps the seconder of the motion might deal with the subject.

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Trade and Commerce): There is no trade in Canada that has been so often investigated as the grain trade. I have before me a record showing that between 1897 and 1921, a period of twenty-four years, there were fourteen royal commissions, federal and provincial. In 1921, a royal commission was appointed to investigate the trade, and it is within the memory, I imagine, of almost every member of the House that the work of that commission was blocked through an injunction obtained in the courts. I have no legal knowledge nor any legal pretensions, but my recollection is that the action to obtain that injunction upon the commission was taken under provincial statute. With the wish therefore to avoid the possibility of a recurrence of such an injunction, I take it, the committee on Agricultural Conditions unanmiously put in this proviso. The government have no pronouncement to make on the issue raised by my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen). If it is the desire of parliament that there should be another investigation into the grain trade the government are quite willing to carry out that desire, and it will necessitate the placing of an amount in the Supplementary Estimates. If, however, in the judgment of legal men the proviso will delay the proceedings, then, of course, it might be a matter for conference, and I am not sure whether my hon. friend who is chairman of the special committee (Mr. McMaster) would not desire to look n ore carefully into that aspect of the subject. But I would appeal to you, Mr. Speaker, that the chairman of the committee, who has no doubt given the matter legal consideration, and possibly has already consulted with the Justice department, might be unanimously given the right to explain the legal features of the matter.

Mr. BUREAU: Without precluding other members from speaking.

Mr. SPEAKER: With the unanimous consent of the House the hon. chairman of the committee may, of course, speak again. I may say to other hon. members, however, that when the member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) speaks he will close the debate, and if any hon. member desires to speak on the subject he should do so now.

Mr. O. R. GOULD (Assiniboia): I think I have already placed myself on record during this session in regard to this matter. Speaking, as I have previously said, in behalf of the producers, I believe that they should have the privileges which a commission of this kind would afford. While it is true, as the minister states, that fourteen commissions have been appointed within a certain number of years to investigate the grain trade, it does seem to me that events have shown in the past that the producers, the men who have the real grievances, have not had an opportunity of placing their views before any commission. At all events, the results have never been to their satisfaction. I have many letters in my office to-day from individuals throughout the country who endorse the attitude I have taken in the past on this subject, when I have urged the appointment of a commission specifically for the purpose of hearing what the producers have to say. And I have tried to point out that in all parliamentary committees appointed by the government such expert evidence as has been given has resulted, I honestly believe, detrimentally to the interests of the producers. My only plea for a commission is based on the desire to facilitate the producers in laying their case before such a body.

Hon. Sir HENRY DRAYTON (West York): Let me say in the first instance that if we can do anything to facilitate a proper inquiry into

the grain trade we want to do it; and I may add that our attitude is exactly the same as it was in 1921. The only thing we are afraid of, however, is that, very likely unwittingly, nay, I will go further and say, absolutely unwittingly, because I know the hon. chairman of the committee—there is a grave danger of our going through the same sort of farce that we went through last year in connection with the wheat board. It is a great deal better to do something we know we can do ourselves than to undertake anything in regard to which our powers are open to dispute. We know at the present time that we can make a certain investigation, and possibly having regard to all the different matters which will be found to be a proper subject of inquiry we might be able to legislate as broadly and as fully as we should like to. I admit that what the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Robb) says is technically correct, there have been many different investigations; but I think he will look in vain for any general investigation into this business in the last ten years. He will not find one. I should like to have the minister converted to the idea of the great necessity of a proper investigation.

Mr. ROBB: I admit it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: We tried to convert him last session, and I thought we had succeeded. Indeed, I thought we had a pledge from him that there was going to be an investigation during the recess. We gave him a vote of $50,000, I think, for that purpose, and apparently all parties wanted the investigation.

Now, in so far as the strict legal position is concerned, it is perfectly true, as the hon. minister has pointed out, that interests which did not want the investigation that was being conducted by the Grain Inquiry Commission applied for an injunction and stopped the investigation temporarily. That injunction ought never to have been issued according to the unanimous opinion of the Court of Appeal of the province of Manitoba, which, reversing the decision of the trial judge, held that this parliament had absolute power to order the investigation. We thought the investigation should have been resumed, but we did not have control of the matter and nothing further was done.

Our only desire, Mr. Speaker, is to have a real investigation as quickly and fully as such an investigation can properly be held, so that we may know exactly what the troubles are, if troubles there be. And certainly we have heard of many; why, every day we are receiving complaints. Cannot we find out what the truth is and remove grievances which, I have no doubt, exist? We want to help our hon. friends, and we know we are helping them for we told them to go ahead and not get themselves in a position where possibly they would be held up through misunderstandings or by obstacles raised here and there. Surely, for the present at any rate, the unanimous judgment of the Court of Appeal of Manitoba, unappealed as it has been, ought to be enough for us.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I think the confusion that has arisen in regard to this report is possibly the result of its wording. If I understand the purpose the committee has in mind, it is that this government should appoint a royal commission, and that if any of the provincial governments desire to co-operate they themselves should give powers to that particular commission. In other words, it is to permit the same gentlemen to exercise all the authority that can come to them from both the federal and provincial governments. If that is correct, I would say that so far as our government is concerned we will endeavour promptly to appoint a commission and to have in mind, in the selection of its personnel, the choice of gentlemen who would inspire the confidence of the governments that are likely to unite to co-operate in this matter. If that is the view of the committee it ought to settle the matter.

Mr. A. B. HUDSON (South Winnipeg): Mr. Speaker, I am not a member of the committee on Agricultural Conditions, but I have some knowledge of the legal position, and particularly of the injunction which the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) has referred to. An injunction was taken out and supported by the trial judge, who held that the commission was improperly issued and was beyond the powers of the Dominion authorities. As my right hon. friend has said, there was an appeal from that decision, and the Court of Appeal reversed the trial judge's finding, holding that the Dominion authorities had power to create that commission. The point in argument in support of the injunction was that the commission covered matters which were not within the purview of the Dominion parliament, but were solely within the jurisdiction of the provincial legislatures. That argument was not supported by the Court of Appeal. But since this decision of the Court of Appeal the Privy Council has decided that the act which

created the Board of Commerce was ultra vires. That had a direct bearing on the extent of the Dominion's powers in regard to matters such as this, and following that decision the Manitoba Court of Appeal held that some portions at least af the Canada Grain Act were ultra vires of the Dominion. For that reason if a commission is now issued solely under Dominion authority questions may be raised which were raised in the preceding case, and may create obstacles.

Mr. McMASTER: I thank you Mr. Speaker, and the House for giving me an opportunity to briefly address hon. members in connection with the report which was brought in unanimously by the committee of which I have the honour to be chairman. When we had the matter of investigating the grain trade brought before us we first of all discussed whether or not we should make the investigation ourselves. We came to the conclusion that if we attempted such an investigation we should have to set aside for the time being all our other work; it would give us more than really we could accomplish ourselves. Then I was asked to confer with the law officers of the Crown to see whether there was some way of obviating the situation which arose in connection with the last royal commission which was stopped in the course of its investigation by a judgment of the court of first instance in Manitoba. True, that judgment was set aside by the higher court of that province, but in rendering judgment the Court of Appeal indicated that, although a royal commission appointed by the federal power had the right to make a general investigation, still in the course of that investigation questions might come up touching contract, property and civil rights which would fall under provincial jurisdiction, and which might lay the investigation proposed to be carried on by the commission open to attack by any one who came before the provincial courts. So we proposed that the government should appoint a commission and should invite the provinces to name the same gentlemen as commissioners for the same purpose, and that these gentlemen should start their work clothed with every power that the sovereign authority of the provinces interested or the sovereign authority of the Dominion might bestow upon them. It seemed to me that that was a wise proceeding to take. It may consume a little more time at the beginning but certainly it opens a way for a full and complete investigation without possibility of let or hindrance.

Motion agreed to.

[Mr. Hudson.]

WRECK OF THE ALASKAN

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. NEILL: I should like to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe), only he is not present, if he would give orders to expedite bringing down the report of the commissioners who investigated the wreck of the Alaskan off the coast of British Columbia. This wreck investigation took place on the second of February; the investigation commission sat then, and on one or two subsequent days. This is the sixteenth of March, and I think the report might be forthcoming by this time.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS

HALIBUT FISHERIES TREATY

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. MEIGHEN: On the 12th of this month, an order was passed calling for production of the correspondence with the British government relating to the Halibut Fisheries Treaty and the execution thereof. Of course, that is four days ago. Some orders might take pretty long in preparation; but this concerns only one department. The correspondence would not likely be very long, and I think an hour would likely be enough in which to copy it. I was expecting the return yesterday or to-day.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think I can promise to give my right hon. friend most of the papers to-day. The delay has been on account of a cable having been sent to the British government to ask a question with respect to some of the papers, and the reply not yet having been received.

BONDED WAREHOUSES, NEW BRUNSWICK

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. CALDWELL: How soon may I expect the papers asked for under an order for return passed on 5th March, covering correspondence between the New Brunswick government and the federal government regarding bonded warehouses in New Brunswick?

Mr. BUREAU: I can bring the return down on Monday for my hon. friend.

MR. JAMES LARKIN

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Can the government give any information concerning the

question which I asked yesterday, as to the reasons for refusing Mr. James Larkin admission into Canada?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I have no further information than that an investigation is being made with respect to this case. I expect to hear to-morrow.

PROPOSED CUSTOMS OFFICER AT NEW YORK

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. LADNER: A despatch has come from British Columbia dealing with the question of a customs officer at New York. It quotes Mr. Oliver, the Premier of British Columbia, as saying that:

> —when he drew the attention of Premier King and Hon. Mr. Fielding, Minister of Finance, to the fact that duty was being collected on goods going from eastern Canada to British Columbia, they were astounded. The existing customs regulations laid it down that Canadian goods transhipped in a foreign port, unless under supervision of a Canadian customs officer, had to pay duty on entry into Canada. Yet, when British Columbia asked for the establishment in New York of a customs officer, the application was refused.

I want to ask if, in fact, the government have refused the application for a customs officer at New York. Because, I should like to say, this is a question in which public bodies, boards of trade and so on, at the coast, are greatly interested, and I understood the government had the matter still under consideration, and perhaps favourable consideration. This is a statement by the Premier of British Columbia.

Mr. BUREAU: Does the hon. member want the Prime Minister to answer?

Mr. LADNER: No.

Mr. BUREAU: An application has been made to place a customs officer at New York to look after the traffiic that goes via the ocean and the Panama canal. This matter has been under the consideration of the department, and while the department has not decided definitely, it feels inclined to refuse the application, because this would divert traffic towards the United States and all the Canadian railways would get out of it would be the haul from the point of departure to the boundary—the whole of the railroad haul to the sea and the whole of the ocean freight would go to the United States.

CANADIAN PURE BRED STOCK

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I notice that in the estimates provision has been made for the appointment of commissioners to visit South America and Great Britain with a view to securing trade in Canadian pure-bred stock. When will the report be placed on the Table or has it already been placed on the Table?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I have one of the reports ready. The other one will be ready, I expect, in the course of a day or two.

SUPPLY

IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the chair:

Immigration—outside service—salaries, $700,000.

Mr. HOEY: It was not my intention to take part in this discussion which has already become unduly long. I feel, however, that I should refer to the address delivered during the course of this debate by the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Garland). I regret that that hon. member felt it incumbent upon him to make certain statements, not because I believe the statements were in themselves untrue. In so far as they relate to Alberta, they may be conservative, but in so far as they relate to western Canada, as I know it, they are hopelessly and outlandishly exaggerated. The weakness of his address, it seems to me, lay in the fact that he failed to distinguish between conditions for which a mistaken economic policy has been responsible and conditions that are inherent in or natural to the territory which he described. Naturally our sympathies all go out to hon. members who have come from other lands, lands of peace and prosperity, and we can all realize their anxiety to return and enjoy the peace and prosperity associated in our minds with those lands from which they originally came.

I want to follow very closely in one particular the hon. member for St. John City (Mr. MacLaren), when he decided to discuss this problem of immigration from a purely sectional standpoint. I want to look at it from the standpoint of the province of Manitoba, with which I am most familiar, and in doing that I want to answer the question put, I think, by the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Martell), the chief interrogator for the Liberal party, who asked, "Why should we bring immigrants into this country?"

Turning to the province of Manitoba for a moment, what do we find? We find in that province political, educational, religious and social institutions far in excess of our present needs. We have in the province of Manitoba a parliament building of which we are justly proud, that was built in all good faith anticipating immigration, a structure which cost almost exactly as much as this edifice in which I speak this afternoon. We have also in that province an agricultural college, one of the finest in the Dominion of Canada, an agricultural college that cost us millions of dollars and costs us now hundreds of thousands of dollars a year to maintain an institution the capacity of which has never been tested. Nor is that all. If we turn eastward from Winnipeg to the Winnipeg river, we find there a complete power plant. It was opened in January of this year at a cost of exactly $6,000,000, money invested largely by American investors, business men of astuteness, men who have unshakable faith in the future of that province—an electrical plant that is at present giving us electricity far in excess of our present needs, the cheapest light and power on the American continent, a plant that ought ultimately to make the city of Winnipeg one of the largest industrial centres on the American continent.

If we turn to lake Winnipeg we have there in our fisheries, if they are carefully guarded and legitimately exploited, a source of inexhaustible wealth. We have our mining areas in the north, two of which have just recently been opened up, the value of which has not yet been determined. I say that the institutions to which I have referred earlier in my remarks were all built, in my judgment, in good faith. But we are over-institutionalized. I am not blaming anybody in the province of Manitoba to-day for that, but we are groaning and staggering under the burden of taxation resulting therefrom.

Let me take hon. members in imagination just for a moment or two to a typical Manitoba town. The train service is tri-weekly. We arrive at the depot and get into conversation with the station agent. If he is an honest man—and all station agents are honest men, as the Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock) well knows—what will he tell us? He will tell us what hundreds of them have told me, that they could handle three times the traffic that they are at present handling, and handle it just as efficiently without one cent of added cost to the company. Turning to the section men what do we find? Exactly the same conditions. Go into the village itself and there you will find two or three storekeepers who are unemployed two-thirds of their time. Go into the schools immediately adjoining that territory, and what do you find? You find school teachers, employed at a salary of approximately $100 per month, teaching seven, ten or fifteen youngsters, when they could just as efficiently teach forty-five. We find in those territories —and I know Manitoba; I do not take second place to any member in this House in my knowledge of Manitoba and conditions in that province; I stand open to correction, the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Brown) sits to my left—we find in those territories men attempting to farm—shall I say, or to scratch? —large areas of land. In this regard I often think of a story I once heard of a farm wife who sent a youngster out to set the hen on some eggs. She gave him a specified number, and when he returned she asked him how he accomplished the task. He said, "I accomplished it fine. I set the hen down on two hundred eggs." "Oh", she said in astonishment, "a hen can never cover two hundred eggs." "I know that", the boy replied, "but I did it just to see the old fool trying to spread herself." It is most pitiful, Mr. Chairman, to see the attempts on the part of certain sincere but mistaken agriculturists in the province to "spread themselves". Almost everything has been sacrificed—in some cases the education of their children, domestic utensils in the home, all sacrificed—in a mad lust to acquire more land. What would immigration mean to these districts? It would mean, first of all, a daily train service, and a daily train service would mean a daily postal service. It would mean the enrichment of the social life and the satisfaction of the social instincts of that community. It would add no extra burden so far as the maintainance of the institutions is concerned. That is my point.

I pass from that to what I consider to be the cardinal fallacy that has entered into this debate. "If you bring settlers into Canada you are going to increase production, and increased production will mean deflation of prices, if indeed you can obtain a market for your products at all." It is scarcely necessary to deal with such a fallacy; it is so pitifully obvious. If you bring an agriculturist from the United States and establish him in the province of Manitoba, does he still remain a producer in the United States? If you bring an immigrant from southern or northern Europe, or even from Ireland, does he remain a producer in Ireland? You cannot cut out competition by shutting men out of the country. The crux of the whole question is, are we going to bring them in

here to co-operate with us or let them remain outside to compete with us? That is the crux of the whole situation. "Oh," you say, "if you keep out European industrial workers we exclude competition and keep up the price of wages." Do you? You cannot keep out their products except by the erection of tariff barriers in which my hon. friends do not believe. Personally I cannot follow a course of reasoning that would allow manufactured articles to come in, and deny men the right to enter this country and manufacture such articles here. That is the cardinal point. "But", you say, "we can keep them in Europe; it is true we cannot keep them from competing with us, if they are Slavs, on the free markets of England, but we can keep them unemployed in Europe." Yes, but to the extent that you keep them unemployed there you paralyze Europe's purchasing power, and consequently cause reaction against your own trade and commerce.

I want to make this suggestion to the minister, with whom I have considerable sympathy and in whose sincerity I absolutely believe, I want to ask him if he has ever seriously considered the advisability of extending to rural areas in this province the housing scheme created by the late government and confined until now to the urban centres. We might establish in the province of Manitoba—or indeed, for that matter, anywhere in Canada—a standard farm labourer's dwelling constructed out of concrete, indestructible, at a cost of say $2,500; we might establish such cottages on our larger tracts of land, give the farm labourer a home in which to live with an acre of land upon which he could produce during the summer months sufficient to keep him and his family during the winter, a little cottage where his wife could board the hired help of the farmer that are now a nuisance—I might precede that by an adjective but I do not want to—to the over-worked farmer's wife, where the wife of the farm labourer could help the farmer's wife during the busy season of the year, and where the farm labourer's family could grow up and enjoy the great advantages of rural life. Similar homes have been erected in European countries, the suggestion is in no sense original. After you had erected such homes and had brought men with their families and established them there, after they had acquired experience and had become familiar with Canadian conditions, is it not the most likely thing in the world that the man who is to-day farming two sections would enter into an agreement with his farm labourer now Canadianized—I mean Canadianized in so far as farming experience is concerned—to take over half of the land he is attempting to scratch.

Reference has been made by the hon. member for Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth), to unemployment in the city of Winnipeg. Unemployment exists there. Unemployment has always existed in Winnipeg, and personally I do not think the government treated Winnipeg fairly in regard to unemployment relief this year. Winnipeg has for years been the rendezvous for the surplus farm labour of the three prairie provinces. You can talk to thousands of them on the train, and what do they tell you? "We are going to the Peg, there's no other burg on the prairies big enough to give us a good time." The result is that they crowd in from bankrupt Alberta and from comparatively prosperous Saskatchewan, causing unemployment, causing congestion, creating chaos—and the city of Winnipeg has got to maintain them. We have a real grievance, speaking as an industrial worker in the city of Winnipeg, against the agriculturists of the prairies; and I think the time has come when we have a right to demand of them that they absorb their surplus farm help in the fall of each year. How can they expect us to maintain it?

Mr. COOTE: Does my hon. friend not believe in immigration? If so, why does he object to this labour immigrating to Winnipeg?

Mr. HOEY: I say the time has come when we have a right to demand that these agriculturists, a great many of whom are in no sense insolvent, absorb their own surplus labour. And I want to say that after fifteen years' intensive study of the rural problem in the province of Manitoba, I do not think this labour can ever hope to become absorbed until some such scheme as I have indicated is launched. Personally I would take the whole amount to be voted for immigration this year and build farm labour cottages. The building of these cottages would cause employment and stimulate the building trades; it would distribute wealth in this country and go far to create a spirit of optimism; and when you have these homes constructed I can assure you that there are thousands with their families to-day in the urban centres who will be glad to go out and take possession of them. The scheme may seem impracticable, it did seem so to me at one time, but it is the best suggestion I can submit.

I am opposed to the co-operation of the government with the Canadian Colonization Association—not because I know anything of

that body, but because I believe the co-operation does no go far enough to achieve practical results. But it goes far enough to create suspicion in the minds of the people, and create a great deal of unpopularity so far as the government is concerned. That, without knowing anything about the association, is the position that I take. If I were the minister I would put forth a supreme effort to interest the provincial departments of immigration. I would propose to the province of Manitoba that their department of immigration, which has been dead for some years, might be resuscitated and placed under the Minister of Agriculture, the federal government perhaps, paying the salary of the Deputy Minister of Immigration. I would propose some such policy to all of the provincial governments. I would go further than that, I would get in touch with our municipal reeves, and our municipal councils throughout the province; I think that the thing might be very profitably discussed if we are going to have a conference on the problem of taxation in this country. And then I would utilize the whole machinery associated with the Soldier Settlement Board. Now, if the federal government, the provincial governments, the municipal authorities and the Soldier Settlement Board cannot put across this scheme of immigration I do not think the Canadian Colonization Association can. The co-operation which is proposed by the minister is going to be interpreted as a tacit confession of failure on the part of the Dominion government to undertake a task which is paramountly their duty.

Now, just a word with regard to the type of immigrant that should come in. I have come in contact with thousands of so-called non-English-speaking people in the province of Manitoba. I have entered their homes; I have met them in a thousand and one different ways. I want to say that they are not the most prosperous people in the province to-day, but they are as prosperous as other sections of our Manitoba people and, I think, the most contented. They were driven up into the northern sections of the province; they had to encounter almost unsurmountable obstacles. They have made good, their young men are entering the universities and graduating with honours; they are entering the professions; they are a source of pride not only to Manitoba but to the Dominion as a whole. But when you turn to the class of immigrants that we should encourage to come in, it is a somewhat difficult task to determine the most desirable type. Personally I am opposed to bringing into this country any man who has passed the age of 35 years. You can never detach him from the old country habits and from the old country methods of doing things. Again and again he will remind you of the kind of trains they have in the Old Country, the way they live there and the way they do things there. If you bring him out when he is comparatively young, he forgets the Old Country. I never think of the Old Country. Therefore, I would discourage men who are past the age of 35 years coming to this country.

Speaking of Scandinavians I would admit all the Scandinavians into Canada to-morrow and would be prepared to accept the responsibility for so doing. I never met in western Canada a Scandinavian who was, if you will pardon the colloquialism, "broke." I remember a former American school teacher in Minnesota paying me a great tribute on one occasion when I was in conversation with her. She asked me how long I had been in that part of the country where I resided. I said I had been there three years. She said "How did you acquire such a working knowledge of English?" I said they spoke English in the land from which I came. She said "Have you not come from Sweden?" The Scandinavians are the best settlers that have been brought to this country. But when you are deciding the type of settlers it all depends on the ambition of the individual, and unfortunately it is difficult to detect ambition in a man—when you are first introduced to him it is absolutely impossible. I can remember an immigrant who came to this country some fourteen years ago. When he arrived in the city of Quebec he had not $35 which, at that time, it was necessary for him to have in order to land. But by his ingenuity he evaded the immigration authorities and got in. He came up to the city of Montreal, and unemployment at that time was rampant. After two hours' search he secured a job in a Montreal tannery owned by a Scotchman, washing and stretching hides. The old employer said to him "The work is difficult and onerous, but the wages are high", and he received for his work in that tannery for two months $7 a week. He saved in that two months enough money to take him to Fort Frances in New Ontario, where he obtained a position at $400 a year, where he worked for two years and saved enough to enable him to take a five-year college course—that is, with the little additional sums the he was able to earn during the college vacation. We sometimes hear of men living on a meal a day. This particular immigrant

lived for four days on one meal, and I remember on one occasion he lived for five days on one meal, and the last six weeks of the year in which he graduated he lived for ten cents a day, and was denied
4 p.m. the privilege of writing home to his parents, because he did not have the money for postage. His parents were then living but have since died. He graduated from that institution, and is to-day a member of the Dominion parliament. He is still in his thirties, and by no means a physical wreck. I wish to say that even the discussions that have taken place on this subject have not shaken my faith in the Dominion of Canada. With that experience, Mr. Chairman, could I honestly and conscientiously deny young ambitious men the right to come into this country? I would not encourage them to come in, and I would not spend a cent to bring them in, but I would allow them to come if they so desired. We have a tremendous debt in this country. We have social conditions that are depressing, but I believe we can bring immigrants in here who will help us surmount these difficulties, and help us pay off these financial obligations, and in the meantime these immigrants may enjoy a measure of prosperity which is greater than you can enjoy in any other country in modern civilization.

Mr. CLARK: I find myself, Mr. Chairman, very much in agreement with the sentiments expressed by the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Hoey) and I think it entirely proper that I should congratulate him upon the attitude he takes on this question. I certainly agree with him in his statement that immigration in this country is a great necessity. I look upon the problem of immigration as the greatest problem facing this country to-day. It is the country's most important business and likewise the most important business of this House. Canada cannot develop without an increase in her population. The subject of immigration cannot be considered except in relation to three things, farm industry, our railways and our industrial concerns. Each one of those has its own bearing upon this subject. Our farmers complain that they are not making profits today. I think the same is true of our industrials. Canada is over-industrialized, she is over-built with railways, and at the present time all classes are suffering owing to the lack of markets. The hon. member for Springfield said: Are we going to bring in immigrants to co-operate with us, or leave them out to compete with us? I think that is all very well, so far as it goes, but if they co-operate with us they will certainly create markets for our farmers and for our manufacturers, and traffic for our railways, and increased traffic will produce what the farmers so urgently desire, lower freight rates, and thereby lessen the cost of their agricultural implements and other necessities. Increased production and increased markets must also enable the manufacturer to reduce his overhead, and by increasing the volume of his production, enable him to reduce the price at which it can be sold. Furthermore this increase in population will mean more people to share our burdens of taxation.

A great deal has been said with regard to the question of emigration. I believe that emigration from our farming community has resulted from the burdens borne by these farmers due to high freight rates, due to the fact that they are not getting more for their produce, or very little more, than they were before the war, and due to the decreased value of our dollar. Therefore, our farmers are leaving, wherever they can, for better farms, or better places to earn a living. The lack of markets has caused stagnation in industries and building trades. The result is that our skilled artisans, our professional men, our architects are leaving the country to go to the United States where there is an industrial boom. But when we create those conditions which are bound to result from an increased population these men will flow back into the country.

I believe that the matter of great importance in connection with any policy of immigration is to select immigrants from the right sort of people, and the qualifications of such people, in my opinion, are these. First, the mental capacity of the immigrants; secondly, I would see to it that we secure people whom we can assimilate; and thirdly, I would insist that the people who come are such as will not drag down the standard of living in Canada. We in British Columbia have a very good illustration of the sort of immigrants we cannot assimilate, in the orientals who have been allowed to come into the country. And the people in the East, I believe, have also had an example of people whom it is impossible to absorb into the population in those immigrants who go into the city of Montreal, for instance, and work in the sweat shops, thus driving out our best labour from the manufacturing industries and forcing them to seek employment elsewhere. I know of two industrial concerns in Hamilton, one of which has failed recently. That firm always employed good Canadian citizens of Hamilton,

and I believe they have been driven out of business because of the fact that we have permitted to come into the country sweat shop labour that we cannot assimilate into our population, and with which our own people cannot compete.

I have listened with a great deal of interest to the long explanation given by the minister and I must confess that I have yet no clear conception of what he has done or what he proposes to do with reference to this problem. I believe that we are entering an era in the history of this country when we require for our proper development something new in the shape of an aggressive immigration policy; we need measures that are vigorous and bold. We have to take a chance if we are to succeed; we cannot sit down and rely on old methods and the course of nature if we are to secure the population which we so much require. I know of a scheme which has been before the department for at least a year and which involved the bringing into Canada of the most desirable type of settlers from the north of Scotland, from the Hebrides, but I have reason to believe that these settlers have not yet been secured, although at least a thousand of them could have been brought in in the last year. Why has not this been done? I cannot understand why we should suffer from a moment's delay in this regard. We want people in this country of the right sort and we should not hesitate a moment in seizing an opportunity to bring in a dozen, a hundred, or a thousand men who will make desirable citizens.

With the majority of the members of this House, I regard farming as our basic industry; and so far as I can gather from the minister's policy he purposes to look for agricultural immigrants from foreign countries. True, he states that the British will be given the preference. But what steps is he going to take to bring people from the British Isles into Canada? I have waited for some explanation as to why such a small amount is spent in advertising in Great Britain in comparison with such a tremendous sum in foreign countries. That explanation has been promised but so far it is not forthcoming, and I think that this House might have expected it almost forthwith, after the suggestion that was made that enough was not being spent in Great Britain. In my opinion it is possible to secure desirable settlers from Great Britain for farming purpose—I have given one instance of where there are farmers available for this country who have not been brought in.

[Mr. Clark.]

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Perhaps I might reply to my hon. friend at this stage in regard to the matter of advertising. The approximate sum spent in Great Britain is $69,000, and in all other countries about $200,000.

Mr. CLARK: Well I still look on that as being almost as bad as the figures we were given at first, of some $3,000 and $90,000 respectively. This country requires an energetic and aggressive campaign for immigrants from Great Britain.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The hon. gentleman is complaining about nothing having been done in the north of Scotland. We have had an agent working there and settlers are coming from that part of Great Britain about the beginning of next month.

Mr. CLARK: I was speaking of last year; I was refering to people who, I knew, were available but who were not brought.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): If my hon. friend was in the House when I spoke he will remember I stated there was a delegation of five gentlemen who travelled throughout Canada last year from the north of Scotland and who were coming back to this country with a fairly large number of their neighbours. These people intend to settle in the vicinity of Red Deer, Alberta, that desperate province, about the ruin of which we have heard so much.

Mr. CLARK: I am glad to know that some steps are being taken in this direction, but at the same time I want to impress upon the minister the fact that our people are anxious to increase the 54 per cent of Anglo-Saxons who now reside in Canada. And we can do this by a proper, aggressive campaign for immigrants from Great Britain. I do not know whether a suggestion from me is of any use, but I cannot see why we should not inform the British government and our agents in Great Britain that we are prepared to take in this country 100,000, or as many as they like to send, of the youth of Great Britain from the ages of fourteen to sixteen or seventeen. The Canadian government could take the responsibility of placing them on proper farms and carrying out a system of inspection of these farms to see that these youths were properly educated, and there might be, in connection with a scheme of this kind, a regular annual examination, so that these boys, when they qualified under tests prescribed by the Department of Agriculture, or whatever department was selected, might be enabled to secure land of their own and

be encouraged to develop it. By so doing I believe we could form the foundation in this country of such a future as we cannot expect if we bring in undesirable immigrants from foreign countries.

The same policy should be adopted for our cities. I think, with the hon. member (Mr. Hoey), that there should be co-operation between our Department of Immigration and the various municipal councils. But I would go further. We have in every city and town social service organizations such as Rotary and Kiwanis clubs, Y.M.C.A.'s and church associations, every one of which is directly interested in the development of this country. I would advocate that we carry on a campaign of education among these organizations with a view to impressing upon them the great importance to Canada's welfare of increasing our population by the addition of the right sort of people. And I believe that if proper steps were taken to co-operate with these organizations we could secure the results we desire.

We have placed before us briefly three views: one, no restrictions; two, no immigrants; three, selected immigrants. I want to support my argument for selected immigrants, and for immigrants as largely as possible from the British Isles, with some figures giving the experience of the United States. They have gone through a period in their history similar to what we will go through in the next hundred years. They have had the experience, let us benefit by that experience. What I am about to quote is the result of their experience gained from scientific tests made by them during the war. Scientific mental tests were made on 1,700,000 officers and men of the American expeditionary force. This is a quotation from the official army mental tests:

> Relatively early in this supreme struggle, it became clear to certain individuals that the proper utilization of man-power, and more particularly of mind or brain-power, would assure ultimate victory. . . All this had to be done in the least possible time. Never before in the history of civilization was brain, as contrasted with brawn, so important; never before, the proper placement and utilization of brain-power so essential to success.
>
> Our War Department, nerved to exceptional risks by the stern necessity for early victory, saw and immediately seized its opportunity to develop various new lines of personnel work. Among these is numbered the psychological service. Great will be our good fortune if the lesson in human engineering which the war has taught is carried over directly and effectively into our civil institutions and activities.
>
> The purposes of these psychologcal tests were, as stated in the army orders: "(a) to aid in segregating the mentally incompetent, (b) to classify men according to their mental capacity, (c) to assist in selecting competent men for responsible positions." And, to quote a subsequent official pronouncement after the administration of the tests: "In the opinion of this office these reports indicate very definitely that the desired results have been achieved."

These tests were made according to nationality of the individual, and the table which I shall now present gives the percentage of inferiors found among 1,700,000 men, namely:

Country of Birth—	Percentage of inferiority
England	8.7
Holland	9.2
Denmark	13.4
Scotland	13.6
Germany	15.0
Sweden	19.4
Canada	19.5
Belgium	24.0
Norway	25.6
Austria	37.5
Ireland	39.4
Turkey	42.0
Greece	43.6
Russia	60.4
Italy	63.4
Poland	69.9

In the table giving the percentage of superiority we find the English again come first. Here are the figures:

Country of birth—	Percentage of superiority
England	19.7
Scotland	13.0
Holland	10.7
Canada	10.5
Germany	8.3
Denmark	5.4
Sweden	4.3
Norway	4.1
Ireland	4.1
Turkey	3.4
Austria	3.4
Russia	2.7
Greece	2.1
Italy	.8
Belgium	.8
Poland	.5

I think these tables tell a very interesting story summarizing the experience of the United States. In selecting immigrants from foreign countries I think the minister might well be guided by the experience of the United States and profit by the lessons they have learned.

I should like to refer to a remark made, I think, either by the minister himself (Mr. Stewart) or by the leader of the Progressive party (Mr. Forke), that the Londoner cannot stand the conditions on our farms.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I did not say so.

Mr. CLARK: Then it was the leader of the Progressive party. I take issue with him. While the Londoner of mature age may not make a good farmer, still the youth born in London will if he is properly trained. I be-

lieve the Londoner can be trained to do anything. Many of us saw the Londoner on the field of battle, and we also saw him living under conditions that no farmer in this country has ever had to endure—sleeping in the mud and on ice with nothing under him but a waterproof sheet. And he stood it. We must not belittle the Anglo-Saxon, the British, because I feel that the United States have proved beyond all question that the immigrant of Anglo-Saxon stock makes the best citizen. He is the dominant influence in the United States to-day. In my opinion the only way in which we can make this country prosperous and have a national type with a proper patriotism is to follow the policy of bringing the Britisher to this country and thus making Canada a British nation instead of the conglomerate nation we shall be if we persist in the policy of bringing in foreigners.

Mr. EULER: Mr. Chairman, I am not entering this debate with any thought of delaying the estimates, nor of embarrassing the minister, but to offer what little I can to solve what seems to be a very difficult problem. I am glad to speak for a moment, if it is only to congratulate the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Hoey) on the excellent address he gave the committee a few moments ago. I was very glad to hear what he said, because after I had visualized the picture drawn by the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Garland) last night I feared that one of the factors in the prosperity of the city from which I come was about to disappear entirely.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Mr. Chairman, if I may be allowed a question. Is not the hon. gentleman aware—I am quite sure the hon. member for Springfield is—that the crop of which we have a record in the Manitoba Free Press for 1921 fell below the taxes of the province by over $16,000,000?

Mr. EULER: Mr. Chairman, I was not referring to an isolated statement of that kind at all.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): But that is the fact.

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. EULER: I was referring to the statement my hon. friend made last night that his province was practically bankrupt. And people who are bankrupt cannot buy goods.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): We are not buying them, either.

Mr. EULER: I think it is hardly necessary to argue that immigration is desirable, although I know there are elements in this House that are rather unfriendly to the idea of bringing more people into this country. I do not think the point needs labouring that we want more people. In a country of the size of Canada, with its illimitable resources, the question of the need of more people should not be open to argument at all. But if in working out the details, the minister finds that he is meeting with a good deal of difficulty and some opposition, I would say to him, if I may, that in this parliament as elsewhere, it is absolutely impossible always to reconcile the ideas of various people, and he should go on just as he thinks is in the interest of the people of Canada. When I say that, I would also say—and I will refer to this later—that I do not entirely agree with one or two of the suggestions which he has in mind.

The value of immigration cannot be minimised. It develops our natural resources, in the first place. The greater the number of people you have in the country, the greater the consumption and therefore, the greater will be the production required. Thus, the question whether we should have more people in this country with its great spaces and its resources should not be open to argument. There are certain facts operating against the success of immigration at the present time, even if we open the door very wide. The first thing is the high cost of transportation. The people of the British Isles, and the people of European continental countries as well, are not blessed with a great deal of this world's goods. In many instances, they have not the money, even if they so desire, to pay their way across the ocean. In past years those immigrants who have come to Canada—and I have knowledge of some of them—have come here because their friends or relatives in this country have advanced them the money to pay for transportation. The second reason is this, that in the past two years the restrictions have been so onerous that it has been impossible for those people to come. While some of those restrictions have, I am glad to say, been removed by the present government—and I am in this making no special criticism of the previous government—the effects of those restrictions are still occupying the minds of people who would like to come. There are, I understand, people to-day in England and on the European continent who believe it is impossible for them to enter Canada, who believe that the restrictions which existed at one time are still in force. A vigorous immigration policy would include making known to the people whom we wish to secure the fact that they would be welcome if they desired to come to Canada. For that

I would spend a little money; I would not spend a great deal. I may say frankly and almost at the outset that I am in favour of voluntary immigration. I am not particularly enamoured—and I say this with all goodwill —of any scheme which contemplates the expenditure of great sums of money to induce people to come to Canada, and perhaps, painting rosier pictures than should be painted. I am also not very greatly in favour of spending large amounts of money on those people after they arrive in Canada. Briefly, I would say this. I would spend a reasonable sum of money in acquainting the people of various countries from which we wish to attract immigrants, with the fact that if they are willing to work, if they are healthy, if they are white, if they are morally and physically sound, we shall be glad to welcome them to this country and to open the door to them.

I might say, just in passing, in reply to the speech of the hon. gentleman who preceded me (Mr. Clark) that I am quite in sympathy with him when he says that we ought to encourage immigration from the British Isles. I believe, however, if we desire to obtain all the immigration which this country ought to have and which it can stand, we cannot stop there.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): What class of men would the hon. member bring from the British Isles?

Mr. EULER: I was coming to that a little later on; but I would say to my hon. friend that I would not bar a man whether he was a farmer or engaged in any other occupation, provided that he was physically, mentally and morally fit. I was going to refer for a moment to some of the remarks made by one or two hon. members opposite, and more particularly to the remarks made by the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Garland). Last evening, when I was listening to him, I felt rather depressed and discouraged for fear that what he said might possibly be true, although I could hardly believe it. I was, for that reason, particularly pleased that the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Hoey) took up the cudgels on behalf of the western provinces and said what he did.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I would not like the hon. member to go on record in that way. Every word of what I said was true, and the hon. member for Springfield admitted that quite possibly it was true in Alberta.

Mr. EULER: I did not hear the hon. member for Springfield admit that the West was bankrupt. In discussing western Canada and the life of the farmer there, I say with all sincerity—and I think my hon. friends will believe me—that those who come from industrial Ontario have every sympathy with the western farmer, and I believe we are willing to go almost any distance in a reasonable way to help them, if giving such assistance is possible. In saying that, I am thinking now of another farming district in Ontario. I come from the county of Waterloo, the centre of a farming and industrial district in western Ontario. I believe that there we have, perhaps, the happiest combination, the combination that makes for success. We have an industrial population, manufacturing towns and cities surounded by good farming country in which mixed farming is being carried on. If that could be developed in western Canada, I think the problem that is being discussed would be solved.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Would the hon. member tell us where the farmers would find a market for products from mixed farming?

Mr. EULER: I was coming to that. That deals very intimately with the question of immigration of which we are speaking now. That is why I am in favour of immigration for the West as well as for other parts of Canada. I was going to make a comparison. In western Ontario, the part of the province from which I come we have first-class agricultural land. In Western Canada, I fear it is true that many of the farmers, particularly in southern Alberta, from what I have heard, have become located on land which will never be able to support them as an agricultural community. That will correct itself in time. Apparently, the greatest difficulty they have is their distance from the market. The population is not there to consume that which they themselves produce, and they are forced to the necessity of exporting their goods by rail for some thousand or fifteen hundred miles and then overseas to foreign markets. I am not a pessimist when I say this, but this has often occurred to me when the difficulties of the western farmer have been discussed: I am not sure whether the West, in the matter of growing wheat and exporting it thousands of miles to the country of consumption, is not at the present moment conducting what is really a great experiment. I do not know whether it is possible for western Canada to continue to grow wheat only and to send it to market, this requiring the expenditure of large sums of money for transportation, something which cannot be overcome at the present time. It must be difficult to carry this on, because the western farmers are in competition with countries where wheat can

be produced at low prices and transported at lower costs.

Mr. HOEY: Is the hon. member aware that the best British economists inform us that wheat consumption in Europe to-day is only one-third of what it would normally be if Europe were re-established?

Mr. EULER: That is, in a way, an answer to my question. When the European peoples become able again to purchase to the full extent of their requirements, the price of wheat will go up, and that will immediately be reflected in the prosperity of the western farmer. Let us hope that that condition will soon come about.

Mr. GOULD: "A good time coming".

Mr. EULER: In the meantime the eastern farmer has his local market, and I am inclined to believe—I do not care to be dogmatic with regard to these things—that that which makes the eastern farmer prosperous will be what in the end will have to make the western farmer prosperous, and that is the development of a home market.

Miss MACPHAIL: Does the hon. member consider that the eastern farmer is prosperous to-day?

Mr. EULER: I am speaking now for the farmers in my own community. Perhaps when I use the word "prosperous", I use too strong a word.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. EULER: I am not going to say I used too strong a word. I said "perhaps". I do say this, that the farmers in the neighbourhood in which I live are very comfortable. They produce a great many of the things which they need; they produce a variety of commodities—butter, cheese, eggs, wheat, and the other products that are raised in western Ontario, and which they take to the towns and industrial centres. The point I want to make is that the interests of the cities and towns are identical with theirs, the farmer gets his home market there, and the working man living in the towns and cities gets the benefit of having these goods brought in to him from time to time. I believe that that will be the salvation of the West. Perhaps I should not say the salvation, but I believe that is the proper solution of their problem. When the hon. member for Springfield spoke of the development of a water power in Manitoba great enough to move the wheels of vast industries, I was hoping that at no distant time the West itself would begin to create its own industrial centres, and then the problem of the farmers will be solved if they apply themselves diligently to farming as farming ought to be carried out, and do not try to spread themselves over too much territory, as was mentioned by the hon. member for Springfield.

Mr. GOULD: What is "too much"?

Mr. EULER: If it is true that the western lands, as in some cases has been mentioned, are not in a position to produce crops, if that should turn out to be the general condition in the West, which I do not believe, then I do not see how any legislation on the part of this or any other government can relieve the situation. I am not referring particularly to the tariff. I know my western friends would like to have the tariff reduced, and in some cases entirely wiped out. I come from an industrial community. Some 150 to 175 manufacturing establishments are operating in the town from which I come, and I say to my hon. friends, if it is of any interest to them to have me say it, I am not a high protectionist. I have the good of the industries at heart. I do not wish to see them destroyed.

Mr. SHAW: Can my hon. friend mention any member of this House who is a high protectionist?

Mr. EULER: I think that almost anybody in the chamber is as capable of forming an opinion with regard to that as I am.

Mr. HANSON: Then the hon. member is not in sympathy with the tariff plank in the Liberal platform of 1919.

Mr. EULER: I do not know just exactly what the hon. member is driving at, but I will say quite frankly that I at no time approved of the tariff plank in the Liberal platform.

I was making a comparison between the eastern farmer, and the western farmer, and for that reason I did not think it necessary to discuss the tariff in this connection for the simple reason that the tariff applies to the eastern farmer just as it does to the western farmer. If the trouble, then, is with the markets, they must find their market in the United States where there are great centres of population nearer to them, or else build a market of their own. The latter takes time and immigration, and that is my sole reason for referring to the West and western conditions in this way.

Mr. BIRD: How would it be possible for the West to build up industrial centres without some form of protection against the highly developed industrialism of Ontario and Quebec?

Mr. EULER: There is no reason in the world why the west could not develop industries just as Ontario has done. I can see no point in that argument.

Mr. BIRD: The hon. gentleman seems to be anxious to protect the industries of his own town against the industries of the United States. Have we of the West not the same right to be anxious concerning the highly developed industries of Ontario?

Mr. EULER: I cannot grasp the hon. member's solicitude for the industries of western Ontario. I do not see why in the course of time western Canada, which is under exactly the same economic conditions as eastern Canada so far as the tariff is concerned, cannot develop industries in the same way as western Ontario has developed them, or Quebec, or any other part of Canada. Perhaps I am very slow in grasping the point of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BIRD: I wish I could put the question a little more clearly, because it is vital. How does the hon. member expect western Canada to develop industries without some form of protection against the highly developed industries of Ontario?

Mr. EULER: In exactly the same way as, to-day, a small manufacturer can begin his industry in Ontario and build it up in competition with the larger ones.

Mr. GOOD: Why, then, do the Ontario manufacturers need protection against the United States manufacturers?

Mr. EULER: I did not propose to get into a debate on the tariff, though I am not at all afraid of debating the tariff. As I said, I am not a high protectionist, or perhaps I might say, as one hon. gentleman said once, I am not a very high protectionist. The one answer to that question, and I propose then to go on with my argument, is this: As against the United States you have a population of 120,000,000 to compete with. Their manufacturers have a market of 120,000,000 of people as compared with the 8,000,000 of people that the Canadian manufacturer has for his market. I will say this, and leave it at that: I believe there are many manufacturers in Canada to-day—and I know some of them in my own community—who would be willing to enter into open competition on an equal basis with the United States manufacturer if the tariff wall came down both ways. But to ask the Canadian manufacturer to throw his market open to the highly developed industries of the United States, with their big home market, and not have access to that market himself, that, I say is not a fair and square deal.

Mr. GOOD: They are ready for reciprocity.

Mr. EULER: Now, I think I might be permitted to go on with my real argument. I have said that I favoured a form of voluntary immigration with no great amount of money expended in bringing the people here, but I would like to make known to them that they could come, and that we would welcome them when they did come. I would open the door reasonably wide with proper precautions. I would let in the man who looks like a worker, though I agree with the hon. member for Springfield that it might be pretty difficult to say whether a man is an earnest worker or not, but where there was any doubt I would be inclined to give the immigrant the benefit of the doubt.

I think there are certain things that are fundamental in the discussion of this question. First of all, the immigrant should be physically healthy, mentally and morally healthy. Secondly, there should be a certain racial fitness, and in that I am not going so far perhaps as some others; when I speak of that, I would say that I would exclude the oriental; I would go that far, and not a great deal further. And then there should be a certain industrial fitness, although I think that is of minor importance.

Now, some of the non-essentials as I view them are these: I would not insist on any great money qualification. If this country had insisted on immigrants having a certain amount of money in their pockets upon arrival, I wonder how many of us would be here to-day. I think the forefathers, the fathers and grandfathers, of a great many of us, would not have been able to come to Canada if there had been any money test at that time. I am glad that requirement has now been removed. I do not think the matter of language is so important; that will correct itself in one generation. I further think that the matter of occupation is not of very great importance either, because if we enforce too many restrictions, if we ask too many questions of these people as to what they are going to do, exactly what man they are going to be employed with, and all the rest of it, the impression will remain in the European countries and in Britain that it is difficult to enter Canada, and a great many people whom it would be desirable to have come here would not even attempt to enter. So I say that if men fill all the requirements of which I have spoken I would let them enter Canada no

matter what their race or creed, and I would bid them welcome.

Now, I am going to speak for a moment about the position of labour in regard to this matter. I know that the representatives of labour have some doubts as to the advisability of permitting men to come into this country who are not going on the farm. I have not the fears that perhaps they have. I have before me here an extract taken from one of the Toronto papers—possibly it has been quoted before—which reads:

> Canadian skilled Labor is absorbed
>
> Ontario now faced with a shortage
>
> That the absorption of Canadian skilled labor by the United States continues, and that the result the industrial life of the province of Ontario is faced with the prospect of a shortage of labour comparable with war-time conditions, is the opinion of William Meath, superintendent of the Ontario Government Employment Service. "There is still some unemployment in Ontario", said Mr. Meath "but these without work are mostly unskilled men. The coming of spring with the revival of building and construction work is sure to encounter a famine in trained labour in Ontario" says Mr. Meath.

The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, (Mr. Robb) some time ago, in the course of an address stated as follows:

> "It should be the ambition of all," he said to work for the day when Canada will export all finished products. This day would see increased labour in the country and a consequent increased domestic consumption of Canada's own products. He said that Canada would not only have to make goods in quantity but in quality. The keynote of the export trade, urged the speaker, was quality.

Now, I would not for one moment be understood as saying that the skilled workmen of Canada are not as skilled as those of other countries, I think that the great majority of them are; but there does actually exist in some of the manufacturing towns and cities in this country to-day a scarcity of skilled labour in certain lines, and it has been difficult to get the right kind of men from other countries. I can cite an incident in support of that statement. I spoke to a gentleman—a manufacturer in a very large way, who had built up his business with his own hands and had himself been a workman—and he said to me, "I do not like to take a walk through my factory and see the way in which the work is done. It is not done the way we did it in the olden days. We are making to-day articles of as good quality as anybody in Canada, but they are not as good as they were because we are unable to get skilled labour at the present time." If we did permit a number of intelligent and industrious men to enter this country freely—I do not say that we should go after them particularly—I do not believe there would be any hardship worked to the men who are already here. In this connection I want for a moment to refer to what was said by the hon. member for George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs) and to support his statement. He referred to the attitude of the president of the Dominion Trades and Labour Congress, Mr. Tom Moore, and he disagreed with that attitude. I was rather surprised to read some time ago an article written by that gentleman in which, while he did not absolutely say so in so many words, he intimated that he objected to the coming into Canada of immigrants who would go to the farms, because possibly they might drift into the cities and there compete with workmen. If Mr. Moore was correctly reported I think that is a selfish view that would not be endorsed by the working people in general in Canada, and I think it is an attitude that is entirely improper—possibly that word is too strong—but it is an attitude that should not be taken by a gentleman who is also a director of the National Railways in whose success the matter of immigration is such a great factor.

I have only one more point to touch upon, and it is one that I have not heard mentioned to any great extent. I think, possibly, those who know me best will not say that I am a sentimentalist, or anything of that kind, but I would like to refer to the humanitarian side of the question of immigration. They say that charity begins at home, but I do not think that a civilized people can entirely dissociate themselves from the welfare of others of their race or from the obligations to their fellow men. We were said to have fought a war to end war, but the world has been disappointed in that hope. There is only one remedy for that evil and that is a realization by all the peoples of the world that there is such a thing as the brotherhood of man. Now it seems to me that if that is true, it is inhuman and immoral, if the term is not too strong, to exclude from this country, which has infinitely more territory than the present population can occupy, men women and children desiring to escape the misery of over-crowding and the conditions of war-worn Europe, where life is such a trial and in some cases is almost impossible. I wonder, Sir, whether eight or nine millions of people have the right to monopolize the millions of acres of land and the boundless resources which they themselves cannot occupy and develop. Are we justified in assuming that the Creator of the human race has given forever and exclusively to the few people in Canada this land for us and our descendants? I do not believe it. I am not, Sir, in favour of un-

restricted immigration. I do not believe that we should admit people whom it would not be in our interest or their interest to admit. The United States has a negro problem on its hands because it imported years ago a prolific race which never will assimilate with the white people of that country. I do not think we want to repeat that error, we do not want a jumble of black and white and yellow races, but my conviction is this: Excluding those, our proper immigration policy is to let it be known that we shall welcome industrious people of all kinds, so long as they are white and physically and morally fit and likely readily to become real Canadians in this or the next generation.

Mr. LEWIS: During the past few weeks when reading the newspapers I was in hopes that peace was in sight in Ireland. But after hearing the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Hoey), I have decided that the prospect is hopeless. In regard to this important subject that is now being discussed I was just a little disappointed in the spech of that hon. member. I will tell you why. My hon. friend mentioned immigration, and also spoke of the economic factors that entered into the life of the West, but devoted practically the whole of his time to the subject of immigration. I wish he had devoted his fine talents to solving the economic difficulties that are the real cause of our dissatisfaction at the present time.

The hon. member for North Waterloo (Mr. Euler) made the statement that the West needs salvation. By implication he admits that the conditions are not what they should be in the West, and in speaking of the conditions of Canada in general and the subject of immigration he naturally spoke of the brotherhood of man. I wonder whether the brotherhood of man takes in the black man and the yellow race as well as the white race. Of course, I do not believe in these people being admitted here, but it seems to me to be a little inconsistent, when you are speaking of the brotherhood of man and the equality of man, to discriminate against those races. It may be that some time in the near future it will be difficult for us to discriminate against those nations which are becoming enlightened forces in the world at the present time. The hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Clark) spoke of British immigration. So far as that question is concerned, he has my sympathy. I believe to a large extent that a British country, or a country that was settled by the British to a large extent, should be populated by that stock, and for that reason I am in sympathy with what the hon. member said in regard to that policy.

I was very much impressed with the very excellent and most extraordinary speech of the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Garland). In the first place it was excellent in preparation, excellent in delivery and most extraordinary in the revelation that he gave to this House last night. He qualified his statement to some extent by saying that he was dealing largely with the conditions in his own constituency, and I have it on the authority of the Minister of Immigration (Mr. Stewart) that a part of my own constituency is really in a worse condition than the constituency of the hon. member for Bow River. But after I got home last night, feeling depressed with the situation, I came to the conclusion that it was not the part of wisdom to generalize and to say that the whole of western Canada was in the same condition, because we do know that in certain portions of the West it is possible at least to make a comfortable living. As far as my own constituency is concerned, I do not say that the fault lies with this administration, but it seems to me a great fault lies at the feet of the governments who opened up large areas of land that should never have been opened. That is one of the problems of the West. Lands that should have always remained ranch lands should never have been opened for homesteading. If I shut my eyes for a moment I can see a stretch of a hundred miles in my own constituency that
5 p.m. to-day is largely becoming a barren wilderness, and yet fifteen years ago it was the most productive part of my constituency. The government opened mile after mile of land until they got a little too near the hills, with the result that after the prairie grass and shrubbery were taken off the hills, the wind played havoc with the soil, and smothered the valley with sand, till to-day, if you drive through with a motor car, you will find the fences covered with it. So that the fault was not altogether with the country, but the trouble arose because of the opening of certain territories which should never have been opened to the settler.

I am glad to see there is a remedy in view, and the government to a large extent have advocated that remedy. There is a scheme on foot by which those good settlers who are acclimatized and experienced shall be taken off those bad lands and transferred to lands more favourable to the diversified agriculture

which we advocate in Saskatchewan. With reference to the remedy which the hon. member for Bow River emphasized last night, I am entirely in accord, but I am not in accord with the general conditions. However, I agree with the remedy which he advocated and emphasized. There is one point upon which I differ, and I differ because of what I heard this afternoon. He made a quotation from a statement of the Bishop of Birmingham, to the effect that the British race were being sent to the colonies to re-invigorate them. Well, if the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Hoey) and the hon. member for Bow River, are samples of the stock they are sending here to be re-invigorated, I do not think that the British nation is going to become defunct, or that they are in a state of decay or in need of regeneration.

An hon. MEMBER: How about yourself?

Mr. LEWIS: That is all right. The hon. member for Springfield said that in a careful analysis of western conditions we should discriminate between the economic factors that are entering into the situation and the country at large. I quite agree with him. I am quite in accord, and I do not play second fiddle to any one in regard to eulogies of the West. I think it is a splendid country. I think it has the most productive soil of any country in the world.

Mr. MARLER: Hear, hear.

Mr. LEWIS: Nobody denies that. We are not denying that. We can produce 400,000,000 bushels of wheat in the coming year, as far as that is concerned. But in spite of the fact that we have the finest land and can produce the best wheat in the world, to a large extent we are not prosperous and many people are leaving us. Therefore, what we say is not that the land is not good or that there is anything wrong with the country, but that there must be something wrong with our internal policy which makes conditions as they are.

Mr. MARLER: Are the people all right out there?

Mr. LEWIS: The people that we have, yes. But some of the people who come to us are not always the best.

The hon. member for West Edmonton (Mr. Kennedy) spoke of the literature that was sent to the Old Country. I remember, twenty years ago, receiving this very literature. I admit it was a little exaggerated, but I am not sorry that I came to this country. I am glad that I came. The hon. member for Springfield tells us about coming to this country and working his way through university. I may tell him that I was in the same position when I came to Canada. I took the first job offered to me. I was told I had an appointment in Winnipeg when I came here, but I found the agent was lying to me. I simply settled down and took the first job I could get. After a number of years I saved enough to take a university and theological course, and I had a wife and family at the same time. Any country where there is this possibility of a man of ambition getting through, I think, is a worth-while country. There is nothing wrong with the country. But it is probably our internal conditions that make it what it is at the present time. In the matter of comparison can you compare Canada with Germany, where we are told economic conditions are terrible and people are hardly able to live, or with Russia where conditions are so bad—with apologies for the hon. member for Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth). In those countries, there seems to be economic chaos. As far as other countries are concerned, with the one exception of the United States, it seems to me at the present time that Canada is the finest country in the world.

Mr. MARTELL: Why except the United States?

Mr. LEWIS: At the present time it seems to me that the conditions in the United States, with its internal policy, are possibly a little better for the people who want to create desirable home conditions. The climate is not so severe and industrial conditions in that country seem to give better scope for men who are seeking employment. Of course, from the point of view of my wife and family, I would say that Canada is the best.

Let me say a few words in regard to the speech of my hon. friend (Mr. Rinfret). I always listen to that hon. gentleman with marked attention. He generally has a prepared address and we usually expect something worth while from him. But his immigration policy I do not agree with. He said he was willing to let any people come into Canada from any country in the world. That statement, I think, is far too general. The hon. member sympathises with the minister and the government because he says there are so many contradictory views placed before parliament on this subject that it is very difficult to know where one stands. It seems to me, however, that he rather increased the contradiction. There is one thing he did say that struck me and that was that the reason

for immigration was obvious. I listened to learn just wherein it was so obvious, and the hon. gentleman explained himself. In the first place, he said, immigration was to help the people who are now in the country to bear the burden of the national debt; secondly, it was to assist our National Railways; and in the third place it was intended to increase our wealth. Now, I do not think that any one of these three things is the real reason why we should get people to come into Canada. You tell the people of other lands that you want them to help bear the national debt, to assist the railways out of their difficulties, and to contribute towards our wealth, and they will look for some other field for their activities. It is easy to see, of course, that if you increase the number of people in the country and divide the debt amongst them you will decrease it proportionately. But I do not see how, if the wealth in Canada to-day is stationary, you are going to increase it by bringing more people into the country, when at the same time that increase in population means a decrease in the debt. It does not appear to me to be logical that in one direction you decrease the national debt by bringing in more people and, in another, you increase the wealth by the same means. The hon. member also referred to emigration to the United States. He did not say whether the figures were correct, but no doubt they were approximately so. He gave a cure for this outward flow of people; he said that it lay in an increase in the number of immigrants coming into the country. And he was surprised at the opposition of the farmers to farm labourers coming into Canada. Now, so far as my hon. friend for Springfield is concerned, in view of the conditions in Manitoba, there may be room for immigrants there; and if the people in that province are in such circumstances that they can assimilate farm labourers and take care of them in winter they should do so. But, speaking for my own constituency, I must say that during the winter we have not even enough work for our own boys who are living on our farms to-day, and I do certainly hope that there will be found some solution whereby the western farmer can be enabled to make ends meet.

Now a word or two with regard to the statement that we need a class of immigrants from northern Europe to go into northern Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, and the observation that came from across the floor that this class of people will exist where the average Canadian would perish. I do not think that it would be the best plan to bring such people into the country. It may be that we can get a class of settlers who will establish themselves on such lands as are evidently in contemplation. But I see a difficulty; how are you going to keep them there? Let me state my own experience. We have certain people of that description whom we settled in Saskatchewan; and what do we do immediately we find them there? The different churches—and I am speaking of my own church as well—immediately look over the situation from the home mission standpoint, see that these people are isolated, and go to them with this statement, "Why, you have not the facilities for education that you should have." Then what action do we take? We make our appeal and gather money from East and West and in Saskatoon, Prince Albert and other places we build what are called "school homes." We then educate the most favoured and the soundest of these boys at the home in Saskatoon and in immediate proximity to the collegiate and the university, and after we have educated them we find that instead of going back to their own people as we had expected, they enter into our professions and defeat the very object for which we had them educated. So that in the ultimate analysis the people do not settle at all. The older generation stay there, but the younger generation, of whom we say that our democracy should be built up, will not stay under these conditions. So that unless we loop the loop every ten years by resettling that northern country, this kind of education and settlement is not advantageous to the Canadian people at large.

I do not wish to speak at any great length on this subject, but there is one thing that was said by the hon. member for Calgary East (Mr. Irvine) with reference to children who might be brought into this country. He presented one phase of the argument against the bringing in of these children by almost casting a blot on our national life. He spoke about the number of babies that died under one year of age in Quebec, Ontario, and all through the list of the provinces. Now, I have had some experience so far as this is concerned, and I am convinced that the death rate in Canada of children under one year compares favourably with that of any other country in the world. We all admit that some children die under that age, but we could not rear them all; that has never yet been done. So that there is no argument in that respect against bringing children into the country. There is, however, an argument against such immigration, in that, as it seems to me, during the period of adolescence these children should have at least the influence of a real home under the care of father and mother

and not be subject entirely to the influence of strangers.

Now I come to what I think is the crux of the whole problem. Why is such a desperate effort being made to-day to secure immigration to Canada? That seems to me to be the crux of the entire situation. I am not against immigration to Canada. Not at all. I believe that ambitious young men and women should come to this country, and I think that there is plenty of room for them. But why this desperate effort? If conditions in the country were all right and people here were satisfied I have no doubt that they would tell their friends just how things were. But it does seem to me that there is something wrong with our internal policy when we find it necessary to make such strenuous efforts to secure people. We are told that the United States to-day has received almost its full quota of immigration from the British Isles, although it has no special immigration policy. The United States does not make any particular plea for people to come in. The only reason I can see why people go to the United States is that immigrants who go there are so satisfied with the internal conditions and the economic life of the country, and find that there is such a possibility of making a home, that through their own propaganda other people are attracted to the country.

My hon. friend the member for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Marler), who is in his seat at the moment, made a very fine speech, but there was one thing he bemoaned. He said that if we do not get immigration to this country we shall soon be out of existence. I am surprised at the hon. member making that statement. If it came from British Columbia, where it seems race suicide is on the increase, it would be all right; but it seems out of place coming from the province of Quebec, which I think is doing her duty towards the national life of Canada. I might say myself that I do not believe there is any danger of our going out of existence. Fifteen years ago there were only myself and my wife; now we are ten.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. LEWIS: So I do not think there is any danger of our passing out of existence for some time. But after carefully looking over the arguments of the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George, I am led to this conclusion, that he contends that the prosperity of Canada, industrial, economic and social, depends entirely on the prosperity of agriculture. I think that is a right conclusion to draw from his speech. If it is wrong I hope he will say so.

[Mr. Lewis.]

Mr. MARLER: I do not think my hon. friend is quite right. I said that agriculture was tributary to the cities, and that you had to have a properly balanced population. I think the rural population should be greater than the urban in a country of this description. They should be balanced; that is my argument.

Mr. LEWIS: I accept my hon. friend's statement, but it does seem to me he went further and said that the basis of the prosperity of our industrial life depended upon the prosperity of agriculture.

Mr. MARLER: I admit that. I think it does in this country.

Mr. LEWIS: Then I think we are agreed that the success of agriculture is essential to the well-being of the whole of Canada.

Mr. MARLER: Hear, hear.

Mr. LEWIS: Now, I want to ask: Is immigration going to assist agriculture? Are we making one step in the right direction so that the prosperity of agriculture may become the basis of the well-being of Canada? That is the only question I wish to ask. I shall try to answer it in a few moments.

There is one other subject I wish to speak upon in passing, and that is the deporting of immigrants. Recently I was speaking to a clergyman who some time ago went over to the Old Land. He told me that he decided to take a berth in the steerage because he found there were on board thirty-three or thirty-four British immigrants who were being deported. He spoke to these people and found among them a Scotchman, a very strong man physically and apparently mentally sound. He had had a position offered to him in Canada, but for some reason on arrival he was detained, later placed behind bars, and in a month's time deported. That man was a veteran of the Great War and had received honour at the hands of the British authorities. When he tells his own people in Scotland of his deportation it is safe to assume that any intending immigrants to this country after hearing his story will change their plans and go to the United States.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Would the hon. gentleman give me the name of the individual so deported?

Mr. LEWIS: I will endeavour to furnish it later.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Thank you.

Mr. LEWIS: One hon. member speaking about the causes of failure said there were

two: one, over-purchase of land; the other, heavy overhead expenses. Are these the real causes of the difficulty in which our agriculturists find themselves at the present time? I do not think this is the trouble in Saskatchewan; it may be in Manitoba where holdings of two sections are said to be common, but the great majority of the people where I live in Saskatchewen—and I am acquainted with over 1,000 families—farm a half-section which I do not think is too large. Consequently I do not believe that the two causes mentioned are responsible for the general failure of agriculturists in the West.

I think the hon. minister (Mr. Stewart) in speaking of colonization said he hoped his scheme would enable men to be settled within eighteen to thirty miles of railway facilities where they could engage in mixed farming.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Not thirty miles; up to fifteen.

Mr. LEWIS: I thank the minister for the correction. I believe that mixed farming is going to be one of the main solutions of the difficulties of Saskatchewan farmers at all events. The hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Manion) in speaking of the solution of the problems confronting this country said that free trade would ruin the East and he voiced the opinion that the kind of people wanted here was domestic servants and labourers with pick and shovel. I believe that in this discrimination between men engaged in manual work and professional men there is a false philosophy which sooner or later will drive our highly organized society to the wall. I remember some years ago in the University of Saskatchewan coming in contact with men who thought that because a man had a university education he had a right to a better home than the man who worked in the sewers, for instance. It seems to me that the man who works in the sewers, who, as we say, does the dirty work, is far more in need of recreation and the luxuries of home than the professional man; and I think the sooner we as a democracy realize that the health and sanity of this nation depend to a large extent upon the groundwork, the so-called dirty work of looking after our sewers and so forth, the better it will be for all concerned. The sooner we educate the people that any honest work is worthy of a place of honour in our society, the sooner we shall recognize that there must be a commensurate reward for the proper discharge of the disagreeable work of the community.

Mr. MARLER: Quite right.

Mr. LEWIS: In my constituency of Swift Current we had a class of people who are called Mennonites. I understand from the Minister of Agriculture and from the people around Swift Current that they were the best class of farmers to be found in the district. They were making good, and yet for some reason or other they in a body went to Mexico. We do not believe that the Mexican conditions are better than our own, and yet as far as I am able to discover we did not turn a hand to try and stop this exodus. They may not be ideal citizens in conforming to our educational laws, but they are amongst the very best farmers to be found anywhere.

Now, I do not think it would be wise on my part to take up the time of this House without offering some solution of the problem that confronts us. In this connection I do not want to be hard on the government. The Acting Minister of Immigration has my sympathy, but I have listened for a definite policy of immigration, and so far as I can gather it seems to be this. When we, as representing the farmers speak in regard to the tariff, we are told that the government listens first of all to the manufacturers to see if it is possible for them to do without certain protection that we wish to have removed. That may be the right course to pursue. The manufacturers understand manufacturing conditions better than we do, and therefore the government may be justified in listening to them. In the same way it seems to me that when we, who are agriculturists, come down to this House and describe the conditions of agriculture, an industry in whose success we are personally interested, the government should listen to our representations. But instead of taking the advice of those who are on the spot and experienced in agricultural conditions, the government listens to someone else. The same may be said in regard to labour. Labour has its representatives here who tell us that they do not need any industrial immigrants. Do we take any notice of what they say? I did not think that all the wisdom of the sages was monopolized by the capitalistic and manufacturing classes—not by any means. I think it will be found that the greatest men that have ever lived have all sprung from the farm. For that reason, it seems to me, it behooves the government to listen to the agriculturists as regards their conditions and the solution of their problems.

I will close by speaking briefly regarding three things. If I were to be asked what I consider would be one way to improve the condition of the West, I believe the remedy and immigration should come in at the same

time. I do not include one to the exclusion of the other. We should have people coming in because, in my constituency, you have a school, you have taxation, and if people leave the land, the burden on the few that remain becomes intolerable. Therefore, if people are moving from this country, we must have other people to take their place. But at the same time, we should have a remedy that will cause people to remain in this country. One of the solutions of the problem is, I think, this. I am not speaking of agricultural implements, and I am speaking directly now to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding). I would place the absolute necessaries of life on the free trade list, and I would also remove the sales tax and give the people who are endeavouring to make a home an opportunity to establish themselves on the land. That would be one of the remedies that I would advocate and I give that advice to the government.

The second, it seems to me, the hon. member for Springfield just touched on, and that is the lack of co-operation amongst the whole people of Canada. What I mean by that is this. I think it was found some time ago by investigation that, as regards a hundred commodities that enter into the national well-being of the people of this country, the factory price was forty cents on the dollar, but sixty cents was taken up before an article got into the hands of the consumer. That is "over-commercialization," if you can use that term. I have seen it in my village, a village with two stores, and the commercial men crowding on each other at the rate of five or six a day, selling brooms, bluing, washing machines and so on. It seems to me that we are overrun with that class of people who are taking out a picking, in the middleman sense, before an article gets to the consumer. I am not saying that the manufacturer charges too much for his commodity; perhaps he does not; but before an article gets to the consumer, instead of costing forty cents, it costs one dollar. What we are kicking against at the present time is this lack of co-operation, and if some means could be devised by which we could eliminate many of these middlemen, commercial men and selling agents, and lower freight rates I believe one of the greatest problems that enter into the production of our western lands would be solved.

I do not know that I should presume to give advice to the government; but this is my final statement. If I were asked to go into a business, first of all I would look into that business to see if it was solvent, if there was any danger of bankruptcy. If I found that the business was exceeding its revenue, I would think twice before going in. We have the great business of Canada, nationalizing our assets, our industrial life and our agricultural life, and we are inviting people to come to this country. They look into the situation and the financial state of Canada, and they find that we as a government—and I include myself in this parliament—are exceeding our revenue in the administration of our work by over $40,000,000 or $50,000,000, as the case may be. If we as a people want to get people to come from different parts of the world, people who are intelligent, who can discriminate, then let us clean house in this parliament; let us, as a nation, begin to live within our income, and the time will not be long before we hear once again the tramp of feet of people coming to our shores, and the laughter of the children in the many homes that are found within the borders of Canada.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): A consideration of the matter involved in this appropriation is one of the most important that could engage the attention of this parliament. The problems involved, which have been discussed by various hon. gentlemen who have spoken in this debate, are of the most vital character; they strike at the existing condition of affairs in this country. It is, therefore, quite right that we should have had such a full discussion as we have had, and I hope the discussion will go on until all hon. members may deal with this question from their various points of view. The hon. member for Swift Current (Mr. Lewis) and the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Hoey) who preceded him from the other side of the House are, I think, to be congratulated on the fact that they have lifted the debate to a much higher level than that on which it stood yesterday. I did not have an opportunity of hearing the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Garland); but on reading over his remarks, I began to wonder whether he really belonged to a party which called itself "Progressive", because if there ever was a misnomer as regards the application of the term "progressive" to that hon. gentleman as a member of that party, then I am sure it revealed itself last night. Rather, he might be said to belong to a "retrograde" or " pessimistic" party, in whose make-up no vestige of progressiveness could be found. When the hon. member for Springfield and the hon. member for Swift Current manfully and courageously faced and laid before us the real situation in the country and discussed the matter in a practical way, I am sure the House and the country felt gratified at their contribution to this debate.

Everybody must recognize that the situation in Canada to-day is one which demands the closest possible attention and the wisest judgment on the part of every hon. gentleman who happens to represent in this House any portion of the people of Canada. We are confronted by great problems which one might enumerate at length; but I need only mention the fact that the problem of taxation which bears upon the wage earner, the farmer, the artisan, in fact, every man in every occupation in life, is of so severe a character that how we are going to deal with that problem and how we can reach the stage and time in our history when we may be relieved in some degree of that burden, is a matter which is of great importance, not only to ourselves, but to those who come after us in this country. That problem is not to be faced by sitting down and declaring that this is the worst country in the world because hon. gentlemen who use that argument in discussing this question, utterly fail to pay the slightest attention to conditions which exist elsewhere. My hon. friend (Mr. Garland) who came from across the ocean, knows that the land from which he came is to-day suffering under difficulties and conditions a thousand times worse than those that exist in Canada. If you take the whole of Europe, the situation there was well described a few days ago by Hilaire Belloc, speaking in Montreal, when he discussed the possible fate of civilization which at the moment was hanging in the balance in Europe, and pointed out conditions that existed. If that is so in other parts of the world, why should hon. gentlemen in this House undertake to tell a pitiful story of exaggeration as to conditions that happen to be found in one locality due to drought, and the continued failure of crops on account of like conditions, and lead the House and the country to believe that Canada is in a desperate condition, because that happens to be the situation in one particular part of this country?

We have our difficulties in the East. Our farmers and wage earners have problems of a more or less grave character; but where do these problems come from? They come from the reaction which followed the war in a very great degree. Nowadays, we are all too apt to think that the solution of matters that come up for consideration to-day can be determined by the wisdom which we possess for the moment, and that we must not look at the story of the past or the lessons of history in order to find out whether or not in the days that have gone, the people that have gone before, have had similar problems to deal with. What was the situation in Great Britain after the great Napoleonic wars? Let me call the attention of the committee to a very short statement regarding that published in an admirable work, written by Mr. Marriott, M.A., Professor of History in the University of Oxford, and entitled England Since Waterloo.

The human heart through all the ages that have gone has always remained the same. Problems of a different nature would recur throughout the ages and they were solved by the wise men of those days but in the century following probably exactly the same problem would arise under different conditions varying according to the country where it did arise, and would have to be dealt with along the same lines. One might think to hear hon. gentlemen talk about the condition of the country that at no other time were conditions in any other country comparable to what we have in Canada to-day. Let me call your attention to what this writer says. Speaking of the conditions that existed in Great Britain during the Napoleonic wars, he says:

> For the last twenty years England had been the only country in western Europe free from the devastating effects of military operations. She had consequently been called upon to supply the commercial needs of the whole world, and, thanks to the recent improvements in agriculture and in manufacturing industry, she was in a position to do so. The result was seen in a totally unprecedented expansion of foreign trade.

The conditions with us during the war while our sons were fighting overseas were the same as when the sons of Britain were fighting one hundred years ago on the Continent. We were freed from the devastating influence of the war itself, and we had an unprecedented period of prosperity in this country, a period of unusual development of our agricultural and industrial life, with the greatest foreign trade we ever had since confederation. But what was the reaction that came in England? This writer says that almost immediately after the war:

> Bad harvests and violent fluctuations of prices were bringing widespread ruin upon agriculturalists. In the hope of assisting them the legislature in 1815 prohibited the importation of wheat until the price reached 80 s. a quarter. But this afforded no relief when, as in 1816, the price fell to 52s. 6d. It is easy to blame farmers for their folly in taking leases at rents calculated upon war prices, and to condemn landlords for extortion.

Just as it is easy to say that the people took on too much land in the West:

> But meanwhile the course of English industries appeared to be threatened with imminent ruin. Reports received by the Board of Agriculture in response to a circular letter issued in 1816 attest the severity of the crisis. Farmers, who a few years ago were competing eagerly for farms, were sending in notices to

quit, and many farms were unlet; mortgagees found it difficult to realize; credit was collapsing; banks were failing in all directions; substantial farmers were becoming parish paupers. And while the producer was ruined the consumer derived no benefit. In December, 1816, wheat which in the spring had fallen to 52s. 6d. rose to 103s. Agriculture had become a mere gamble.

The condition was even worse in England than that portrayed by the hon. member for Bow River last night. It continued:

If landlords and farmers were ruined, merchants and manufacturers were in no better plight. . . . Traders, as is their wont, looked no further than their noses. The inevitable happened. With the restoration of normal conditions the continental demand for English goods rapidly slackened; prices came down with a run; production was paralysed, and thousands of hands were turned adrift to swell the army of the unemployed. . .

As William Cobbett himself observed: "When men are in distress they are out of humour: they have not time and are not in a disposition to listen to reason." . . . . Because work was scarce, machinery was smashed and factories were destroyed. . . . Nor was the unrest confined to the agricultural counties. The Tyneside colliers, the Preston cotton-weavers, the Wiltshire cloth-workers, the Monmouthshire and Staffordshire iron-workers, the jute-workers of Dundee,—all alike were in ferment, demanding more employment, higher wages, and cheaper food.

That was the condition of affairs which faced the statesmen of the Mother Country after the Napoleonic wars. The picture portrayed there was a very grave and a very dark one indeed. We have no such dark picture confronting us in this country to-day. We had a period of unprecedented prosperity and of high prices during the war. Then the reaction came and prices fell. Conditions have not been righted, and that is one of the reasons why this discussion has been brought on. But here in this marvellous land of ours, with a territory exceeding that of the United States with great undeveloped mineral wealth as well as great tracts of agricultural lands that have not been opened up, with our great forests, our fisheries and all the other resources in this land which could support a population of 100,000,000 as well as the population of 8,000,000 that we have to-day, are we going to sit down helplessly and hopelessly and say that we do not expect to see the conditions arise under which all that we might hope for would come? I had the honour and distinction of coming to this parliament some twenty years ago and of imbibing from that great statesman, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, some of that inspiration and belief in the future of this country which dominated him in his long political career. He told us and told the Canadian people twenty years ago of his abiding faith that the twentieth century would be Canada's century, and I am satisfied that out of the mist and gloom and uncertainty of these days, which while it exists to-day is not at all comparable to what is to be found among other nations of the world, if we but play our part properly in the days that are to come, that prophetic utterance of his will be fulfilled.

Let us also look at the situation in the United States at the time of the Civil War. There was a great nation absolutely rent asunder by an internecine struggle between the North and the South. Immediately following the war came a period of depression. Their currency became degraded, and that country might almost have been looked upon in the view of the world outside as a nation with no hope for the future. Yet with that wonderful spirit of unity and the development of a national spirit which came to the United States of America, they entered upon a period of prosperity and advancement which in the next fifty years made them the greatest nation in the history of the world. And so we have lessons to learn from the experience of the Mother Country one hundred years ago, and lessons to learn from the experience of the great people to the south of us sixty years ago, and shall we not stop for a moment and see whether the paths they have trod, the lines which they have laid down, and which resulted in their advancement and progress and prosperity, are not such as we might also well follow?

One of the great things we lack in this country to-day is a national spirit. If there is any one thing the Canadian people need, and to this task no matter to which party we may owe allegiance to-day we might well join together and devote ourselves, it is the development of the idea of a great Canada whose sons we ought all to be proud to be; it is the realization that has come to us in this generation carrying on from the generations that have gone before in this wonderful land with its free institutions, where no man is discriminated against on account of birth, religion or station, where the highest position in the gift of the people is open to the man of honesty, ability and integrity, as we have had the fact recorded in this very debate by the hon. member for Springfield who so eloquently told the story of our possibilities. In order that we may develop that spirit, we must see to it that sectionalism is eliminated in this country. Instead of this continual argument going on about the attitude of antagonism between the man in the workshop and the man on the farm, let us realize that in this House, I venture to say, the greater percentage are farmers or sons of farmers, men born on the farm who have occupied prominent judicial and business positions and a high status both in this parliament and elsewhere in this

and other countries. Why should there be any antagonism between the different classes in this country? Rather than that there should be any antagonism between the men in the workshops and mines and the men on the farms, let us vie with each other to be co-mates and partners in everything that makes for the progress and advancement of this our common country.

Mr. GOOD: How can the hon. member prevent the development of antagonism between classes if there is a feeling that one class is exploiting another?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): If certain gentlemen like my hon. friend for Brant (Mr. Good) wish to preach the gospel of class consciousness in this country they are doing little to promote the development of national spirit. I do not believe, Sir, that in this country there is any occasion to preach such a gospel. If there ever was a country that is free from any social condition in which you have upper classes, or middle classes, or lower classes that country is Canada. In that respect we are far in advance of our friends in the United States who, in their hundred years or so of history, have developed an aristocratic class—a class aristocratic as to wealth—which, in its disregard to the rights of the people, is far different even from the aristocracy of birth which exists in the Old Country. But here, in this free land, where the men of to-day are the successors of the workers of yesterday, and where the reward always comes to integrity, to effort, and to industry, we have a condition where there is no room for the existence of class consciousness, no matter in what quarter it is advocated.

Mr. GOOD: I object to the hon. member insinuating that I was preaching, and have preached, class consciousness. I asked him a straight question as to how we were to prevent the development of these antagonisms if there was a feeling among these classes that injustice had been wrought.

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I am very glad to receive the assurance of the hon. member that he will not join in the efforts of those who are engaged in preaching class consciousness. In that case we may welcome him to the ranks of those who are looking to the development of a true national spirit in this country. Nevertheless, there are selfish men on the farm just as there are in the workshop.

Mr. GOOD: I admit it.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Just as there are selfish men in office too, but the selfiish men in any of these occupations are not the men to take the lead in influencing thought in this country but rather men of greater breadth of view.

Mr. BIRD: Can my hon. friend point out an instance in the history of British political life, or economic life, wherein the solution of the difficulty was not attended by the presence of class consciousness, I refer particularly to the problems that arose after the Napoleonic wars?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I do not propose to be examined for the information of my hon. friend, as though I were a student in a class in history. I have made my argument along lines which I think are going to commend themselves to this committee, and I do not propose to be interrogated as though this were a debating society. I propose to lay before the committee my own views on this question, and when I have concluded my speech I shall be very happy to answer any question, pertinent to the issue, which my hon. friend may desire to ask me.

I was urging that one of the necessities to-day is the development of a national spirit and the elimination of sectionalism. I want to say, coming as I do from the Maritime provinces, that I have the greatest possible sympathy with conditions in the West. Down in our little province by the sea a great many of our people are men with Scottish blood. They have inherited, during the one hundred and fifty years they and their forebears have lived in this land, something of the genius of the race, something of the spirit of the men who peopled "Caledonia, stern and wild." They have travelled far through this land. In the West to-day are to be found thousands of Nova Scotians, many of whom came from my own constituency. They know, as we know in the East, that the conditions to-day owe their origin to the reaction following the war. They know that in the home districts in the East we have had a lack of prosperity and have had difficulties to encounter just the same as they have had in the West; but I do hope that these men will be true to the instincts of their race and of their forebears and will take a proper view of the situation.

Let me say that I think the feeling is growing to-day throughout this land that a great mistake was made in 1911 when the Reciprocity treaty, introduced by the present Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) was not adopted. I think a great many of the difficul-

ties that the hon. gentlemen opposite complain of would not have existed to-day, or if they did exist would have disappeared, had the view not been entertained then by a great many that for all time the trade of Canada must flow east and west; had we realized that we cannot be a hermit nation but must trade with our neighbors, and with other nations. However, there is no use in arguing that a movement towards class consciousness is going to remedy a trade condition. We have got to realize this, that in all parts of Canada we are suffering from the after effects of the war, from the deflation which is going on—following an abnormal prosperity and development that occurred during the four years of that great struggle. We must all pull together in Canada and apply ourselves resolutely to the problems which confront us so that we may be able to pass on to those who come after us a prosperous land and a happy condition of affairs as the result of our administration and our efforts.

We are told that men are leaving the farms and going to the cities. Well, they have been leaving the farms and going to the cities during all the ages. They have been going also to the United States; they have been going to and from the United States for a great many years. In eastern Canada, comparing the conditions which exist to-day with those which prevailed when I first had the honour of a seat in the Nova Scotia legislature, I remember the time when the young men of our province used to take their axes, go into the forest, hew down the trees, and make homes for themselves. They do not do that to-day. There came the lure of the free lands of the West. Harvest excursions were introduced, the boys of the East were carried out west there to learn that they could acquire 160 acres of land by simply staying on that land six months a year for two years. They went out to the West, saw the land which did not need the axe in order to bring it into a state suitable for cultivation, and thousands of them settled there. To-day the men in the East are not willing to go out and cut down the forest to make homes for themselves as their predecessors used to do with this exception: that the sons of Quebec still retain the wonderful pioneering instinct of the men who settled on the banks of the St. Lawrence two or three centuries ago, in greater degree than people in other portions of Canada. Our people have felt the lure of the cities, they have experienced the stirring of life that the twentieth century has brought with it, they have felt the development of materialism that has been going on not only in the cities but also among the tillers of the soil. The present situation is, perhaps, not due to any financial or economic reason; it is due to inherent conditions which have prevailed at all times but have become more deeply accentuated within the last few years. We see the same thing in the United States. I read with interest a speech made in New York by Judge Manton, a distinguished jurist, who declared that the United States had lost by emigration during the last calendar year 100,000 of its workers—men who had come from southern Europe, had tarried for a period, and had gone home. The country, in the meantime, had received 32,000 people who had come to take the place of the 100,000 workers referred to. What was the situation last fall over there? Plans were drawn for the construction of public and other buildings to the extent of over five billions of dollars. Then the call came to the worker in Canada and every other worker elsewhere who was out of employment. Do we forget one of the difficulties we have in this country that when the snow comes in November there is a period of six months when our workers cannot engage in any outside employment? Thousands of these men have gone over there temporarily. They have gone from my province. They went from the city of Halifax which was partially destroyed during the war by an explosion. After that explosion men came from all parts of the Maritime provinces to engage in the work of reconstruction. When that was finished they went to the United States, to engage in this wonderful building movement which developed there. They are gone, but they are coming back again, and I say there is no reason why we should be fainthearted on account of either of these things. In the cycle of events all these problems come and go, but if we have abiding faith in the possibilities of Canada, then let us look forward with confidence to the future.

At six o'clock the Speaker resumed the chair and the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 3, respecting The Royal Guardians.—Mr. Mitchell.

Bill No. 13, respecting The Nipissing Central Railway Company.—Mr. Lapierre.

Bill No. 32, to incorporate The Alert Guarantee Company of Canada.—Mr. Ladner.

Bill No. 36, respecting The Quebec Central Railway Company.—Mr. Tobin.

Bill No. 38, respecting The Essex Terminal Railway Company.—Mr. German.

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 55 (from the Senate), for the relief of Margaret Elizabeth Moran.—Mr. Church.

Bill No. 56 (from the Senate), for the relief of Ethel Lillian Duncan.—Mr. Macdonald (Pictou).

Bill No. 57, (from the Senate), for the relief of Florence Mary Ramsden.—Mr. Macdonald (Pictou).

Bill No. 58 (from the Senate), for the relief of Ross John Craig.—Mr. Macdonald (Pictou).

Bill No. 59 (from the Senate), for the relief of Florence Dodds.—Mr. Hocken.

Bill No. 60 (from the Senate), for the relief of Blanche Hilton.—Mr. Harris.

Bill No. 61 (from the Senate), for the relief of May Woodbridge.—Mr. Harris.

Bill No. 62 (from the Senate), for the relief of Alice May Smith.—Mr. White.

Bill No. 63 (from the Senate), for the relief of Albert Ernest Mould.—Sir Henry Drayton.

Bill No. 64 (from the Senate), for the relief of Winifred Rose Foster.—Mr. German.

Bill No. 65 (from the Senate), for the relief of Emily May Small.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 66 (from the Senate), for the relief of Irene Herdsman.— Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 67 (from the Senate), for the relief of John Frederick King Hall.—Mr. McMaster.

Bill No. 68 (from the Senate), for the relief of Herbert Martin.—Mr. Shaw.

Bill No. 69 (from the Senate), for the relief of Frederick John Saunders.—Mr. Shaw.

Bill No. 70 (from the Senate), for the relief of Robert Archibald Logan.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 71 (from the Senate), for the relief of Violet Marie Finn.—Mr. Sheard.

Bill No. 73 (from the Senate), for the relief of Harriet Ethelwyn Kingsley.—Mr. Rankin.

Bill No. 74 respecting the Montreal Central Terminal Company.—Mr. Rinfret.

SUPPLY.

IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION

The House again in Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the chair:

Immigration—outside service—salaries, $700,000.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): When the committee rose at six o'clock, I was endeavouring to deal with that phase of the discussion which was referred to by several hon. gentlemen as to the fact that there was a continual flow of emigration from Canada to the United States. Some hon. gentlemen went so far as to argue that, therefore, we should take no steps for further immigration to this country. I was pointing out the unique situation that that great country to the south occupies, the fact that for a great number of years there was a continual flow back and forth between the two countries, and the further fact that last autumn there developed in the United States a tremendous boom involving an expenditure running into billions of dollars. This naturally drew from Canada, in the autumn and winter months, men who were unable to engage in outside work in this country. In addition to that, in considering this question, we must always remember that we are situated alongside a country with a population of a hundred million people, with wonderful diversity of climate, which enables the people within its borders to engage, at all seasons of the year, in vocations to which they are accustomed. Another fact in this connection that we must not forget, is that the United States, of all nations which participated in the war, came through in the best financial position. Almost every European country is debtor to the United States, and she succeeded in obtaining and in bringing within her borders the greatest percentage of the available gold in the world. That has been her situation. Therefore, she was better able than other countries in which these advantages did not exist, to stand the reaction which followed the war, and she had the further advantage, owing to the fact that she did not enter the war until a later date, of having participated probably to a greater extent than any other country, in the benefits resulting from the tremendous expenditure on supplies required during the war. So that it was natural that, during that period, those who might, for the time being, be out of employment in Canada, might find their way to the United States.

It is also well worth remarking that the United States was the one great democratic country that, during the war, did not find it necessary to destroy its party alignment in order to carry on its affairs. The historic Republican and Democratic parties maintained their identity and worked together through all the problems that came before that great nation. I am sure the lesson which we ought to learn from the magnificent position she occupies to-day, should not be lost upon some hon. gentlemen in this House.

An hon. MEMBER: Explain.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): The fact is so self-evident that it is hardly necessary to give an explanation. In Canada, ever since the war, we have been under the shadow of the swing of the pendulum that occurred after the tremendous prosperity that existed in this country, the high prices that were paid for and received from agricultural products, the continued activity of our industries in the East, all this creating an abnormal condition which naturally was followed by the situation which we have before us. Fortunately, we are beginning to see the turn of the road. Last year's great crops in the Northwest helped to bring back the nation's poise once more; and as we are awaiting the advent of spring, from all parts of Canada, from the eastern provinces as well as from far-off British Columbia, comes the word: The Canadian people are looking forward with confidence and hope to a renewal of normal conditions under which this country made such marvellous progress in the twenty years before the war. Under those conditions we have no reason to doubt the fact that we should look for, maintain and support a vigorous and aggressive policy of immigration. I take it that notwithstanding the remarks we have heard as to the lack of necessity for attempting to obtain immigration into this country, hon. gentlemen will agree that we are the one great undeveloped country of the northern zone whose resources have yet been touched only in the slightest degree, and that the need is apparent for more people to develop the available wealth of this country. Perhaps, I have been labouring that argument, because I am sure hon. gentlemen will agree as to the necessity of activity along those lines having regard to the problems before the people, and the advantage and necessity of having additional population to cope with them.

What is the class of people that we should have in this country? We have had various arguments and suggestions in regard to that. I was interested in seeing what Abraham Lincoln, whose language and whose predictions have almost come to be regarded as the voice of a seer, said in one of his wonderful utterances as to the conditions that existed and should exist in the country to the south of us. He said:

> We should welcome every person of good family who really means to incorporate himself into our society, but repel all who will not be a real addition to the health and strength of the United States.

It seems to me that that general statement is one we might well adopt with regard to the immigrants who come here. I believe there should be no restriction as to nationality or religion with respect to the men who are

to come to Canada. The test as laid down by Lincoln is one that I think we might well apply to everyone who comes here to participate in our Canadian citizenship and take part in building up this country. We do not want any laggards in this country, but men and women who are industrious, and who realize that indolence and indifference will lead to failure here as in any other country.

Hon. gentlemen who come from other parts of Canada have spoken of the advantages of their own particular part of the country, and in that connection reference has been made particularly to the West. I am free to say that I think those of us who come from the Maritime provinces have been altogether too modest in asserting the advantages which would flow to the immigrant who should settle in our part of the country. We cannot boast of wheat fields that will yield the products of the earth simply by a little scratching, and by that I mean that fertilization is required, but we can boast of this, that the settler who comes to our part of Canada will be able to find a home there, not necessarily in the forest, but close by the forest, where he can get his wood to keep his family and himself warm, and where he has no difficulty in getting water for his household and his stock. There he will be beside the great ocean which yields with the slightest possible effort the best food any settler could have in the fish that swim in the sea. We have also there rich fruit belts, and the conditions as to living and the social conditions generally offer to anyone with a limited capital, even the settler who comes to Canada with only $2,000 as his entire capital an opportunity to make a home for himself and his family in the provinces down by the sea under better conditions I believe than obtain in any other part of Canada. When he has started his home there, he will be able to live with less effort than he would elsewhere, because nature has so generously endowed that part of the country with those things that the poor but able and industrious man looks for in the place where he wants to make his home. That is the place I think where these immigrants who come to our shores should settle.

There are many problems that have been suggested in connection with this question. I do not profess to be an expert upon it. I believe that the question of the best regulation of immigration is a very difficult and a very important one, and personally I would be disposed to leave in a very broad way to the minister, who has given very careful attention to this subject, the solution of these various problems.

We hear a great deal about the British Empire colonization scheme. It is a singular thing that for the first time in the history of the Empire, Great Britain has embarked upon the policy of assisted emigration. Never before has she undertaken to engage in the policy of assisting her people to go abroad, either to other parts of the Empire or elsewhere. The necessity for this action has been unquestionably due to the tremendous amount the unemployment doles have reached. I do not mean to say that that is the sole reason why the proposition is made that Great Britain should help send her people to all parts of our far-flung Empire and participate in their upbuilding, but still that fact does exist, and a proposition is made which would involve the assumption by Canada of very grave and very serious obligations if she undertakes to participate in the scheme. It does seem to me that there are a great many problems involved in questions of this kind, and the solution of this immigration problem is one in which the self-reliance and the energy of the individual immigrant ought to be trusted to a very great degree if it is going to result successfully.

I view with some alarm the proposition that we should bring people out wholesale to this country, find land for them, pay them to stay on the land, and altogether finance them. Why, if Canadians are ever to be worth while, the men of to-day must do like our fathers did, and go out relying on themselves to build their homes and establish themselves in this country. It has become the fashion to-day to ask the government to have a finger in every pie, and if every man who is to come to this country is to be financed from the general treasury, that is a proposition that must be very seriously considered. I welcome as I am sure every Canadian should welcome, as many people from the Old Country as can come here, for naturally we would like to have them join with us in the development of Canada and the upbuilding of the Empire, but I think this matter should be approached with the greatest possible care. I do not wish to be understood as absolutely condemning it, but I think the minister should give it the gravest consideration and the closest possible attention in order that the correct solution of the problem may be arrived at. I think that with a return of prosperity to this country, which I believe is coming, we can safely leave the selection to the man who desires to get away from the difficult conditions in Europe and elsewhere, and who is looking abroad for an opportunity to make a new home for himself and family, and with all the advantages Canada has to offer, I think that with the advent of prosperity this country will prove a great attraction to these men from across the sea.

With reference to the Canada Colonization scheme, I gathered from the statement made by the minister the other day that we did not have before us the full facts in the matter, and personally I propose to await with interest the fuller statement which we were promised later on in this debate. In this connection let me remind hon. gentlemen that though some severe criticisms have been made, we have also had tributes paid to the immigration law of this country as it stands to-day. Judge Manton, federal judge for the state of New York, and one of the leading jurists of the United States, in discussing about a month ago what he regarded as the inequalities and injustices of the American law went on to point out this:

> Our younger neighbor at the north, Canada, can teach us a lesson in dealing with the question of immigration. Its law is simple and direct. There the immigration officer may admit any immigrant who otherwise complies with the provisions of the immigration act, if it is shown to his satisfaction that such immigrant is (a) a bona fide agriculturalist entering Canada to farm, with sufficient means to begin farming in Canada; (b) a bona fide farm labourer to follow that occupation, who has reasonable assurance of employment; (c) a female domestic servant with reasonable assurance of employment, or any other labourer who has reasonable assurance of employment.
>
> The wife and family are admitted with the immigrant labourer. The passport must be vised by Canadian immigration officers stationed in Canada and simple provisions are made which aid and invite the immigrant to the shores of Canada.

Notwithstanding the criticisms that have been made of our immigration system, this statement made by a gentleman who is unquestionably an expert and has studied all the phases of the American immigration problem is an indication that we are quite up-to-date in the immigration law we have in this country.

I have detained this committee at very much greater length than I intended. I merely wish to say in conclusion that I hope every man who takes part in this discussion will feel, when expressing his views on this problem of immigration, that we are dealing, or ought to deal, with it in the most serious manner, entirely apart from any local or any narrow political consideration, and animated solely by the greatest possible faith in the future of our common country, and that we will do all we can to bring to this Dominion men and women who will come within Abraham Lincoln's estimate of what the citizens of a country ought to be. I hope that we will give to the government and the Acting

Minister of Immigration, in dealing with this problem at the present time, the greatest opportunity for thorough study and thought in order that such a policy may be devised as will work out in the best interests of Canada not only for to-day but in the days that are to come.

Mr. MORRISON: Mr. Chairman, the immigration question which is now before us is a national question. Nevertheless, it seems to me as though some hon. members have been looking at it from a merely local viewpoint. My sympathies to-day are with the Acting Minister of Immigration in his efforts to solve this great problem in the interests of Canada. I believe the government need constructive criticism of their policy, and I will try to offer to-night suggestions which may be helpful.

Economic conditions in Canada to-day, as previous speakers have said are poorly balanced, and are mainly attributable to the war, but local factors and conditions have also had their influence. It is a trait of human nature to try and pass the blame on to someone else when things go wrong; but I think if we are courageous we will take our share of the blame and admit that we have contributed in some degree to the position in which we find ourselves at present. I contend that many of the farmers who are in great difficulty—and that such is the case cannot be denied—are responsible to some extent for the existing trouble. I do not wish to underestimate the picture painted by the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Garland)—he was conscientious in expressing his views, and I give him credit for it—but I do not think that conditions are as bad as described even over the entire West. The farmers, in my opinion, helped to a certain extent to bring about the difficulties from which we are now suffering. During the war years they allowed their judgment, to some extent, to be warped. They got out of alignment with the true conditions and in good years did not conduct their operations wisely. They were not sufficiently careful in their expenditures during the period of high prices and good crops. Following the big harvests of 1915 and 1916, we had five successive years of comparative crop failure in large areas covering thousands of square miles, with the result that in those areas there is great distress to-day. Hence, it is the duty of parliament to try and alleviate the condition of the people in those districts if it possibly can.

I also think that the labour unions—including the coal miners, the building trades, the transportation workers, the railway and shipping interests—have all contributed towards making the problem as we find it to-day. The farmers have to sell their products on the open markets of the world in competition with cheap labour, and have to buy commodities produced at unionized prices. Our dollar, as one hon. member said, is to-day in reality only worth about seventy cents, while unionized produced goods are selling at prices in excess of their real value. Some of the farmers are afraid of over-production and the consequent reduction of the prices of the products which they sell. I do not like the idea of restricting production. I think it is a poor policy for any organization of people—whether it is producers of coal, or farm products, or anything else—to adopt. Restricting production in an effort to make high prices only creates poverty. The world does not need high prices for anything; high prices denote a scarcity in some quarter. An extremely high price for wheat would be reasonable evidence that there was a famine in some country. Surely we do not want a condition of that kind. I think that what we are suffering from very largely is underconsumption. Most of us realize that Europe is our main market for food products to-day, and Europe is in a chaotic condition. The great mass of people there are not eating as they would if they were working steadily. Consequently they cannot buy, and we cannot sell our products. This big problem cannot be righted in a day; its solution is going to take time even though we all do our utmost, and even though a greater degree of harmony prevails in the future than in the past among European governments.

I would like to see greater production in every line of activity, in every line of industry. To-day we have a big overhead expense in running this country. We have railways which would carry several times as much freight as they are carrying to-day; we have a post office system large enough to cater to the needs of twenty-five or thirty millions of people. But our overhead has to be met, even though we have but a comparatively small population, just as much as though our population were far in excess of what it is. I think, therefore, it behooves us to get people into Canada in order to utilize those public facilities which are costing us so much, and thus help to lighten the per capita burden. To-day we have great natural wealth which is lying undeveloped. Natural wealth in its raw state is more of a liability than an asset if it is not worked. I think that what Canada needs is the intelligent application of labour to our natural resources so as to de-

velop and work them up to nearer 100 per cent of capacity. When Canada reaches that stage many of the economic difficulties from which we now suffer will have disappeared.

I would give prospective settlers, as nearly as possible, the actual facts about Canada. I would not try to picture the prospects for settlers in colours too rosy. Let the actual facts be stated, and if the truth will not attract settlers let them stay away. A dissatisfied settler will do more harm to the immigration policy of Canada than anything else. If we can succeed in satisfying settlers that will be the best immigration agency we could have. Hard conditions are not confined to Canada; they obtain in many other countries including the great United States. I will not admit that conditions are roseate throughout the entire republic, although that is what we have been hearing so much about to-day. In some of the great middle western states farming is in a precarious condition to-day, due to an over-inflation of the price of land when the war was on. In the great states of Iowa and Illinois, where the price of land went up to three or four hundred dollars an acre, they were fortunate enough during the war to get big crops, and, as we all know, they got tremendous prices. That threw the farmers generally off the track, and they overvalued their lands. Farm lands were sold for three or four hundred dollars an acre. Many farmers sold their small holdings and bought larger ones. The result is that thousands of those farmers are absolutely bankrupt and are looking for new places to locate and start in business. These farmers would make the very best settlers that Canada could procure.

I am sorry, for this reason, that the member for Bow River painted as blue a picture as he did, because the American agents will use the statements that have been made on the floor of this House to try and keep people from coming to Canada. I know that the United States government had two men in the city of Regina before I came down here, trying to get settlers to go to the States. They were working among the Mennonites, trying to show them they could give them better terms in the States than they were getting here. A friend of mine in western Canada, an ex-American farmer, told me shortly before Christmas that a neighbour of his who was very much dissatisfied with conditions in Alberta, took his boys and went back to their old stamping ground in the States. They found conditions even worse there than in northern Alberta when they left. They returned to northern Alberta.

There are many people in England, Ireland and Scotland who would improve their positions very much if they came to Canada. The same is true of the Scandinavian countries, and Germany, Holland, Denmark and Switzerland. Large numbers of the people in these countries would be delighted to come to Canada. I do not like to mention matters that come under my personal notice, but I will give one instance which will give the House a little idea of what can be done. A neighbour of mine, a German farmer, got his sister-in-law and six children to come out here. They have been here about 17 months. Shortly before I left home he came to my house and told me that it cost $1,600 to bring that family out here—a widow with her six children, the youngest being eight years old and the eldest a girl of twenty. In fifteen months they had paid back the $1,600 and had $300 in the bank. That man said the family were simply delighted with everything in Canada, it was so much better than conditions in Germany. Those people make the very best settlers Canada can get. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that we should forget about the alien enemy and try to do the right thing by these people. The great common masses of Germany are not the people who brought on the war. It was the military element that was in the saddle and forced the situation, but the great common people were not to blame for it any more than our working classes were to blame. I would like to see the restrictions against alien enemy countries lifted, and would like to see all good, sane, worthy people brought in. We want everybody who is willing to take off his coat and go to work and who would not be too particular about what work he did. These people would be valuable citizens in Canada. It used to be said that every man was estimated by the government as being worth $1,000 to the country. The greatest asset Canada can have is her people, and I submit that those people make settlers that are second to none. They are not afraid to encounter hardships, and we may as well admit that settlers have to suffer hardships. It is not a bed of roses and we should not hold up such a picture before prospective settlers, because if we do we will only have dissatisfied settlers, who will go some place else, and we will have spent our money in vain.

Referring to the conditions under which new settlers should expect to start in this country, some people expect they are coming to a ready-made farm. I do not think it is at all necessary to give them that idea. Canada

wants working people, domestics and farm labourers. We are very much in need of them. A good farm labourer will soon become a tenant farmer, and, with an improved land credit system, which I hope we will get, those men will soon become proprietors of farms. It can be done, but it cannot be done in a day or in a year or two. I venture to say that most of the men in this House who are farmers started in a small way; at least, many of us started as farm labourers and worked our way up and that is good enough for the incoming immigrant. The man who gets a chance to work and gets good pay for his work is not entitled to any more. I do not feel sorry for the man or woman who has to work. I feel sorry for a man who cannot find work when he is willing to work. But

9 p.m.

if incoming immigrants have got a fair field, and good wages, as they will have in this country, they can get along much better than they can in the Old Land. About 25 or 30 years ago farmers that went West, while they were not compelled to endure as much hardship as the pioneer settlers in Ontario and Quebec in clearing their farms, yet they had to put up with hard conditions. The hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) was for 20 years located 25 miles or so from a railway station. It would take him two or three days to make the round trip to Indian Head with his grain. He had to put up with many hardships, and thousands of others were in a similar position. The average incoming immigrant from Europe, or even from the United States, should not expect to have everything handed to him on a plate. Give them a fair chance and they will make good. In my constituency there is a lot of vacant land, on which some day prosperous farmers will be located. I admit the best of it was taken up, but there is plenty of land yet where good men will succeed. We want some branch lines of railway there, but the railways like to put a line in some place where they are sure it will pay, where there will be a big production and large tonnage to ship out right away, and that condition prevails in most of the western constituencies. There will be lines built in to help out the unfortunate people that went in there ten or fifteen years ago with the expectation that railway lines would be built. These lines will be built when they have more population in those districts. We are overbuilt with railway mileage to-day, according to our population, and immigration will hurry the building of railways when we get more settlers in. Somebody asks, are we justified in spending money on an immigration policy? I say, yes. I say that at the cost per capita of immigrants Canada to-day can make no better investment than to spend money to bring immigrants to the country.

I have my doubts about the wisdom of this Canada Colonization Association. I would have preferred seeing this government cooperate with the provincial governments in the matter of immigration and have the provincial governments take it up with their municipal authorities and distribute the immigrants. I think this could have been worked out more satisfactorily in that way. I do not know whether it would be more economical, but in the past there has been much misrepresentation by interested shipping companies, railway companies, and real estate companies, painting too rosy a picture, and they got the settler out here and he was immediately dissatisfied. Now, this is a very delicate problem that should be properly attended to, and I think the government should take the responsibility of it instead of deputing it to some other organization.

My hon. friend (Mr. Hoey) advocated the building of labourers' homes. I do not like the idea of asking the government to do anything of that kind. On many of these large farms there are two or three houses to-day which the settlers had to put up for themselves. I think that we should go rather slowly and not undertake to build homes for anybody. Most of the settlers who went out to this part of Canada built them very cheaply. I myself lived for seven years in a house, if you can call it such, which cost me $65, and there are lots of people who have lived in shacks that did not cost them much. They have lived in them for years, and they are healthy men to-day. I think that most people can manage to build their own homes after they have been out there a little while. Some people say that you cannot afford to build to-day as you could twenty-five years ago. Well, the best wages I could draw was $40 for a month at harvest time, or $1.25 a day, and I have paid men five times that during harvest. I have paid them by the month five times as much as I ever got myself. Labourers get more money to-day and they can get work out there more easily than people could twenty-five years ago. I like to see people come here and help themselves. I do not think we should spoon-feed people; let the right class come out who are willing to dig in and help themselves. Now, I think I have said enough for the present. There are several other hon. gentlemen who would like to speak, and although there is much more

that I might say on the subject, I shall not weary the House further. However, I should like to see several hundred thousand immigrants a year brought into Canada and distributed throughout the country, provided they are of the right type, because I am sure that most of the provinces can assimilate large numbers of hard-working settlers.

Mr. DESLAURIERS (Translation): Mr. Chairman. I have listened with much interest to the speakers who have expressed their views on the question of immigration. After consideration of the policy which the hon. Minister of the Interior, at present, submits to us, I deem it my duty to strongly support him, although a number of my colleagues have thought fit—they call themselves good Liberals —to state that this policy is devoid of sense or rather foolish. For my part I think there is wisdom, foresight and especially good judgment in this policy. Some favour the open-door policy for all immigrants as regards our country. I believe this would oblige us to recommend a policy devoid of control, which would be a source of more evil than good. In regard to the immigration of artisans to this country, I am very glad to hear that the hon. member for George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs), has kindly invited the hon. Minister of Labour to take a trip to Montreal, so as to enable him to form an opinion as to the needs of the labouring classes in the metropolis. As I represent a constituency which by itself forms a large city, I take the House as witness that I will place at his disposal large halls, capable of holding 10,000 people. I would advise him to invite at that meeting those who contend that there is unwillingness to do any manual labour rampant among the electors and I would ask him not to forget to invite the hon. members for Hochelaga, St. Henry and St. Denis. I would further advise my hon. colleague to also invite those members who have already expressed their opinion in the House on this question; moreover, to come himself and advocate the reduction of salaries of the people who work three days per week during six months in the year, and I promise him that the same evening the question of labour immigration will be settled and that our honoured guests will return to Ottawa after witnessing some good evidences of democracy and bringing back a precious souvenir of their visit to Montreal.

For the last twenty years Canada's policy has been marked by a system of migration, and if we are to-day facing an immigration problem requiring a rather tactful handling, it is because this system of migration has produced here another problem, far more serious in my opinion, than is the emigration problem, without which we would not have devoted so much time to the question of immigration.

In about twenty years, the Canadian government has brought to this country more than 1,500,000 Europeans. We, to-day, find out that the increase of our population barely exceeds a figure representing its natural increase. There is therefore as many people who leave Canada as there are immigrants entering.

In 1921, for 90,000 immigrants received 100,000 of our own people have crossed the 45th parallel, in search of more favourable conditions. In the province of Quebec the evil is of long standing. Between 1865 and 1890, more than 400,000 of our people have crossed the border. This emigration has not diminished. In 1910, when the country enjoyed the greatest prosperity, it was shown, during the inquiry made by Mr. Rene Dupond, that there emigrated to the United States 19,093 of our countrymen. A few months ago, a paper published in the United States, Le Messager, of Lewiston, stated that during the year 1922, for the period of July, August and September 5,000 Canadian families, that is to say about 25,000 people had crossed to the frontier. In one parish alone in the Richelieu Valley, in the space of a few weeks only, 126 people went over to the American side. In one of the northern parishes, seven families, in a week's time, sold their furniture at auction, and purchased railway tickets to the United States.

Proof of these statements may be obtained by calling at the United States immigration bureau, at Montreal. There it will be seen that on many week-days, they have to make out as many as 100 certificates for French Canadians to enable them to enter the United States. The question that we should ask ourselves, at present, is certainly the one which the hon. Minister of the Interior, on November 16, 1922, put to the Kiwanis club, at Montreal: "What is the cause of there being so many Canadians in the United States; why are there so many deserted farms in Canada?" The reasons are numerous. The enticing wages offered in the United States is one of the causes. A number of families not finding in this country means of subsistence, leave for more clement skies. We also have a quota of adventurers, citizens who settle now here, real immigration agents who, through their advice, induce many people to follow them. There are also those who have heavily mortgaged properties which they cannot clear, and who emigrate to the United States hoping to make a fortune. Lastly, there are those who

seek a more favourable climate; and on that score the United States offers better advantages than Canada. I admit that it is hard to restrain immigration if we take into account the reasons I have just enumerated.

There is also a class of citizens who are forced to emigrate to the United States, I mean the large families with holdings too restricted in area to provide for their needs, and which they cannot possibly extend. I think, Sir, that the government could perhaps come to an agreement with the provincial governments, so as encourage the settling in new territories of those families who still desire to cultivate the land and thereby remain together on our Canadian soil.

I believe it would be possible to found a trust and loan institution for settlers; I also think that it would be possible to establish for these new settlers, a good market for the disposal of their lumber and grain. We should particularly assist in the transportation of these families so as to allow them, once settled on these new farms, to visit their relatives; in this way, they would act as agents for the government and attract many of their people to these new territories. We should, in my judgment, extend to these men of goodwill, facilities for railway transportation, settlers should not be left to pay their railway fares out of the few dollars remaining to them, thus exposing them to hardships once the work is started,—my opinion is that the government must undertake first an educational compaign. This campaign should especially begin with our own settlers so as to help them in the fulfilment of their task and so as to let it be known among our people that there must be in Canada, as in other countries, a national spirit which pledges the people to obligations and duties towards the country.

The Minister of the Interior should have agents to organize the common effort, watch over our interests and to carry on publicity in all possible ways; such as excursions, demonstrations, lectures and literature so as to pave the way to success and cultivate the love of one's country. This would perhaps cost much less than to import, at our expense from European countries, settlers who will be exposed to the same hardships as our own settlers and who, as in the past, will at our expense, cross over the borders to settle in the United States.

In 1921, while a serious situation existed, I deemed it my duty to rise in this House and bring on a debate on the subject, when we had 500,000 unemployed, according to the statistics of that day, when revolution was rampant in Russia and threatened all the European nations, when the Workers of the World, that you all know as an outgrowth of the Soviets began to branch out in various cities of this Dominion. I moved a resolution perhaps somewhat radical, asking that the admission to this country of all immigrants be stopped until conditions became normal again. At that time this resolution apparently supported to a certain extent by the government of the day, did not have the good fortune to please everybody. I was then the object of some criticism on the part of certain colleagues, I am, however, glad to see, to-day, on the Orders of the Day, under less solemn circumstances, a proposed resolution by my colleague from George Etienne Cartier, having as marked a radical character as the one I proposed in 1921, although tending exactly in the opposite direction "O tempora, O mores!" instead of having, as he then had, the sympathy of his colleagues the contrary is happening to-day and I should be glad to see the vote taken to-night on his resolution in regard to immigration. I wish however, to prove to my hon. friend and to those who may share his views, that he was in error when he said that I examined the immigration question through spectacles which did not allow me to see beyond the county of St. Mary. To give the proof, I shall travel 800 miles away from my home: I shall go down to Gaspé; it is some distance from St. Mary's but I think it is well known by most of the members of this House. All tourists know the country for its beautiful spots, they are aware that it is rich in beautiful vistas of valley and plain; with fisheries renowned for the abundance of their fish, and their high quality as well; mines also of great value. Indeed, we all know that there are zinc and lead mines in operation; we all know that at Port Daniel, on the coast of Baie des Chaleurs, there is to be found a large bed of bituminous schist; finally we all know that the country is rich in forests that are taken advantage of by Americans by way of New Brunswick. Now, notwithstanding all these natural advantages, farming is at a standstill, fisheries pay very little, the lumbering is done to the benefit of a foreign country. Why does this state of things exist? Because the means of transportation are useless or inexistent. The country is drained by a number of rivers, such as the St. John, the Dartmouth, the York, the Bonaventure, the St. Anne, the Madeleine, whose water powers could be utilized to bring to life the pulp and saw-mills of Gaspé. The utilizing of these water powers would allow the manufacture, in Gaspé, of all the pulp and

paper which is at present being manufactured in the United States with the pulpwood of Gaspé. This would help to keep in our country a class of our countrymen which is very valuable to us and already acclimatized; it would moreover control this rush of emigration which is taking place at a staggering pace.

According to many hydrographic authorities, the Bay of Gaspé could be turned into one of the freight ports of the world if some work not of a very extensive character were carried out so as to allow the largest ocean craft to enter that bay twenty-two miles long; this would shorten, by 375 miles, the ocean route. A few years ago, a private company requested from the government permission to build a railway from Gaspé to Amqui, and, later, from Amqui to Edmundston, this would have further shortened the freight route by about two hundred miles. However, an hon. senator of the Maritime provinces, whose name I do not know, prevented this company obtaining a charter. Would it be possible now, in order to retain the whole population of Gaspé in that territory, to get in touch with this company and to grant it a charter free of charge, since it was disposed to carry on all the necessary work at its own expense? It is an acknowledged fact that this railway would be an excellent thing and would come to the rescue of the one that exists now and which is not sufficient. The railway of the Quebec Oriental Company and Atlantic Quebec and Western Company does not suffice, first of all, it is practically useless owing to its length and its exorbitant freight rates. We have at Murray Bay a deep water wharf which cannot be utilized as a winter port because the building of a branch railway of less than two miles in length has always been refused. The whole population of this locality is thereby isolated and business intercourse being rendered impossible for these people, they are obliged to emigrate; and that is what is happening. If this branch line was built, I feel certain that would greatly contribute to retain at home the inhabitants of that locality. The government might also agree to the building of a winter port on the coast of Baie des Chaleurs, at Paspébiac or at Port Daniel. The proposition was already mooted but, there again, influences, either local or provincial, were brought to bear to prevent the carrying out of the project. I think that it is under such circumstances as those under which we are at present placed, and when it comes to discussing questions so ticklish as that of immigration, that the government should not only consider the province which I have chosen as an example, but also co-operate with every province, where the necessity arises, so as to stop that rush of emigration towards the United States, dispensing us with the necessity of bringing here, at the public expense, foreign citizens.

We can but praise the government for the appointment of Mr. Arthur Lemont to the Immigration Bureau, at Ottawa. The good effects of his work is already being felt. We must also congratulate the government on the advertising campaign which it has undertaken in the United States for the repatriation and the settling in our country of our own people at present in the United States. Already good results have been obtained, namely in the counties of Chicoutimi and Lake St. John, where during the last year, 263 families have settled on farms and 126 in the villages. Last year alone, 2,471 people came from the United States to settle in the province of Quebec. Why did these people decide to return to their country? Because they knew they could earn their living, owing to colonization, agriculture and the industries being in full swing.

Mr. Chairman, I am coming to the end of the few remarks that I had to make. I sincerely believe that the question of emigration that I have just discussed is more important than the immigration one and I think if we went to the trouble of keeping our own people in this country, we would not find ourselves in the sad plight of having to bring foreigners here. I support almost in its entirety the policy which the hon. Minister of the Interior has proposed. Perhaps, he might again consider the item in his programme relative to young children. I think it would be more practical to hold on to our public money so as to bring up our own abandoned children rather than apply this money to foreign children.

I was listening, last night, to the remarks of the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Garland) on the immigration question. He stated that the western people did not wish or have need for, more immigrants. I am led to believe that he did not then express the views of the western provinces, for, at the time of the last census, they gave us proof that they did not think they had a sufficiently large population, by inflating the figures of the census so as to secure more representation than they were really entitled to.

As to the hon. member for Southeast Grey (Miss Macphail) I must say, that I cannot agree with her theories going so far as to deny the dignity of labour. I contend that a young girl can perfectly be honourable and so honoured while performing domestic duties, when she would perhaps, if constrained to

change her occupation, be a failure as a school teacher.

I am glad to have had the opportunity of drawing the government's attention to the emigration question of our people, for I am satisfied that if, after giving the question serious consideration, they are able to solve the problem, it would be from the economic standpoint, to the great advantage of Canada.

Mr. DICKIE: I have thought, after listening to this debate for several days, if a composite picture could be drawn of it, I would like to have that picture. We have had all kinds of expressions of opinion and arguments with respect to the policy brought down by the minister, and I do not see any finality in anything that has been said with respect to that policy. I am sometimes almost persuaded to one phase or another, and then another speaker arises and disabuses my mind. I am reminded of an old man of ninety-two years of age who had never taken a drink in his life. Some prominent temperance people were holding a meeting in the vicinity, and they decided to motor out to interview this old gentleman. They went out and saw him. He was hale and hearty, ninety-two years of age. He said: "Yes, gentlemen, I have never taken a drink in my life." While he was talking, there was a noise of furniture being broken upstairs, and someone expressed a little concern. The old man said: "Never mind, that is only father; he has been out and had a drink or two, and they cannot do anything with him." So that shows that what may seem almost unassailable is probably not quite as sound as it would seem. I sympathize with the minister in connection with the policy that he has placed before the House. I sympathize with him because of some of the criticisms that policy has received. It is my humble opinion that he is trying to do what is best for the country in what is a most complex, difficult and contentious problem.

I am going to deal with this problem from an entirely different angle. I am going to try to show that it is of very little use bringing immigrants to this country, unless we can prepare the country for them. For a number of years now we have had very many of our men and women going to the country to the south of us. Why are they going? I am going to endeavour to tell this House why they are going, and they are going in greater numbers now than in previous years. This is due in large measure to the wonderful prosperity which that country is enjoying at the present time, to which prosperity we are contributing in a large degree. Our young men are leaving the West, leaving the Pacific province, of which I am best able to speak, and their fondest wish when they leave is that they will return at some early date, for they love their country and are only leaving it because of the better opportunities that exist in the United States. The reason, I think, Mr. Chairman, is this: We have an adverse trade balance with our neighbours to the south, of $200,000,000 every year. A fairly constant stream of $200,000,000 of gold or its equivalent is flowing yearly from this country to the United States. Just imagine—one billion dollars every five years from a population of nine million people! What can be the result? We must inevitably follow that stream of gold. We will drift the way the gold is going. We have a trade balance in our favour with the old countries of Europe and people from those countries are following that gold out here at all times. We want them to stay here. Canada cannot afford to be a preparatory school for people from European countries whose ultimate destination will be with our neighbours to the south. If they come here and remain here they will probably displace some of our citizens, and then they will go. One man who has been brought up in the resourceful Canadian school is in some respects worth on an average three men that come to us from European countries. I think that will be conceded. We must keep our people at home.

How are we going to stop them following this constant stream of gold to the United States every year? My remedy will be one which will not appeal to my hon. friend from Saskatoon probably, but he may agree with me before I get through with my argument.

One phase of my remedy would be for each of us to practise a little patriotism ourselves for the sake of our country. There is not a person in this country who does not buy something that is manufactured in the United States when probably he could buy something here that he could get along with just as well. I do not mean to discourage trade with that wonderful country to the south, but we must keep our money at home, and we can probably do that by a little self-denial on the part of each person in Canada, if we only would do it.

Let me explain a little further how this stream of wealth affects us. In the island where I live, Vancouver Island, we have a large coal mining population in the district represented by my hon. friend the member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill) and myself. We have a coal mining population of 20,000 people. We find a market for not one half the coal we can mine, and it is rated as the best bituminous coal on the continent to-day. In

the years 1920 and 1921 we were sending $1,000,000 approximately every month out of British Columbia for fuel oil, $12,000,000 a year from a population no larger than the city of Toronto. What could occur under those circumstances? What did occur was this: We send out that million dollars a month, and we are importing 360,000,000 barrels of oil every month. That is the equivalent of 90,000 tons of good coal. That displaces that output of 90,000 tons of coal, and to mine that 90,000 tons of coal monthly would represent a population of 6,000 or 7,000 people. This oil comes into our country. Our coal mines are only working part time, and none are paying dividends. They have been good to their employees. We have had no trouble with our coal miners in British Columbia, although they are largely imbued with socialistic ideas. They were true all through the war, and we had no complaint of them loafing on the job. Our coal operators tried to treat them as men, and receiving such treatment, they are content. But with this $1,000,000 worth of oil coming into our country every month, these coal miners and others who are dependent on what the coal miners do, drifted down into California, and they are down there now working in the oil fields. They simply followed our money to California. There is no other way out of it. The thing seems perfectly plain to me. In California they are having a period of unexampled prosperity. What is known as the Huntington Beach field, near Long Beach, has turned out to be a wonderful oil producing field. In a strip of barren country known as Elk Hills, from which geologically speaking little was to be expected, there is I believe, the deepest well in the world. It was drilled to 6,500 feet and was a failure, but with all the money they have there they tried again, and at 4,500 feet I understand they opened up a gusher of 45,000 barrels a day. Since then numerous wells have been placed there, and it is now one of the great oil fields out-rivalling even Oklahoma. On the Pacific coast transportation is very cheap, as the oil comes in tank steamers to British Columbia. At one time before this Huntington field was opened up, we had to pay $2.75 a barrel. Now by buying for future supply we can get it at $1.24 a barrel. It we had the assurance that we were going to get it that cheap for two years more, our coal mining population would be absolutely wiped out. There is always a chance, as people know who are familiar with the oil question, that some day a well will begin to spout salt water, and then the well is done, and it is only the uncertainty of the life of the oil regions in California that keeps our coal mines operating at all to-day. We are just living from hand to mouth in that respect. I am not going into the remedy for that now. I shall leave that to a time when the subject may more appropriately be discussed.

Just on the subject of people leaving our country, I may say that our probably greatest potential wealth in British Columbia, is timber. Nearly every day immense booms of our logs leave British Columbia for the state of Washington to be manufactured into lumber in the mills there. That raw material is going over there every month to be manufactured, and our people are leaving this country and going over there to assist in that manufacture, or people are manufacturing over there who would come to our country and do the manufacturing here if they were forced to manufacture it in British Columbia. The slopes of our mountains are being denuded. There is a regular timber boom on out there, and a great part of this timber is going to our neighbours to the south. Is not that a matter for grave consideration?

There is another matter which occurs to me at the present moment. I am quite familiar with an undertaking in which half a million dollars has been embarked, and that is the creosoting industry in the constituency of Burrard, which I believe the Minister of Finance has had drawn to his attention. This industry has had simply a life and death struggle for years. For this reason: On the American side they have two immense creosoting plants doing an immense volume of business. I do not need to tell any of you gentlemen that an industry conducted on such a scale can simply crush the life out of a smaller competitor. We have a comparatively small plant in British Columbia, but given equal treatment, given a chance to succeed, it can be made a success. That would mean giving employment to 200 people, which would represent a population of nearly a thousand souls. In that industry preference has always been given to married folks and to white people. When tenders for piling are asked for, the creosoting plants on the American side put in bids at such a low figure that our people cannot compete with them. It has been asserted that the American firms put in such low bids that they made no profit at all. They do that, we have reason to think, in the hope of crushing out their Canadian competitors. The minute they succeeded in doing that, competition would disappear and the prices for creosoting piles and material would go up to rates much beyond

what the British Columbia company is doing this business for. That is another argument which undoubtedly will be used later on in favour of a higher tariff wall.

A policy which appeals to one section in Canada we well know does not appeal to another. In the Maritime provinces free trade is looked upon very kindly. I do not believe that Quebec could succeed under a policy of free trade, or that Ontario would be any more successful. Undoubtedly the prairie provinces would succeed; free trade would be a great temporary benefit to them. In British Columbia free trade would simply put us out of existence. I could multiply arguments showing what the result would be. Therefore, why cannot we sit down and reason together, regardless of political dissensions, and see if we cannot devise some remedy, such a remedy as a business man or a business firm would devise. I know of no reason why we could not do that. I believe that every thinking man in Canada should be in favour of erecting a tariff wall in this country corresponding in height to the tariff wall that has been erected against us by our neighbours to the south. Why, Sir, I have heard Americans laugh at us for neglecting to do this; they wonder at our being so slow in adopting this protection. What argument is there against our doing this? We import forty million pounds of pork products every year from the United States. We also import, I do not know how much, butter—probably a couple of million pounds. We allow the United States to ship butter into this country under a duty of only 4 cents a pound, whereas in the case of the five million pounds of butter which we exported to that country last year we paid a duty of eight cents a pound. That meant a difference of four cents a pound which might represent the profit to the Canadian manufacturer of that butter. What is the argument in favour of such a policy? I can see many good arguments in favour of reciprocity which was so strongly supported by the Minister of Finance. Some of us, however, were fearful of the future effect of reciprocity on this Dominion. Whether right or wrong I for one was fully convinced, from personal judgment, and in view of the statements of Mr. Champ Clark, Mr. Taft, and others that the policy was one which required careful consideration on the part of Canadians. But, Sir, reciprocity is absolutely out of the question at the present time. Under the circumstances why allow to these gentlemen in the United States privileges which they do not extend to us?

[Mr. Dickie.]

With respect to our Progressive friends to my left something must undoubtedly be done for them and for those whom they represent. Unless the farmers on the western prairies prosper, to a limited degree anyway, we cannot prosper as a whole in Canada. Out in British Columbia we look to them for our market, we would like to be more closely associated with them so that we might work together. In the matter of Canada's welfare we should all be closely united. As the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) so eloquently said, we must be united if we are to make of this Dominion the country which it should be, a country of which we will all be proud. Why not let us all work together? Why not let us forget this miserable political bickering and sparring for position; let us sit down in council together and try and do business. The benefits which my hon. friends to my left would lose under a policy which I advocate could be made up to them in some other way. The hon. member for Comox-Alberni suggested that we might possibly bonus the production of wheat. I do not agree with that suggestion, but possibly some concession in the matter of freight rates might be given to them which would be sort of equivalent for any benefit they might otherwise derive under free trade. The great argument in favour of a policy which I recommend is that under it our money would remain in this country. If we only had $100,000,000 of the $200,000,000 which we send over to the United States what could we not accomplish in this country. The future of Canada is fraught with great possibilities. I have made a somewhat modest study of geological and mineralogical conditions and I say it is the consensus of opinion among mining men that the great Laurentian plateau away to the north of us holds possibilities leading us to expect that it will prove to be the greatest gold mining country in the world. We have plenty of reason for optimism. But let us try and stop the flow of gold which is at present going from Canada to the United States. If we do this it will help to put an end to the exodus of people from this country. At present there is a great boom over there to which we are contributing very materially. People will go to a country which holds strong attractions in the way of possibilities, but after all there is in the heart of every man a love for his own country. Make the conditions here more attractive and you will be able to repatriate many Canadians now in the United States. Personally I think very little of a man born in this country with a soul so dead

that he will ever forget that he is a Canadian.

There is another thing which would contribute materially to the prosperity of this country. We have got to find a remedy for the situation which exists in Canada at the present time in regard to coal. Our American friends have been more than kind; they have allowed Canadians to have coal when they could have used it themselves to good advantage. In 1922 we sent $60,000,000 to the United States for anthracite and bituminous coal. Now that flow of gold to the other side of the line could be stopped. Suppose we have the anthracite fields that are said to exist in Alberta. I do not know whether the facts are overdrawn with respect to these immense deposits or not; at any rate we know there is plenty of coal there. Even supposing our railways haul that coal at a loss, if we can only keep in the country that $60,000,000 now going to the United States do you not see how we could make good any losses incurred in the transportation of coal via Canadian channels. Such a policy would work to the great benefit of Canada. We have unbounded reason for optimism. If we will only work together we can make this country a land to be proud of and we can prevent our people from leaving the Dominion and going to the country to the south. We will also pave the way for a flow of acceptable immigrants from European countries.

With respect to immigration, reference has been made by some of the British Columbia members to the oriental problem in that province. I am not going to say anything about it tonight except that it is a very serious problem, more serious than this House evidently realizes. We also have to have a good white population out there; some of them are not just what we would wish. In saying this I hope it will have some influence on any action which the minister may contemplate in respect to bringing immigrants from Europe. During the peregrinations of the Fishery Commission last summer we called at Malcolm Island where there is a Finnish settlement the members of which are said to be free lovers and socialists. I do not know whether they are Marxians or Leninists. I do know that they are absolutely discontented although they live on an island which is an elysium compared to the country from which they came. Owing to the noxious doctrines evolved from the unsound reasoning of unsound brains, they have imbibed, however, they are absolutely discontented. There is no reason why they should be. We listened to their woes for a while. We sat in a large hall with a drop curtain on the stage. There was depicted on the curtain an Hogarthian female with a large red flag. We deliberated under the red flag in this country with people living better than they had ever lived at home. Those people were told at the last election that if they did not exercise their franchise they would probably lose it. We were informed that a number of them voted and deliberately spoiled their ballots. We want no such citizens. It may be said they were white people and perhaps their children will be all right. Well, they may be, but what chance has a child raised in an atmosphere of sullen discontent and sodden lust to become a good citizen? It may be true that in after years environment will bring out the best that is in them, but the best that environment can bring out is pre-determined by heredity. True, some may be useful citizens, but the chance for children of that kind is a remote one. I would very much prefer that no more of those people should come here. With respect to oriental immigration, I have no doubt that other hon. members will deal with that in a very comprehensive way later on.

Mr. BALDWIN: If ever I thought there was need of building up in this country a spirit of patriotism and love of country, it is since this debate commenced. We have been taken by some speakers to the hill tops of patriotism, and others have taken us to the dark valleys, if not of death, then of despair. When we look at this vast and amazing country, and see the opposition that has been aroused against allowing people from the crowded sections of middle Europe and Scandinavia to come over and work out their destiny, it seems to me the situation is peculiar. The hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Marler), the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Baxter), the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Hoey), and a few others appear in this debate like an oasis in a horrible desert. I am pretty nearly the oldest member of this House, as near as I can figure it out; I have lived along the United States boundary and I have seen the pendulum of immigration swing to and fro many many times in my lifetime. It seems to me the pendulum is swinging the people into the United States and for what reason? On account of the United States not entering the war for two or three years after it commenced, they have become the richest nation on the earth. They are now engaged in the greatest development possible in the country, notwithstanding the immense cost. If

prudent Canadians are able to go into that country and get $10 or $15 a day, live on $2 a day and bring the residue back to this country, I congratulate them. Personally, as good a deal as I ever made was when I bought something from a cold-footed American, and sold it to a hot-headed one. If we can make a profit by dealing with them in that way, let us go to it.

The suggestion that this country is not able to assimilate or receive tens of thousands of the people of Europe seems to me a queer proposition. The wheat raisers of the West have told us their tale of woe, and have stated that they have paid from $8 to $10 a day to people who would not be subservient to their will and wanted to be masters. It is inconceivable to me that they do not want people to come to this country. The people of the West are asking for the Hudson Bay railway and for branch lines. Why, they need labour in every part of the great western provinces. We want labour now and we wanted labour many years ago. The people of Nova Scotia will remember when the product of their quarries was being taken to Atlantic cities of the United States, and with these products the people erected permanent buildings. At present we have great mines in Manitoba and no one to work them. In my own county we have the best granite quarries of the Dominion and they were practically closed for want of help. Formerly the owners of the mines went to Scotland for their help, but Scotland was so depleted by the war that they can furnish no more help from that country. Then they went to Norway and Sweden where the boys learn stone quarrying and stone cutting, as the boys in this country learn farming. Then the embargo was put on. I know that the Acting Minister of Immigration (Mr. Stewart) has had many overtures made to him to alleviate the situation but with what success I do not know.

10 p.m. I have understood from this debate that neither Norway nor Sweden is willing to allow their people to emigrate.

If I were to tell the House one-quarter of what the great nation of the south had received by immigration, it would take half the night. Any one who had the opportunity during the last 40 or 50 years of seeing the people pouring into Castle Garden, New York, Portland, Maine, Boston, Chicago or St. Louis, must have wondered where all these people could plant themselves. But they have done it. The United States has received millions of people, and before the American Civil War they had a system of bringing the sunny negroes to that country as slaves. In order to emancipate the country from the condition of slavery the United States was placed in a worse position than Canada is in to-day. They have those people there now and they have to contend with them. We do not wish to mention the horrible things the whites have perpetrated on them. The negro population amounts to 10 per cent of the whole population of that great and glorious country. We have not that negro element to deal with here, but our British Columbia friends are becoming alarmed because Oregon and California became alarmed first. Considering that the negro element constitutes one-tenth of the population of the United States they do not want the yellow race to predominate in the western states. They were to blame. They were proud at one time when they had their Chinese and Japanese to work for them, but when these orientals through their thrift became moneyed men and desired to invest in real estate they became suspicious and they are now quite alarmed. I think Canada need not be so much alarmed, although I would not set up my own judgment against the judgment of the people who live in British Columbia. Hansard will show that I have said in this House on more than one occasion that I would allow every one who is law-abiding and willing to work to come to Canada. I would have to change my statements a little by saying that we would not give the yellow race free admission to this country, but beyond that I make no qualification.

I believe that my hon. friend (Mr. Euler) said what was right and just to-day. I have heard in this House, I will not say from which quarter, some remarks that lead me to suspect that the feeling of class hatred is not yet extinct, and that is one of the worst things with which any people can be cursed. The great nations of the world are to-day sending missionaries all over the globe in an effort to Christianize people, and surely the colour of a man's skin should make no difference to us and certainly should not render him unfit to be a fellow-citizen of ours, for we are all brothers if we believe in the fatherhood of God. But looking at the question from the point of view of the necessity for bringing immigrants into this country to-day, I say that the need is imperative.

In the part of the country from which I come, and is known as the "New England of Canada" we have great water powers which are awaiting development, and probably within the next five years in the province of Quebec I am positive that there will be commenced a development which will run up into tens of millions of dollars. During the last three or four years the great hindrance to

hydro electric development has been simply because the metallic world has been wild, and the cost of labour has been high. We are looking forward to development, but there is a labour shortage on every hand, and we want people to come into the country to produce from our resources.

The free traders on the other side of the House contend that we should be able to sell goods in Canada as cheap as they can be got anywhere else in the world, and they would have us pull down the protective tariff wall. But how can we manufacture goods in Canada and compete successfully, in the absence of a protective tariff, against Japan and Germany where there are great armies of workmen who labour long hours, and where a great degree of skill and ingenuity is brought to bear upon their industries? If it were not for the tariff wall in Canada to-day we should hear the same tale of woe in every other part of the country as we have heard from some who have been sent here possibly to espouse the cause of certain classes. What happened in the United States after the great Civil War? Non-commissioned men who had passed through the great fight, perhaps thirty or forty years of age, became great captains of industry, and under the fostering policy that was adopted in that country the industries of the United States gradually grew until they are what we find them to-day. There is no use in everlastingly demonstrating this fact. I believe in following the pattern of those who have been successful. If I adopted any course as an individual I would certainly follow that of the man who I thought had made the greatest success in life, and I think the same thing applies to nations. Living as we do alongside of a nation between whom and ourselves there is a border line of some 5,400 miles, both peoples speaking the same tongue and having almost wholly the same resources, I do not see why we in Canada should not be successful if we followed the same course that our neighbours have pursued, and which has made them so rich. How can it be reasonably urged that we should throw down our tariff wall while they maintain one of high protection? It is inconceivable. I admit, with the hon. member (Mr. Euler) that I have heard captains of industry say we can stand free trade with the United States. We have the great white coal in this country that provides power cheaper than black coal can give them; and although there are not many of us here who will live to see it, I believe the time will come when Canada will be able to compete with the world in the manufacturing industry even though we may have free trade. Considering our population I think that Canada holds a wonderful position to-day; her agricultural, mining and timber resources and her fisheries are enormous; but we must have people, more people in the country if we are to develop these resources. The other night, during the course of my remarks, I referred to the vastness of this country, mentioning incidentally Hudson bay, which I said was more like a sea. Two minutes in the Library showed me that this bay is five times the size of either the Black or the Balkan seas.

I do not wish to detain the House but I might refer to one or two other points before I close. The other day I was searching the market for beans and I discovered that if I wanted this commodity at a reasonable price I could get only Danubian beans grown in Hungary or Austria, or beans raised in Egypt Now, the farmers are afraid of competition, and this is not saying anything new. I heard only to-day in the Agricultural committee rumours of the enormous amount of money that we are sending to the United States for agricultural products. What does this show? Is there not room for agriculturists in this country, in every province of this wide Dominion? There certainly is. We are sending $100,000,000 to the United States for agricultural products, not including corn and cotton. These are two commodities for which we have to depend on the United States. And we are sending a huge amount of money to that country for coal. I hope that the amount we send out of the country for this purpose will in the next decade be diminished to as many thousands as we are now sending millions of dollars. I believe that we can so build up this country that our great national railways will be able to carry our own products within our borders at reasonable rates and that there will be an increase in traffic so that the deficits may be reduced.

I agree with the hon. member (Miss Macphail) who stated that we should have lawyers and doctors and everyone who could come into the country enter Canada. That is my opinion. Do not let us turn anyone down. Let them all come and we will build up this Dominion as the great United States has been built up. They have no unduly restrictive measures there, and I think we would meet with the same success which has attended that country. I spent a few weeks in the state of Wisconsin some forty-five years ago and what I discovered was a revelation. The Scandinavians, particularly the Norwegians and the Swedes, had done so well that large numbers of their friends and relatives were following them and occupying that part of the United States, so that the population of the

states of Wisconsin and Minnesota was comprised very largely of these people. An hon. member on the other side spoke a few moments ago about lifting the ban from our former enemies of the war. I most heartily concur in that sentiment. You will find in the United States that the German element has been second to none in the settling of that country. I do not think there should be any more talk about race hatred. I am a pacifist and am opposed to that sort of thing, and this world will never be right until race hatred ceases. With our tremendous railway system, with our extensive waterway system to feed our railways, and with our practically unlimited natural resources, it is simply beyond the scope of my judgment to know how we can get along without a broad immigration policy. The writers in our newspapers and magazines are for the most part agreed on the necessity for an energetic and comprehensive policy of immigration, and I think it may be safely assumed that these gentlemen possess as much wisdom as any of us in the House. They see no other way out.

I think the Progressives and the Labour representatives entertain a wrong idea in thinking that the more people we bring into this country the greater competition they will have to meet, for it must be borne in mind that every settler is a consumer as well as a producer, and we need men that will do hard, laborious work and rough it. In the United States the early settlers lived in dug-outs and shacks built of poles and roofed with straw, they roughed it, and the most affluent people in the United States to-day are the descendants of those settlers in the great Mississippi valley and westward for two or three hundred miles. For fifty years or more these men hung on to their land with just enough returns from their work to exist on and pay their taxes, until ultimately with the development of the country the rise in the value of their land made them prosperous and even wealthy. I say the same good fortune will attend our farmers in the West: Let them hang on and deny themselves for the present and with the development of our country they, too, will become rich like the American farmers.

Our Progressive friends have been bewailing both this session and last session the unsatisfactory conditions of agriculture. Let me make a comparison. In New England, in Minnesota, Dakota, Idaho, Oregon and Washington just as many tales of woe are heard as in Canada. And I would tell our western farmers that just as many tales of woe can be told right down in my community, the Eastern Townships. Why? Because our farmers

[Mr. Baldwin.]

paid three times more for their farms in many instances than they are now worth. That is an instance of over-capitalization.

It has been suggested, Mr. Chairman, that every member give his opinions regarding the solution of our immigration problem. I have given mine. I presume the minister, with whom I sympathize very much would like to see this debate close before we sleep, and therefore I refrain from making any further remarks.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I realize that this is perhaps one of the most important debates which can engage our attention, because immigration and all that it involves touches practically every phase of our national life. In immigration itself is wrapped up not only the present condition of this country but the possibilities of its future development, and therefore I repeat, this is one of the most important subjects that we can discuss.

It is customary, I believe, to commence with a few remarks concerning present conditions. We have heard so much from so many different angles that I shall content myself with a consideration of the conditions which will to a large extent influence the class of immigrants coming to this country and which also will to a large extent direct and guide any immigration policy that may be evolved, for it is upon present conditions that the policy of the minister (Mr. Stewart) must be founded if it is to be successful.

I find there is general agreement on one point—that for one reason or another we have not been able to take anything like full advantage of the immigration we have received in the past. Now, that is not a statement which can be very well controverted. Indeed, I do not think it is an argumentative statement at all, it is a statement of fact founded upon the figures of the department itself and upon the knowledge of every member of this House and of every one outside who has given any thought to this subject. We have not been able to take advantage to any great extent of our past immigration policy because we have not succeeded in retaining the percentage which we should have retained of the men and women who have come here.

Why is it? In speaking of conditions I shall refer to those portrayed by two hon. members who sit in this quarter of the House. I shall first take the picture drawn by the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Garland). I regret some of the criticisms that have been directed against his speech. I know, and many others in this House know, that in describing conditions as they exist in his part

of the country he described them with truthfulness and exactitude. I do not say that those conditions prevail generally throughout the West, but I do say that in the part of the country from which the hon. gentleman comes those conditions exist as he has described them. I know because although I do not live there part of my constituency runs into that country. I also know because thirty odd years ago I went through that district and at that time every oldtimer—and I include the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell)—and every rancher knew it was not fitted by nature for farming. In that country, in fact throughout the whole West, there are two reasons for adverse conditions. One is the lack of sufficient rainfall to produce crops—a natural condition which no government can mend. No government can cause enough rain to fall for the production of crops. The other condition is one for which to a large extent governments may be held responsible—the economic policy which we have followed during the past. I wish to divide those two adverse conditions, because the government has enough sins—and I am not speaking merely of this government but of preceding governments also—they have enough sins to answer for without calling down the sins of Providence on their head as well.

Mr. McMASTER: Surely that is dangerous theology, that Providence is responsible for sins?

Mr. SPEAKMAN: The hon. gentleman is probably better qualified to speak as to that. I was simply discussing natural shortcomings with which the farmer has to contend. During the last general election a certain gentleman not unknown to fame in this country made the statement, with which I sympathize to a great extent, that his lack of success in that campaign was due very largely in the West to too much rain having fallen in some places and not enough in others. I am not going to blame the present government or the preceding government for these conditions. They exist in that part of the country, and in stating those conditions, I think the hon. member performed nothing more or less than his bounden duty in this House because, if we are to provide remedies for conditions that prevail, if we are to improve those conditions, we can provide those remedies or improve those conditions only if we have a knowledge of the conditions as they exist. Those conditions may be unpalatable to us; we may not like to face them; but if they are there, we should know they are there, face them like men, and see if, to some extent, they can be overcome. Nothing can be gained by closing our eyes to facts and imagining, because we do not see those facts, they do not exist. When the hon. member for Springfield spoke and poured forth his optimism and praise of the great province of Manitoba, I was cheered up; I felt almost exuberant in my joy to know, in one part of Canada at least, all was well with the world. I could not, I will admit, quite understand the full extent of his optimism in the face of some facts that even I was aware of, for instance, that there are at the present time in that province unpaid taxes amounting to $14,000,000. But no doubt that was attributable to the "over-institutionalism", was it not?

Mr. HOEY: That it was staggering under taxation.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: That it was staggering under taxation, and I am not going to hold that against my hon. friend at all. But when he spoke of that province, again I say, if those are the conditions there, the conditions of which he was cognizant, he was right in stating what he did. As for myself, I shall have to walk the middle of the road again. You know, I have noted that it has been commented upon that I have been given to moderation in this House; I intend to stick to moderation in this House, and in this respect I shall be moderate again. In my part of the country—and that extends over a good deal of Alberta—conditions are not as bad as they are painted by the hon. member for Bow River. We are in a part of the country where we have in an average year sufficient rainfall and sufficient feed for our stock, where we can grow crops year after year, where we engage in dairying, where we raise beef, hogs, poultry and eggs, and where in most years we can make our living. I believe that, given a decent chance economically, given laws under which we can carry on, under which we shall be put on an equality with other people, in our part of the country and taking the West as an average, we shall certainly succeed.

There is in this House no man to whom I will yield a place in my pride in Canada, in my optimism for the future of Canada, if rightly governed and if proper policies are put into effect. I believe we have at the present time, in potential possibilities, one of the greatest countries in the world. No one who has ridden as I have ridden over the plains of my own Alberta, who has gone through the mountains and seen the enormous deposits of the easily mined coal to be found there, who

has seen hills covered with cattle, the crops that can be raised and the results of the gas deposits, who believes, as I believe, that oil, that almost every natural product can be found there, can despair of a country like that. I believe we have potentially one of the greatest countries in the world, indeed, as the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) said, probably the one great undeveloped country in the northern zone, and there is no country to which we need take a second place. But if we grant that—and most hon. members have granted that— then why is it that during the past forty or fifty years we have not been able to retain more of our population; that we have not succeeded better than we have succeeded with that foundation of natural resources? In an ordinary business, if a company or if a certain number of men were provided with capital, with a splendid stand for doing business, with all the essentials to conduct a successful business and to carry it on to a successful conclusion, and they failed, would you not think their failure was due to bad management on their part? Therefore, if in the face of those natural advantages we possess, we have not succeeded as we should have succeeded—and I do not think any hon. member will say that we have succeeded up to the present time—I contend that there must be something wrong with the management.

Mr. McBRIDE: Since I have come into this House, I have not heard one person in this section say a good word about the prairies. How is it that from 2,000 to 3,000 people come to the coast every year and that many of them go down to California and have a good time if conditions on the prairies are as bad as represented?

Mr. SPEAKMAN: No doubt, many men do go to the coast from some of our towns and a few from the farms. I have heard a good deal about the men who go to California, and spend their ill gotten gains in riotous living during the winter; but it has not been my good fortune to meet one of them. There may be such men, but they can be but a very small percentage of the men who live on the prairies.

The hon. member just asked me how it was that there was no one with a good word to say for the prairies. I am one who will say a good word for the prairies. I believe the prairies and those western provinces have all that is necessary to make a great country. I have lived there since I was a small boy; I went in there when the country was absolutely undeveloped, and my life, my whole upbringing has been in that country. I have grown up in it; I have learned to love it; I believe in it, and I have the greatest faith in it. It is not the country which is at fault, and no one in my presence will say that the prairies are at fault. The prairies are all right. What I contend is this, that given those prairies as they are, with all their vast resources and potential wealth, the men living on the prairies and working them should be now in a better financial position than they are, and we should have been able to hold our population there.

I know criticism is easy. Nothing is easier than to criticise and to say that the policies of the past were wrong. It is far more difficult to offer any suggestion as to how things might be bettered. I am prepared to offer one or two suggestions; I am not prepared to say that they will absolutely hold water, because they have never been tried out, and until they have been tried out, they will be in the nature merely of a theory or experiment. But I believe three or four changes could be made in our economic system, in the laws which govern our country, which would tend to eliminate many of the disadvantages under which we live at the present time and to bring back at least a reasonable measure of prosperity. I have enough confidence in the country for that. I will state them very briefly, because the time is getting late, and I like to live up to my reputation of confining my remarks to a very short period. First—and this matter is being worked on now—we should have a better system of credit. I have touched on that before and I shall not go into it again. Second, we should have a tariff which would not bear so hardly upon the basic producers. It is acknowledged on every side that at the present time the tariff is an unmitigated evil to the men on the prairies. Since I have come here I have learned to sympathize more deeply than before with men who are not on the prairies, because I know more of the troubles with which they are faced. I have learned that no one section of the country can have all it desires; that the matter must be one of compromise. But so far the compromise has all been made by the men on the prairies, and the tariff policy could be adjusted so that it would not bear so hardly upon those men and would not raise the cost of their means of production so far beyond the proper proportion of the value of the stuff they raise.

Again, and this is perhaps one of the most important questions—and that is not just a statement, it is a fact—in the matter of transportation for years the western railways

[Mr. Speakman.]

have been bled for the benefit of the eastern end of the system. There is absolutely no question about that. All we have to do is take the statements made before the Transportation Committee last year, and every hon. member must acknowledge that through these past years, whether under the Crowsnest pass agreement or not the prairie section and the British Columbia section of the railway system of this country have paid a large part of the profits for the system as a whole. I believe that an equalization of rates in that respect all the way through from points to the east and from points to the west, would be of very material assistance.

Further, I believe that with the encouragement of a system of co-operative buying and selling by which the produce could be pooled and sold in large quantities at the lowest possible cost, eliminating the enormous cost of distribution which at present stands between producer and consumer, and which I believe can be done—I think that the cumulative effect of these four remedies, which are worth trying, would go far towards making it possible for the dwellers on the plains to live and to prosper.

What is the remedy offered by some of our friends? Immigration. That means that when you have a leaky barrel, one with a hole knocked in the bottom, you are going to fill it by continually pouring in more water regardless of how fast it is running out. That seems to me to be somewhat of an absurdity. It has been pointed out by some hon. members that as long as there is this enormous demand in the States, our people will keep going to the States, and apparently their only remedy is that we shall pump immigrants into Canada who will pass on to the south until the United States is saturated, and then the residue may remain here. I contend that that is a most absurd policy. We cannot afford to assist in bringing in immigrants if they are simply to use Canada as a sort of calling place on their way to the States, and continue that process until the United States is saturated and has received all the population it requires. I say we cannot afford to do that. When I look upon this country and hear the glowing eulogies pronounced upon it by various members—and I endorse all those eulogies, I believe this is a great country—it makes me all the more deplore the paucity of policy on the part of the government, and I am not referring particularly to the policy of the minister but the policy of this government and of other governments preceding, in attempting to deal with this problem.

What have been the policies suggested? They are embodied in a few words spoken by one of the members to my right, who said that the remedy, forsooth, was more protection. Protection, forsooth, was to be the great panacea which would alleviate and remedy all our wrongs, which would set us all right and enable us to retain our population, enable us to succeed where now we are not succeeding, and to prosper. I have a great deal of respect for that hon. gentleman. I find him in private life to be a most kindly and sympathetic man, but I cannot believe that the simple continuance of a system which has been found to be absolutely useless in that respect for forty or fifty years is going to solve the problem. Something more than that is needed. As a young member in parliament I do not pretend to have the knowledge that is necessary to solve a problem of that kind. I have some suggestions, some ideas of what might be done, but I cannot pretend to bring forward any solution. The problem has baffled a great many of our wisest men. But in order to solve it, the first thing that must take place is the realization that these conditions exist and that the old methods have failed. If these methods have failed, it seems to me that the obligation is upon the shoulders of the men upon whom has been placed the responsibility for governing this country, and who I believe to be intelligent and sincere men, to find a remedy. We can make suggestions; it is for them to act upon them.

I would like to say a word as to the possibility of immigration itself. I am not one of those, nor do I think there are many in this House, who are among those who believe that we should not have any more people in this country, that this country cannot support any more people than it has at the present time. I believe that this country could support five and ten times the population it has at the present time. I believe it would be good for the country and good for the immigrants themselves, but until we have a policy of retention to go hand-in-hand with the policy of immigration, an immigration policy is suicidal. It in itself cannot solve the problem. Immigration to my mind is a result. It is not a means for gaining a result. It is the result of sound policies put in force, practised, and the two must go hand in hand. We know, even the farmers, and we are not credited with knowing much by some members of this House, that it is absolutely useless to sow a crop of wheat, buy your seed and put it in the ground, unless you get the ground right first. You have to plough it, and till it, and

put it in proper condition, or you will not have any crop, and I wish to reiterate and emphasize the fact that that applies absolutely in the same manner to the crop of people we wish to sow here. If they are to grow and prosper and succeed, they must be planted in the proper soil, and we must prepare the soil for them.

I was somewhat interested in a few remarks that were made by one or two hon. members who apparently feel that they have a personal grievance in our presence in this House. I was struck by a remark of the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) and I speak of him with a good deal of respect because I admire his ability, ability gained, no doubt through many years in this parliament, and no doubt also through his legal studies and in his practice. The ability with which he can present a case is only equalled, if possible, by the ability with which he evaded answering any question asked of him. I was interested in one thing he said in particular. He said that the United States, which is a very great country, was prospering far more than Canada was at the present time under the two-party system, and that they had not found it necessary to bring in a third party in order to save the country. That is a criticism that might cut both ways. If this country had prospered under the two-party system then this third party would not have entered the House in this country. The third party entered this House as a protest on the part of a great many people against the way in which the business of the country had been handled by the two old parties. That is the reason we are here.

It was also stated by the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Baldwin) I think, that we were here representing one particular class. Well, to some extent that is true.

Mr. BALDWIN: I think I did not say one particular class. I said that men were in the House representing certain classes.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: In that case I must apologize to the hon. gentleman, but at this distance I certainly understood him to say that there were men in this House who had come here to represent a class.

Mr. BALDWIN: I did not mean the farming class.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I am glad my hon. friend does not mean his observation in any derogatory sense. I will admit that some of the members here are largely representing one class. And why? Because any hon. member sent to this House represents the majority of the people in his constituency. They cannot help the fact that in certain constituencies the majority of the people happen to be of one class; there is no known means of preventing the majority in any constituency, or in any province, from sending representatives to parliament if the people come together and work together in co-operation. If any excuse were necessary for the farmers sending men to represent them in parliament that excuse is to be found in the statements of some hon. members in this House, and the fact that certain hon. members seemed to be unaware, until the last two sessions of parliament, of conditions as they existed amongst the farmers.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish to make one or two suggestions with respect to the subject of immigration itself. I am not sure whether they will be of a constructive character, but I hope they will be. The first suggestion would be as to the type of settlers we could do with here. They should be settlers who would come on a voluntary basis, selected simply according to their fitness for admission to this country, of a type that would be apt to succeed here under reasonable conditions, I would not draw a line at Anglo-Saxons particularly, I would not limit admission to people who come from the United States or from the Old Land. All through our western country we meet with a great many people, especially people from northern Europe, and I want to say this: Although I am of British birth myself, and am perhaps prejudiced in that direction sometimes, no better settlers are to be found anywhere than the Scandinavians, the Dutch, the Finlanders, let us say in many cases the Icelanders, the Esthonians, and a number of other such people. They make splendid neighbours, fine farmers, excellent citizens, and they are turning out to be good Canadians. I have met them by scores and by hundreds and in every case I have found that their standard of living is rapidly rising to the standard of living of the Anglo-Saxon. They are striving after high ideals of citizenship such as are held by the true Canadian, and they are endeavouring to make true Canadians of their children. I am not in favour, however of bringing people of these nationalities and establishing them in colonies consisting exclusively of people of their own race. That is no way to build up a country. You cannot build up Canada by establishing in it little Scandinavians and little Russians. These people must be treated as individuals, and established individually, if they are to be absorbed into the life of this country and become part of the real Canadian population.

There is one point in the minister's policy that I would like to comment on for a mo-

ment, and that is the possible use of the Soldier Settlement Board for the purpose of locating men on the land. Now, Mr. Chairman, I have become somewhat familiar with the working of that organization, and I believe that the staff are admirably qualified to carry on some aspects of this work. I would not believe in the staff of this organization acting as immigration agents—that is going out to solicit immigrants to enter this country. But I think there are no men better qualified to do that; to take care of and locate people after they come here; they have the knowledge, and they have the experience, in fact the store of data they have at their disposal is simply enormous and may be utilized to good advantage; I would agree to that only on one condition. I would not be in favour of—in fact I would strongly protest against—that organization being allied in any way with any corporation, or any company, in this country whose business was the establishment of persons on the land. Whatever success they have obtained in settling soldiers on the land—and I believe under the circumstances it has been considerable—has been due to the fact that they were able to control the character of land which the settlers would buy, and control the price to be paid for that land. That is the secret of the success they were able to achieve. But if someone else were allowed to sell at high prices to settlers land that was absolutely unsuitable for farming, and then the Soldier Settlement Board were to step in and take over the supervision of those men, and assume a part of the responsibility for their success, it would put them in an absolutely impossible position, and would make it absolutely impossible for them to succeed. If the responsibility is placed on governmental officials or a governmental organization, then the necessary authority and powers should go along with that responsibility; the two things cannot be divorced. I have seen farm after farm where the farmer was industrious, thrifty and honest, working all hours of the day and night, absolutely fail for the simple reason that the land upon which the farmer was located was totally unsuited for farming purposes. I am very much afraid that any colonization company might list properties of an unsuitable character and the Soldier Settlement Board officials would have no supervision over the choice of those lands or the price to be paid for them. Yet they might be asked to assist in supervising the work of the settlers afterwards. I think such a situation would be absolutely impossible. I believe in granting assistance to those who are going to be settled on farms. I do not believe in the system of assisted passages, but I do believe in giving intending settlers all the information possible as to the places where they should be located, and the style of farming which might be followed profitably in certain districts. I also believe in protecting them against the exorbitant exactions of men who, in some cases, have more land to sell than they have conscience. I believe in looking after the prospective settlers to that extent. We have no officials more competent to perform that work at the present time than those on the staff of the Soldier Settlement Board.

In conclusion let me say that the way to ensure the success in connection with immigration is to inaugurate a plan under which a governmental policy which will enable men to succeed shall go hand in hand with the policy of bringing in more immigrants. That course being followed I would let the people of those countries where there is a surplus population know of the opportunities to be found here. I would let them know of the opportunities that exist, what lands there were, inform them of the laws under which they must live—in fact give them a true picture of the conditions they must face and the possibilities of success. Having done that, if they were of a suitable type to be admitted into Canada and wished to come to this country I would do everything possible to welcome them here and to see that they got a fair chance to be favourably located, to make a living, and to prove that they were capable of becoming good citizens.

One hon. member spoke of the co-operation that was necessary. I also think that co-operation is necessary. I think that the co-operation of every man and woman who is already in this country is the main essential. I think the one thing that, more than anything else, discourages a settler is to come into a new country and find himself apparently unwelcome, to find himself excluded from the social circles, excluded from friendships and from neighbourly kindliness. I think one of the greatest ways in which we can co-operate, one of the greatest helps we can be to the new arrival is to see that he gets the help that honest, kind hearted neighbours can give. In my opinion that will prove a very great help indeed. I am in favour of having as many people coming to this country as desire to do so, if they are suitable for the country and can make a living here. I would go further; I am in favour of doing all we can so to change conditions and so to change some of the laws under which we work as to make it possible for those men to succeed.

Progress reported.

MESSAGE FROM THE GOVERNOR GENERAL

ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF ADDRESS

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Marcil, Bonaventure): I have the honour to inform the House that I have received a message from His Excellency the Governor General, signed by his own hand, reading as follows:

I have received with great pleasure the Address you have voted in reply to my speech at the opening of parliament and thank you for it sincerely.

BYNG OF VIMY.

Government House,
Ottawa, 16th March, 1923.

HALIBUT FISHERIES TREATY—CORRESPONDENCE TABLED

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I promised the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) that before the House rose I would lay on the Table, the correspondence passing between the government of Canada and the government of Great Britain respecting the Halibut Fisheries Treaty.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the House adjourned at 10.55 p.m.

Monday, March 19, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

MEMORIAL OF THE LATE LIEUT.-COL. BAKER, M.P.

Mr. W. F. KAY (Missisquoi) presented the first report of the special committee appointed to consider the form of the memorial to be erected in the parliament buildings to the memory of the late Lieut.-Col. Baker, M.P.

That the special committee on the Baker Memorial have leave to report from time to time.

On motion of Mr. Kay the report was adopted.

CIVIL SERVICE ACT

FIRST REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY

Mr. JAMES MALCOLM (North Bruce) moved:

That the first report of the special committee appointed to inquire into the operation of chapter 12, 8-9 George V, an act respecting the Civil Service of Canada, be concurred in.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I would ask the hon. member to explain the effect of the report.

[Mr. Speakman.]

Mr. MALCOLM: The committee recommends that the order in reference should be so broadened as to allow the committee to make recommendations looking towards the betterment of the act; and that the committee be empowered to sit while the House is in session.

Mr. MEIGHEN: On the understanding that that is the effect of the report I have no objection to it.

Motion agreed to.

FOREST RESERVES AND PARKS

Hon. CHARLES STEWART (Argenteuil, Minister of the Interior) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 82 to amend the Dominion Forest Reserves and Parks Act.

He said: The purpose of this bill is in some cases to reduce the forest areas and in the other cases to add to them. The proposal has been submitted to the provincial governments interested, and they have all acquiesced, with the single exception of the government of Alberta. Therefore, in relation to that province we are not removing from the park areas any of the lands included in the bill, rather we are making additions. That, briefly, is all the bill purports to do—simply to change the boundaries of the forest areas in the several provinces.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have seen in the press a report of the intention of the government in regard to these forest and park areas, namely, to introduce some legislation affecting water-powers therein. That is not included in this legislation?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is there such a bill?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The matter has been discussed, but I am not sure at the moment whether we shall ask for legislation this session or not.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

DECEASED HUSBAND'S BROTHER

Mr. ANDREW McMASTER (Brome) moved the first reading of Bill No. 75 (from the Senate), to make lawful the marriage of a woman to her deceased husband's brother or such brother's son.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST READINGS

Bill No. 76 (from the Senate), for the relief of Ernest Warren Porter.—Mr. Ross (Kingston).

Bill No. 77 (from the Senate), for the relief of May Elizabeth Meng.—Mr. Hunt.

Bill No. 78 (from the Senate), for the relief of Maud Vera Butler.—Mr. Ladner.

Bill No. 79 (from the Senate), for the relief of Lillian Black.—Mr. Hocken.

Bill No. 80 (from the Senate), for the relief of Florence Elizabeth McDonald.—Mr. Church.

Bill No. 81 (from the Senate), for the relief of Gretta Melville.—Mr. Ryckman.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

CIVIL SERVICE BONUS

Mr. WOODSWORTH:

1. Is it the intention of the government, in extending the civil service bonus for another year, to grant the maximum amount to employees unmarried with or without dependents?
2. If not, why not?

Right Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE KING:

1. The arrangements of last year will be followed.
2. Answered by the answer of No. 1.

INTERNATIONAL BRIDGE

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

By return tabled February 28, 1923, it appears that by order in council dated July 27, 1922, remission was made of sales tax on importations and sales or deliveries of material entering into the construction of the new international bridge for the Michigan Central railway, to be constructed at Niagara Falls.

1. What was the character and nature of the material covered by the above order?
2. What was the value of the said material imported from the United States?
3. What was the amount of sales tax remitted in respect of said importations from the United States?
4. What was the value of the said material purchased in Canada?
5. What was the amount of sales tax remitted in respect of said purchases in Canada?
6. What were the names of the firms supplying the said material imported from the United States?
7. What were the names of the firms supplying the said material purchased in Canada?
8. In whose name was the application for refund made?
9. Why was refund granted?

Hon. Mr. BUREAU:

1. All materials used in the construction of a bridge.
2. No importations of material have as yet been reported to the department.
3. Answered by No. 2.
4. No sales of material have as yet been reported to the department.
5. Answered by No. 4.
6. Answered by No. 2.
7. Answered by No. 4.
8. The Canadian Bridge Company, Walkerville, Ont.
9. To remove disadvantages of Canadian contractors.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—HOTELS

Mr. SPENCE:

1. Who is the present manager or superintendent of hotels of the Canadian National Railways, and when was he appointed?
2. What salary does he receive?
3. What experience has he had in such or similar work, and in charge of what hotels?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. D. B. Mulligan, appointment dated February 28, effective March 1, 1923.
2. Rate for new position not yet established.
3. Since 1893: Palmer House, Chicago; Holland House, Waldorf Astoria, New York; Russell House, Ottawa; Breslin, New York; Fort Garry, and other Grand Trunk hotels.

PUBLIC WORKS PAYMASTER

Mr. GENDRON:

1. Has the vacancy for the position of paymaster in the department of Public Works, created by the death of Mr. McKay, been filled?
2. If not, is it the intention of the minister to see that the person appointed to this position is familiar with both English and French languages, in view of the fact that a considerable portion of the work is performed in the province of Quebec, where ninety per cent of the population is French-Canadian?

Hon. Mr. KING (Kootenay):

1. No, but application to have the position filled has been made to the Civil Service Commission.
2. The ability to speak both languages will receive due consideration in making an appointment.

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY

Mr. BENOIT:

1. What was the purchase price paid by the government of Canada for the Grand Trunk Railway?
2. What are the names of the arbitrators who were employed by the government in connection with the Grand Trunk arbitration?
3. What fees were paid to each such arbitrator?
4. Since becoming part of the Canadian National Railways, has the Grand Trunk section of said railways, in the last annual financial statement shown a profit or loss?
5. What is the amount of such profit or loss?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. The government acquired control of the Grand Trunk under the terms of the agreement embodied in Chap. 17, of 1919, and Chap. 13, of 1920, by which the government guaranteed the interest upon the debentures and guaranteed stocks and undertook to

acquire, at a valuation to be established by arbitration, the preference and common stocks. The annual interest charges upon the debentures and guaranteed stocks amount to $8,984,634.58. The board of arbitration held that, at the time of taking over, the preference and common stock were valueless in view of the unsound financial condition of the company. Under the agreement the government became responsible for Grand Trunk financing as of May 21, 1920, and has, through the receiver, been responsible for Grand Trunk Pacific financing since the default of that subsidiary of the Grand Trunk on March 9th, 1919. What these responsibilities have cost the government to December 31, 1922, will be disclosed by the Acting Minister of Railways in his forthcoming annual statement to parliament.

2 & 3. The late Sir Walter Cassels, Chairman, $50,000; by the government, $25,000; by Grand Trunk Shareholders, $25,000; Sir Thomas White, $29,000.

4 & 5. The results for 1921, including the Central Vermont, were a net deficit, after fixed charges, of $15,672,299.34. The 1922 results will be disclosed by the Acting Minister of Railways in his forthcoming annual statement to parliament.

SECOND NARROWS BRIDGE

Mr. BLACK (Yukon):

1. Has the Burrard Tunnel and Bridge Company made application for approval of plans for a bridge spanning Second Narrows in Vancouver harbour?
2. If so, has approval been given to said plans?
3. Have representations been made to the government to reject approval of these plans?
4. If so, by whom?
5. Is it the intention of the Dominion government to grant subsidy to assist in the construction of said bridge?
6. Have any steps been taken to change the plans submitted by said company?

Hon. Mr. KING (Kootenay):

1. Yes.
2. Matter still under consideration.
3 & 4. Not to the Department of Public Works.
5. Matter under consideration.
6. Plans originally submitted are still under consideration.

CARAQUET RAILWAY

Mr. GARLAND (Carleton):

1. What price was paid for the Caraquet Railway?
2. Who were the shareholders of the company at the time of the purchase and what were their respective interests?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. $200,000 and the cancellation of indebtedness of the Caraquet & Gulf Shore Railway to the Canadian Government Railways, amounting to $96,399.60.

2. The government bought the physical property, not the stock, though 24,444 shares of the par value of $50 each, in the names of Messrs. E. B. Stockdale and C. S. Hamilton, in trust, and by them endorsed in blank, were, together with certain debentures, turned over to the government, January 13, 1921, by the Trusts and Guarantee Company, Limited, Toronto, trustees for the bondholders, as security for an advance of $175,000 on purchase price, pending settlement of differences regarding title.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—DIRECTORS

Mr. GRIMMER:

1. Is it the view of the government that the position of director of the Canadian National Railways is of so little importance as to be properly filled by a civil servant whose business ability is represented by a yearly salary of $2,500 since November, 1911, with no increases?
2. In view of the fact that Mr. Talbot is continuing his services with the government of the province of Quebec, is the government nevertheless of the opinion that should occasion arise the said Talbot would not follow the instructions or representations of his provincial employers?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. The remuneration of a Canadian National director, $2,000 a year, is not necessarily indicative of the business ability of the directors, nor is the fact that the directors have had no increase since the board was appointed a reflection on the manner in which the directors have discharged their duties.

2. In the view of the government, Mr. Talbot's experience and acquaintance with conditions pertaining to the district of Quebec will be of distinct advantage in the consideration, by the Canadian National Board, of railway questions affecting that province, in the welfare of which the Dominion government, the Canadian National Board and the provincial government are, in their respective spheres, equally concerned.

TOBACCO IMPORTS

Mr. WHITE:

1. In the years 1920, 1921 and 1922 (any twelve months period given separately) what quantity and what value of tobacco and manufacturers thereof, items 143, 143-A, 144 and 145 of the customs tariff, was imported into Canada?
2. What amount of duty was collected in each year on each particular item?
3. What amount of excise was collected in each year on each particular item?

Hon. Mr. BUREAU:

1 and 2. Imports of tobacco as specified entered for consumption in Canada during the

fiscal years ended March 31, 1920, 1921 and 1922, with customs duties collected thereon.

Item and Period	Lbs.	Value	Customs Duty
Cigars—			
(Tariff item 143.)—			
Fiscal Year 1920.. ..	26,698	$175,130	$153,244 30
" " 1921.. ..	28,666	205,322	168,861 10
" " 1922.. ..	15,081	125,266	93,148 60
Cigarettes—			
(Tariff item 143a)—			
Fiscal year 1920.. ..	19,933	84,364	102,816 30
" " 1921.. ..	25,611	105,309	131,332 35
" " 1922.. ..	27,136	110,261	138,822 85
Tobacco: cut—			
(Tariff item 144)—			
Fiscal Year 1920.. ..	504,720	674,893	479,484 00
" " 1921.. ..	474,000	852,746	450,300 00
" " 1922.. ..	359,721	699,262	341,734 95
Snuff—			
(Tariff item 145)—			
Fiscal Year 1920.. ..	6,435	6,423	5,791 50
" " 1921.. ..	5,426	8,257	4,883 40
" " 1922.. ..	4,026	6,655	3,623 40
All other Mfrs. of Tobacco—			
(Tariff item 145)—			
Fiscal Year 1920.. ..	79,062	127,983	71,155 80
" " 1921.. ..	63,049	101,367	56,744 10
" " 1922.. ..	84,196	138,990	75,776 40

3. Excise duty collected on domestic cigars, cigarettes and manufactured tobacco during the fiscal years ending March 31, 1920, 1921 and 1922.

	Cigars	Cigarettes	Manufactured Tobacco
Fiscal Year 1920	$1,629,254 35	$14,657,162 63	$4,609,788 73
" " 1921	1,293,654 76	14,650,577 55	3,877,853 55
" " 1922	1,095,169 52	14,710,869 68	4,105,645 65

REBATES AND DRAWBACKS

Mr. FANSHER:

1. What was the value of the raw materials imported into Canada during the past fiscal year for the manufacture of goods for export?
2. What was the amount of duty paid on these raw materials?
3. What was the amount of money returned to the importers in the way of rebates or drawbacks?
4. What was the value of the raw materials imported into Canada during the past fiscal year for the manufacture of goods for home consumption?
5. What was the amount of duty paid on these raw materials?
6. What was the amount of money returned to the importers in the way of rebates or drawbacks?

Hon. Mr. BUREAU: It is impossible to answer the question as put. When goods go through customs there is no indication of the purposes for which they are imported. The only check we have in that respect is in connection with the drawback paid when the raw material imported enters into the manufacture of goods that are then exported. If my hon. friend will change his question I can bring down a statement showing the amount of duty paid upon materials imported which entered into the manufacture of goods finally exported from Canada.

Question stands.

INCOME TAX

Mr. WALLACE:

1. How much revenue was derived from federal income tax for the years 1920 and 1921?
2. How much was contributed by farmers from strictly farm operations?
3. How many farmers in Ontario paid income tax for the years 1920 and 1921?
4. What is the cost in salaries and other expenses of administering said act?
5. How many civil servants are employed to handle this work?
6. How do the inspectors of taxation discriminate in asking farmers for their returns?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING:

1. 1920-21, $46,381,806.64; 1921-22, $78,684,-354.80.

2. No statistics available covering strictly farm operations, but the following were the collections from farmers during fiscal years 1921 and 1922: 1920-21, $611,736.64; 1921-22, $1,324,693.68.

3. 1920-21, $1,870; 1921-22, $6,138.

4. (Including bonus) 1920-21, $1,953,988.54; 1921-22, $2,214,638.28.

5. 1920-21, $1,330; 1921-22, $1,453.

The answers to (4) and (5) also include the administration of The Business Profits War Tax Act under which the following collections were made: 1920-21, $40,841,401.25; 1921-22, $22,815,666.58. Total collections under both acts, 1920-21, $87,223,207.89; 1921-22, $101,-500,021.38.

6. Returns are required from all persons who are deemed to be liable to taxation under The Income War Tax Act.

ONTARIO RURAL MAIL CARRIERS

Mr. ELLIOTT (Waterloo):

1. What is the average remuneration per annum to rural mail carriers in Ontario?
2. How many carriers are thus employed?
3. What is the average remuneration per annum to city mail carriers in Ontario?
4. How many carriers are thus employed?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM (for the Postmaster General):

1. $814.49 for service which varies as to time occupied daily, semi-weekly, etc., and according to length of route served, etc.

2. 1958.

3. $1,335 (including bonus) for full-time service.

4. 1174.

RAILWAY COMMISSIONERS

Mr. PREVOST:

1. What are the names of the present members of the Railway Commission?

2. What was the date of their respective appointments?

3. For how long are they appointed and what are their respective salaries?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

Name	Date of appointment	Length of appointment	Salary
			$
Chief Commissioner, Hon. F. B. Carvell, K.C.	Aug. 3, 1919	10 years	12,500
Asst. Chief Commissioner, S. J. McLean, M.A., LL.D., Ph.D.	Aug. 6, 1919	10 "	9,000
Deputy Chief Commissioner, Hon. W. B. Nantel, K.C., LL.D.	Oct. 20, 1914	10 "	8,000
Commissioner, A. C. Boyce, K.C.	Oct. 4, 1917	10 "	8,000
Commissioner, J. G. Rutherford, C.M.G.	Sept. 17, 1918	10 "	8,000
Commissioner, C. Lawrence	Nov. 9, 1921	10 "	8,000

B. C. BONDED WAREHOUSES

Mr. CLARK:

1. How many licenses authorizing the licensees to carry on in the province of British Columbia, the business of exporting intoxicating liquor from that province, or the keeping of such liquor in a licensed warehouse, have been issued since the commencement of the year 1920?

2. Who are the licensees and what are the dates of issue of such licenses?

3. In what cities or towns, respectively, were the warehouses situated in respect of which such licenses were issued?

4. Is it the policy of the government in dealing with applications for such licenses to require the approval of the Attorney General of the province, or the provincial government, or a member thereof, before issuing such licenses?

5. Was such approval given in the case of the licenses so issued? If so, by whom?

Hon. Mr. BUREAU:

1. Licenses are not granted to carry on the business of exporting intoxicating liquors. Bonded warehouses have been authorized in British Columbia since commencement of the year 1920, with the consent of the provincial authorities, for storage of intoxicating liquors in bond, subject to provisions of Customs Act government warehousing and ex-warehousing of imported goods, as follows:—

Location	Proprietor	Date of authorization	Name of Provincial authority giving consent	Remarks
Fernie	Consolidated Exporters Corporation, Limited.	Jan. 22, 1923	Attorney General.	Formerly Fernie Liquor Exporters, Ltd., authorized 11th July, 1921, on consent of Attorney General, and now transferred.
Fernie	B.C. Export Co. of Fernie.	June 26, 1922	Attorney General.	
Cranbrook	Strathcona Export Co., Ltd.	May 11, 1922	Attorney General.	Only granted to take care of one car of liquor. This has since been ex-warehoused and bond closed.
Grand Forks	Consolidated Exporters Corporation, Limited.	Feb. 7, 1923	Attorney General.	Formerly Globe Liquor Export Co., Ltd., authorized 6th May, 1922, on consent of Attorney General, and now transferred.
Prince Rupert	Consolidated Exporters Corporation, Limited.	Feb. 21, 1923	Attorney General.	Formerly Northern Liquor Co., Ltd., authorized 6th February, 1922, on consent of Attorney General, and now transferred.
"	Pacific Cartage Co.	Sept. 17, 1921	Attorney General.	This bond though granted has never been used.
"	Prince Rupert Warehousing Co.	June 22, 1921	Attorney General.	This bond has never been used for storage of liquors.
Vancouver	Provincial Govt. Liquor Control Board.	Aug. 17, 1921	Attorney General.	
"	Consolidated Exporters Corporation, Limited.	Oct. 20, 1922	Attorney General.	Formerly Davis Liquor Co., authorized 6th Aug., 1921, on consent of Attorney General and now transferred.
"	Canadian Pacific S.S., Ltd.	Aug. 10, 1922	Prohibition Commissioner.	Limited to goods for ex-warehouse as ship's stores for this Company's vessels clearing trans-Pacific. Formerly in name of Canadian Pacific Ocean Services, Ltd. Applicant produced permission of Prohibition Commissioner.

Location	Proprietor	Date of authorization	Name of Provincial authority giving consent	Remarks
Vancouver.....	Pacific Coast Storage Co.	Mar. 22, 1921	Attorney General.	
"	Great West Wine Co.	July 15, 1921	Attorney General.	
"	Consolidated Exporters Corporation, Limited.	Jan. 10, 1923	Attorney General.	Formerly Nat. Bell Wine Co., authorized 25th August, 1921, on consent of Attorney General, and now transferred.
"	A. L. McLennan....	April 9, 1921	Attorney General.	
"	Glasgow Liquor Exporters, Ltd.	Jan. 25, 1922	Attorney General.	
"	Calgary Export Co.	June 22, 1921	Attorney General.	Premises vacated and bond closed.
"	J. G. Brooks, Ltd...	Feb. 23, 1921	Attorney General.	Not active—bond empty.
"	Dominion Trading Co.	Mar. 8, 1921	Attorney General.	Not active—bond empty.
"	Lloyd & Sons, Ltd..	Mar. 17, 1921	Attorney General.	Not active—no liquors in bond.
"	National Exporters, Ltd.	May 19, 1921	Attorney General.	Not active—bond empty.
"	Anderson & Morgan.	June 14, 1921	Attorney General.	Not active—bond empty.
"	Metropole Exp. Liquor Co.	Dec. 27, 1921	Attorney General.	Not active—bond empty.
"	California Wine Co..	May 6, 1922	Attorney General.	Not active—bond empty.
"	Western Can. Liquor Co.	June 13, 1921	Attorney General.	Premises vacated and bond closed.
Victoria.....	Consolidated Exporters Corporation, Limited (Dallas Road).	Jan. 22, 1923	Attorney General.	Formerly Rithet Consolidated Ltd., authorized 22nd February, 1921, on consent of Attorney General and now transferred.
"	Consolidated Exporters Corporation, Limited (Wharf Street).	Jan. 22, 1923	Attorney General.	Formerly Messrs. Pither & Leiser, authorized 22nd June, 1921, on consent of Attorney General, and now transferred.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. Answered by No. 1. ,

4. Unqualified consent of proper provincial authority is required before privilege is granted of storing intoxicating liquors in bond, in all provinces and districts where the sale of intoxicating liquor is prohibited under provincial law.

5. Answered by No. 1.

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

DRY DOCK AT LEVIS

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. Does the government own a dry dock at Levis?
2. If so, when was it purchased?
3. From whom was the said dry dock purchased?
4. What price did the government pay for same?
5. On what date was the purchase made?
6. How many boats were repaired, each year, in said dry dock?
7. What was the tonnage of each boat repaired?
8. Of what extent were the repairs?
9. Where is said dry dock located?
10. To whom do the adjoining properties belong?

ORIENTAL IMMIGRATION

Mr. W. G. McQUARRIE (New Westminister) moved for a return showing:

1. All statutes, orders in council, regulations and other enactments and provisions of the province of British Columbia since the entry of that province into confederation, dealing with or affecting oriental immigration, or the rights or privileges of orientals, which have been disallowed; giving dates of disallowance and the reasons therefor in every case respectively.

2. A copy of all papers, correspondence, letters, documents, telegrams and other writings which have passed between the present government or any minister or official thereof, and the government of the province of British Columbia, or any minister or official thereof, relative to the disallowance of any provincial enactment affecting orientals.

3. A copy of all papers, correspondence, letters, telegrams or other writings which have passed between the Secretary of State, or any of his officials and any of the county court judges in Vancouver on the subject of naturalization of oriental aliens.

4. A copy of all orders in council or other regulations passed during, or since, the last session of parliament, affecting oriental immigration.

5. Details as to oriental immigration since the present government assumed office, classified as to age, sex, nationality and occupation.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): My hon. friend is asking for a good deal of information in this motion. Perhaps he would enlarge it to include a little more. Subsection 4 asks for "A copy of all orders in council or other regulations passed during, or since, the last session of parliament, affecting oriental immigration." I would suggest that he change that to read "since January 1, 1917," and also that he change sub-

section 5 to read "since January 1, 1917." If he has no objection to enlarging the order to that extent, it might pass.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN: (Leader of the Opposition): The understanding would be that the information would come down by years.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes.

Motion as amended agreed to.

CANADA'S COAL SUPPLY

MOTION BY MR. CHURCH FOR A NATIONAL FUEL POLICY

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (North Toronto) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the time has arrived for Canada to have a National Policy in relation to its coal supply and that no part of Canada should be left dependent on a United States coal supply. That further in the opinion of this House, the government should immediately consider the initiation of an all-British and Canadian coal supply and that such a policy is both a social and economic necessity and in the best interests of the future of Canada.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the House for the opportunity of presenting this resolution. I am bringing it forward, not in criticism of the government or of anybody, for I believe that everybody has done what he could in the present fuel emergency in Canada. The object of bringing forward this resolution is rather to throw out some constructive suggestions so that another fuel famine such as we have had this year may be avoided.

Canada needs a coal supply from some other source than the United States. Canada's dependence on the coal supply of the United States is not only a national danger but a national humiliation also, and it is the duty of this parliament to try and work out some other arrangement. We have a national policy with respect to food, and a national policy with respect to clothing, and I can see no reason why we should not have a national policy with respect to our fuel supply. This is a question affecting the health, peace and comfort and prosperity of every man, woman and child in the community. Our very industrial life is at stake if conditions are to continue as they have been in the past. It is only of comparatively recent years—about forty years ago—that Canada abandoned her national fuel policy. In those days people used wood very largely for fuel, but the development of the Pennsylvania mines and the advertising which the Pennsylvania coal barons gave to that coal at the fall fairs in Canada brought about a new era. Anthracite coal was burned in stoves at these fairs and at exhibitions from coast to coast as a demonstration and finally the habit of using anthracite coal for fuel became fixed on the people of Canada. We have seen the results of such a policy. We do not want to have another winter like the last one in our large centres of population with plumbing frozen and sanitary conveniences destroyed, where we had many families suffering hardship, people taken sick with grippe and pneumonia and many dying from it, and with such a shortage of fuel that people were lined up for hours before the coal offices hoping to place an order, and when they did get an order placed they would come back the next day and find the office closed.

We do not want to face again such a condition as that if it can possibly be avoided. The shortage of American anthracite in this country was largely due to the two great coal strikes in the United States. The first occurred in 1902-3 when the price of coal in Canada went up to $30 and $35 a ton. The second strike took place about a year ago, in April, 1922, and it was the greatest coal strike in the history of the civilized world. That strike lasted for five months during which time not a ton of anthracite coal was mined as compared with a production of 40,000,000 tons for the corresponding five months of 1921. Of soft coal only 90,000,000 tons were mined during those five months of last year, as against 150,000,000 for the same period of 1921. The first to be affected by the coal shortage in the United States were the manufacturers, but when November arrived the demand for coal became pretty general, and a cry went up that the government should take over and operate the coal mines. Congress was called to consider the situation, but fortunately did not adopt the foolish policy growing out of the popular clamour, which was asked for. The people of this country must never be caught napping again as they were in 1902-3 and in 1922-3. I suppose it is fair to say that the average consumption of a family in Canada is about six tons of coal per annum. In addition to the visible supply of coal for heating purposes there is also an invisible supply that must be taken into consideration. It has been estimated by the Scientific American that a family which consumes 14 tons of coal per annum for heating purposes also consumes 14 tons of what you might call "invisible" coal. The latter represents the coal consumed by electric heating and power plants, gas plants and various industrial establishments in supplying one's household with these public utilities. There is scarcely an article of food appearing on the

table of the average family in the production of which there has not been a substantial consumption of this "invisible coal."

The question has an international as well as a national importance. It is well to bear this fact in mind. In that respect the coal question is like the financial question; it has its international as well as its national aspect. Owing to the shortage of coal in Europe the United States is becoming an exporter of coal. Just as Canada and the rest of the civilized world were affected by financial conditions growing out of the Great War, so this country and the other countries are affected and influenced by the shortage of coal. The production of a coal supply for the world and its distribution on an equitable basis is one of the pressing questions of to-day, and one which must be carefully considered and dealt with in an efficient manner. The importance of this problem has been increasing with the passage of the years; but undoubtedly the present situation has developed very rapidly on account of the conditions growing out of the war. Future industrial development, and the wellbeing of the peoples of the various countries of the world, are jeopardized by this fuel shortage. Although Canada has been, in the main, seriously affected by only the two coal strikes to which I have alluded, the conditions to-day are such that this country stands at the parting of the ways. Unless we take up this problem and deal with it in an adequate manner we shall soon be face to face with a national discomfort on a huge scale, and with industrial disaster. If we do not deal with this problem in a big, broad, statesmanlike manner it threatens the economic future and industrial development of the whole of this country. It is perhaps not too much to say that the future of the civilization of the world depends to as great, if not a greater, degree upon a sufficient production of coal as upon a production of food. Upon this point let me quote the opinion of Mr. Herbert Hoover:

> The fate of European civilization now rests in the hands of the coal and coal mine owners of Europe to an equal if not a greater degree than in the hands of the producers of foods and supplies during the next year.

Mr. Hoover contends that only an adequate production and efficient distribution of coal will save Europe from disaster. Outside of the strikes referred to we have not had in Canada the dire distress from which other countries have suffered in a fuel way. In Europe, for example, the conditions owing to the lack of sufficient coal have been and are to-day lamentable in the extreme. As I said, the United States is now exporting coal to Europe which is also deriving a large supply from Great Britain. The countries of western and southern Europe have been almost entirely supplied with fuel by Great Britain. These countries are France, Italy, Denmark, Germany, Holland, Portugal, Norway and Sweden; all of them are largely dependent on Great Britain for their fuel supply. In 1913, the fairest year of record and the last year before the war, Great Britain exported over 50,000,000 tons of coal to various countries in Europe. France took 20,000,000 tons; Italy, 9,650,000 tons; Sweden, 4,500,000 tons; Norway 2,300,000 tons; Spain, 3,650,000 tons; Denmark, 3,030,000 tons; Holland, 2,010,000 tons; Portugal, 1,360,000 tons; other Mediterranean countries 3,500,000 tons. In addition, Great Britain sent about 9,000,000 tons to South America, 5,000,000 tons to South Africa, 5,000,000 tons to other parts of the world; and to Canada little or none. Great Britain's export of coal, before the war, amounted in value to 8½ per cent of her export trade, and in point of weight to 75 per cent of that trade. A great deal of the coal which the Mother Country exports serves as ballast; the return cargoes consist of food stuffs and other commodities. But the conditions in Great Britain to-day are not reassuring. Owing to the conditions in Europe to-day there is not only a large demand for coal from Europe but requests for fuel are also coming from South America and other countries which in earlier years did not to so great a degree depend upon the British mines. The demands of France for coal from Great Britain, owing to the situation in which it finds itself at present are not confined to Great Britain; she is knocking at the doors of America and preparations are under way to meet that demand from this continent. During the war the mines in France were dismantled by the Germans, wantonly and for reasons of military necessity, and it will be years before they will be rehabilitated. That country produces 20,000,000 tons a year for domestic purposes, but French engineers state that it will take from two to five years to rebuild the operating equipment and ten years to completely restore the production rate of these mines. France, however, will be able to increase her fuel supplies owing to the occupation of the Sarre district. But she has to replace her former importation where deprived of the same. France still faces a serious coal shortage.

Italy's condition with respect to fuel throughout the war period has been desperate. In 1913 she was producing less than 750,000 tons of coal per annum, and was importing from Great Britain some 10,000,000 tons.

During the war, at great expense, she was able to increase her home production of an inferior grade of fuel by about 1,000,000 tons. I shall not dwell at length on the conditions in Germany, because everybody is familiar with them. Owing to the invasion of the Ruhr, Germany has had to import a great deal of coal from Great Britain. To-day she is in need of further importations and is trying to get them from America. During the war some countries were coerced into supplying coal. Referring to Sweden, Switzerland and similar countries, during the war, these neutral countries found themselves dependent upon the warring nations for their coal, but Great Britain and Germany released coal to these countries in exchange for food. The United States export coal is a phase in which Canada is vitally interested, because if the United States exports coal in large quantities to Europe, as she has been doing for the last twelve months, they will have to curtail the supply sent to Canada. The coal commissioner on the other side of the border has told our coal commissioner here that he must curtail his demand.

That is the problem as far as Canada is concerned, because Canada has received some 12,000,000 tons of anthracite coal per annum from the United States. All the countries in the world to-day are forced and urged by scientists and geologists to do something to place an embargo on wanton waste of this coal throughout the world. This matter is not confined solely to America, but it has been considered in other countries. We must take cognizance of the fact that the United States is being pressed by the demands of its own people for local exigencies last year, so that its own people should not suffer on account of what others are receiving. It is a fact that charity begins at home, and I think the people of the United States will adopt that rule, as far as the coal situation in Canada is concerned, because no country should be expected to send outside its borders the commodity upon which the existence and life of the people depends. I do not believe that the United States will place an embargo against coal being shipped to Canada, but economics may drive them to do so. The geologists and the Conservation Commission of the United States for six years have been urging the adoption of such a policy. I think that Canada will have to take some action during the next two years. I do not say we can establish a national policy in a few months, or in the twinkling of an eye, but the policy enunciated by this resolution is the open door policy and the logical one. The people of Canada should work for a national coal policy the same as they have done in the past in regard to a national policy for their food and clothing. I may say that this policy is the only correct one. It is evident to everybody that if the United States, either in the interests of her own people, or in the interests of people whom she may consider more needy than Canada, should decide that it is necessary to supply nations with coal, with the result that Canada's normal supply should be substantially reduced, who may reasonably find fault with such a course? It is evident to every intelligent gentleman that the outlook is far from reassuring, and it calls for drastic action, immediate or prospective.

This coal situation will be far reaching. Canada is richly endowed with water-powers, but she cannot depend upon them as a sole source of heat. Then the question arises what is to be done by Canada? Let us have a survey of our own conditions. Let us adopt a national policy. We must develop our own coal resources. Considering the coal situation, in respect to the quantity and quality of coal, Canada is the most fortunate country in the world. She has 1,000,000,000 tons of semi-anthracite, and 315,000,000,000 tons of bituminous coal and 10,000,000,000,000 tons of sub-bituminous coal and lignite. It seems out of place to emphasize how much we have latent when alongside of it we are not able to show how beneficially these assets are being used both for our own support and for the assistance of other needy nations.

This is not a new question, because I find many authorities in favour of it. Sir Henry Thornton, the head of the Canadian National Railway System, spoke the other day at Edmonton, and gave the people of Alberta—and the people of the West are vitally interested in this problem—his views on this question. Those views are covered in the following newspaper report:

> Referring to his recent trip to the West, Sir Henry said: "We often think of the prairie provinces in the West as agricultural, but believe me there exists in the west of Canada a mineral development which in importance will, in time, fully equal if not excel the possibilities of agricultural development. It is essential that the railway companies, by proper rates, by proper service and by such assistance as lies within their power, should do all that they can to assist in that mineral development and extend the selling radius of the coal and other minerals which lie in the West."
>
> Enlarging on the coal question Sir Henry said: "Certainly it is better and wiser for the people of Canada and the people of Ontario to buy their coal from their own people than to purchase that coal from their neighbour to the south. Because, apart from the sending out of the country each year a large amount of money, there are always embarrassing questions arising with reference to the export of coal from the United

States whenever there happens to be a coal shortage in this country. One of those embarrassing questions is being discussed at the present time. I hope the day will come and the Canadian National Railways will leave nothing undone to hasten that day when the people of Canada will not be dependent on the United States for their coal supply, except to a very limited extent."

Mr. J. B. Shaw, the president of the Manufacturers' Association, speaking at a dinner of the live-stock interest at the Canadian National Exhibition, said that he approves of a national policy, and that every day the policy is postponed the country will be placed in a worse position, and that Canada should face the situation, and do it now.

Sir Clifford Sifton said at a dinner in Ottawa of the Conservation Commission:

We will live to see every pound of American anthracite driven out of Canada. It will mean $100,000,000 a year to Canada.

Sir Clifford Sifton said that a contract of $2,500,000 had been let the other day in Hamilton for the construction of a by-product coke oven, and that so surely as the sun rises the same industry will be started in Toronto and Montreal, and would succeed. Another high authority is quoted in the following news report:

"Canada is at the mercy of the United States in regard to the coal situation," Dr. Frank D. Adams, Dean of the Faculty of Applied Science, McGill University, told the Young Men's Canadian Club in an after dinner address on "The Coal Situation" at the Windsor Hotel last evening.

"They have got us by the throat," he declared. "If they choose they could freeze us to death in one winter." All of Ontario and most of Quebec now depended for its supplies on the United States, because Canada's coal was located in the Maritime provinces and the Western provinces. In addition they had the assurance of American geologists that the coal supply of the United States would not last 100 years. . . . It was "definitely certain" that in 80 years there would be no more anthracite in the United States and that in 25 years Canada would not be able to get any more anthracite from over the border. Canada had therefore to prepare for the time when she would have to provide her own coal. Western coal must be brought as far East as possible and Eastern coal must be taken as far West as possible. The matter was one of transportation and cost since Ontario and Quebec had no coal mines and never would have any.

The coal situation now was grave and the future held no prospect of things getting any better. It was one of the very greatest problems which Canada had to face at the present time, Dr. Adams concluded.

The following shows how this matter is regarded by certain United States authorities:

George Otis Smith, director of the Geological department of the United States, saying that it is a menace to the country to export every year forty per cent of their coal, that this raw material should be preserved to the United States for the purpose of manufacturing and supplying all the nations of the world with the goods they are in need of, we may expect before a very long time—and there is a persistent rumour to this effect—that they will impose a partial if not a total restriction on the export of American coal.

Then the last authority in regard to a national policy is Dr. Charles Camsell, Deputy Minister of Mines, who was appointed to investigate the coal supply of this country and who is head of the Federal Coal Commission. He is quoted thus:

The most feasible scheme appeared to be reducing bituminous coal to coke. He believed that the agitation in the United States against exporting anthracite would ultimately result in an embargo, so that Canada would be forced to burn something else.

Dr. Camsell said a coking plant, to be operated economically must be in conjunction with a gas company. The by-products could not be disposed of profitably by a plant whose sole object was reducing bituminous coal to coke.

Further, Dr. Camsell says:

The transportation problem is the principal one respecting the supply of fuel to the two coal-less provinces, Ontario and Quebec. Peat and wood were the only fuels native to these two provinces. He thought the peat industry could be developed to a point where it would replace to a considerable extent the use of anthracite in the homes. About 7,000,000 tons of peat a year were used in Ireland.

The people of Manitoba have, of necessity, had to adopt a national policy in regard to coal failing to get Pennsylvania anthracite this winter, and they have to thank the people of Alberta for the coal they gave them this winter. It is very fortunate that a large number of people in Manitoba to-day are buying Alberta coal, as this has done a great deal towards helping out Manitoba during the coal scarcity. The national policy adopted by Manitoba of using Alberta coal was a success, and to-morrow, Alberta coal should supply Ontario as well. I cited the quantity of coal which the great province of Alberta possesses. The question is purely one of transportation and, indeed, the coal situation on the North American continent is ninety-five per cent a transportation problem. We have a national railway and a government merchant marine, and the people of Canada have spent some $900,000,000 in direct and indirect aid to the railways of this country. During several months in the year, our national railway is sending to the West empty cars waiting for the grain trade. If a business man has a bargain day, —and the American people and departmental stores have shown the success of bargain days—why should our national railways not have a bargain day? Why should these empty cars be sent out West and left on sidings there for days and weeks when they could be utilized during the slack time to bring coal east to Ontario at a bargain-day or cut rate? I purpose showing in detail how this national policy can be carried out, and this is a constructive policy which I would urge on the government of Canada.

The war has not changed Canada's national status. Canada still remains where she did in the days of Upper and Lower Canada. In time of emergency we can say: "We will go to war," or "we will not go to war," or "we will ask for further information," as we did recently in the case of the Dardanelles. I am not afraid of danger to Canadian autonomy from Downing street. But I am alarmed about the possibility of danger to Canadian autonomy from the hard and soft coal fields of the United States. The account between the people of Canada and the people of the United States is not one-sided by any means. The Americans are our own kith and kin; blood is thicker than water; and they stand for the same high principles of civilization just as much as we do. But in America, to-day, the coal supply is purely a business arrangement and the United States will soon adopt a national policy and place on us a coal embargo. The other day the Secretary of State (Mr. Copp) brought down an answer in the House which shows the situation very clearly. Canada's national autonomy is a myth as long as a great part of our country depends for its coal supply on the United States. This account which I have made up from the return shows that in 1921-22, the last year of which we have record, the imports of bituminous coal from the United States to Canada amounted to 9,734,041 tons, the cash value being $34,305,964. Imports of anthracite coal from the United States to Canada in the same year amounted to 12,515,014 tons, valued at $22,042,584. If you add together the values of the bituminous and anthracite imports into Canada for 1922, the total value of that tonnage of 12,249,055 tons is $56,348,548.

Every dollar of that amount of money which Canada sends to the United States should go for the payment of wages of Canadian or British workmen in the Maritime provinces, Alberta and Wales, and every pound of coal required in Canada should be mined and coked and under the British flag by British miners, not only in Wales, but in the Maritime provinces and Alberta. The people of Toronto have shown that they can bring coal from Wales at a cost of $15.50 per ton, even when freight rates were high; and the people of that city will not wait for any government to act, because they are to-day considering measures to get coal themselves from Wales, the Maritime provinces and Alberta. I should like to see the government carry out a similar national policy. I do not say that this can be accomplished in a day, but the government can work up to it in the years that are to come.

4 p.m.

[Mr. Church.]

In addition to this tremendous amount of money going to the United States in payment of coal imported from that country, the people of Canada have been charged on this coal by American railways the highest rates known in the history of railways in this country. We are told by some people that American coal is a necessity for the industrial life of this country. Industrially, American coal is not more necessary to the industrial life and domestic comfort of this country than the Canadian electricity from our water-powers is necessary to the industrial life and domestic comfort of the people of the United States. It is the duty of the government and of parliament to assist in removing our dependence upon United States coal by substituting for these 12,249,055 tons of anthracite and bituminous coal imported every year from the United States into Canada, coal coked or mined under the British flag; and the day when that is accomplished cannot come too soon.

There are in the United States great areas that are dependent for their electric power on the 158,000 h.p. of energy generated from Canadian water-powers and exported to the United States every year. Exports of Canadian electricity supply power equivalent to the power that could be generated by the consumption of 1,400,000 tons of American coal every year. The cash value of American coal that would be required to produce the energy from Canadian water-powers is not less than $8,000,000. Canada gets no credit for these imports of electricity from the United States, and they are not recognized as an offset to exports of United States coal to Canada. The mayor of Buffalo and the mayor of Boston, have their officers counting the cars of coal crossing to Canada. Why does the mayor of Buffalo not order his officers to count the units of Canadian electricity that go into Buffalo to keep the factories of that city from dependence on United States coal? Sitting near me is the hon member for Lincoln (Mr. Chaplin), one of the Niagara Falls Park Commissioners. What do you see on the Canadian side of the Niagara river to-day except around Niagara Falls, Welland, Thorold, and Inland? You see a boulevard and very few factories except those which are coming into being on account of the cheap power supplied by the Hydro-Electric Commission. But across the river from Lewiston as far as Buffalo, you see a regular chain of factories, every few hundred yards. Why are those factories there? They are there because of the magnanimous and generous policy of the people of this country in exporting electricial energy to the extent

they do, thus enabling these large American concerns to locate on the borders of the river. The mayor of Buffalo does not give us any credit for that, nor for the $56,000,000 in wages which the people of Canada are sending over annually to the United States for coal, wages which might go into the pockets of the miners of Nova Scotia, Alberta and Wales. As I said, in addition Canada has to pay the American railways the highest rates that can be charged for the transportation of American coal. But we get no credit for all this; the chorus of protest suggests that Canada is a Lazarus, prone in the dust, the coal dust, and prostrate beside the tracks of American coal roads, waiting to pick up lumps of anthracite or bituminous fuel from United States coal cars. The United States coal barons pick pretty easy money out of the pockets of the people of Canada—they pick it a good deal faster than Canada picks free coal off the United States freight cars.

Canada does not need to throw American coal overboard as the tea was thrown overboard in Boston harbour on a certain historic occasion. Canada does need a government that will work out a declaration of independence that would free the homes of four millions of this country's population from their present dependence on United States coal. It is true the United States has been worse in word than in action. It is true also that these repeated threats to cut off our coal supply are also humiliating. In a word, we should adopt a truly national policy in the matter of coal. It is true that the American people are friendly to us, but their papers are not at all sympathetic in dealing with the export of coal to this country. For instance, the New York Times says editorially:

> As Canada, though she won't admit it, is "Our Lady of the Snows," to deprive her of the American coal to which she has been accustomed would be cruel. But it is reasonable to ask the Canadians why they do not use their own coal, of which they have in Cape Breton as much as they choose to dig.
>
> It is soft coal, to be sure, and not the best of soft coal at that, but it is quite good enough to use at a pinch, even for the purposes called "domestic," and as most of us down here have been driven to the supplementing of our scanty anthracite by means of such sorry stuff, there is no reason why our neighbours should look across the border for help they can get at home.
>
> That they like hard coal better than soft is no reason for pretending that they will freeze if they do not share our inadequate supply. Besides, there still is wood in Canada, and good hardwood at that, and it is not so many years since no Canadian ever thought of warming himself and his family with anything else.

I submit that no part of this Dominion should be left dependent on the United States for its coal supply, and the only way in which we can become absolutely independent in this matter is to adopt the good old Conservative way, the national policy, the policy of protection put into force by Sir James Whitney and other leading Conservative statesmen in their hydro-electric development. It was this policy which gave us our hydro-electric system in Ontario, which to-day is supplying over 1,000,000 horse-power to the towns and cities and country districts of that province. The demand for power from the Chippewa development is growing at such a rapid rate that by next September the cities of Toronto, London and Hamilton will be able to get no more and will go begging for more power. Now, had it not been for the national policy we would have no hydro-electric power. I think we should extend the principle of that fine old national policy so as to encourage the coking of Nova Scotia coal and the importation of Welsh coal.

The question may be asked, where would we find the money for the adoption of such a policy, money to pay bounties on the production of coke from Nova Scotia coal and to adapt our systems of land and water transportation to the delivery of Welsh anthracite? I reply that we should extend the principles of protection, apply the good old national policy, and so secure a supply of fuel coked and mined under the British flag as a substitute for the 12,249,055 tons or $56,348,548 worth of anthracite and bituminous coal now purchased in the United States and burned in Canada every year. I would take the money not out of the pockets of Canadian coal consumers, but out of the pockets of the American consumers of newsprint. Canada's pulp resources are almost entirely in the hands of Americans. The last pulpwood lands of Canada have become the happy hunting-ground of United States operators. All Canada gets out of her enormous pulp resources is the price of the comparatively ill-paid labour employed in converting the pulpwood into paper. These wages are almost as low as the conditions of the labour market will permit.

I would supply the bounty for the production of coke and the importation of Welsh anthracite by putting an embargo of ten per cent on the newsprint exported to the United States. According to a return laid on the Table of the House the other day our newsprint exports in 1921 reached a total of $62,860,142. A duty of ten per cent ad valorem on this value would yield $6,286,014 per annum. Therefore the proceeds of that export duty would supply a yearly bounty fund of over $6,000,000, from which could be drawn bounties to encourage the production of coke from Nova Scotia coal, and to aid in the freighting

of Welsh coal, or of our eastern and western coal to Canadian markets.

Canadians would not consider that the state of Pennsylvania was guilty of an unfriendly act if it exercised the powers that state has, and confirmed by the Supreme Court of the United States, and placed an export duty on every ton of coal mined in Pennsylvania. Nor would we be guilty of an unfriendly act towards the United States if we imposed an export duty on our newsprint.

Canada must face this issue of an all-British coal supply. We cannot go on shirking the obligation to deal with the condition that confronts us—a condition that must become more and more a menace to our national life. The question of Canada's coal supply becomes simply a question of whether Canada shall live in the strength of an all-British coal supply or die in the weakness of dependence on an American coal supply. The miners of Nova Scotia are bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh, so are the miners of Wales. I am told that Nova Scotia coke makes an almost ideal fuel—better than American coal, anthracite or bituminous. Canada's coal supply must be put on a permanent and national basis. The government should encourage the production and organize for a supply of Nova Scotia and Welsh or western coal. Such a supply would displace our present annual importation of over 12,000,000 tons of anthracite or bituminous coal from the United States, and would divert the $56,000,000, now paid into wages or profits taken by men under the Stars and Stripes, into the pockets of workers under the British flag.

The Geological and Mines department of the government can tell you that there are millions of tons of good steam and coking and other kinds of coal east of the Rockies and in Alberta—enough to supply Canada for more than a century. The only reason why none of it comes to Ontario and the East is found in the high transportation charges, because the coal is immediately accessible to or within fifty miles of the railroads in the districts of Lethbridge, Jasper, Brazeau, Edson, Nordegg and Edmonton. Now that the National railways are owned by the government, for patriotic reasons a government commission or committee should investigate the tonnage of coal that exists, the cost of mining and transporting it, and report upon the Canadian fuel situation generally. It should be shown how much Canada spends annually outside of her own country for fuel, and ways and means should be devised of making us independent of the rest of the world for our fuel supplies.

[Mr. Church.]

It is only proper that the expenditure made by Canada on fuel should be distributed in our own land, and provision should be made to ensure an adequate supply of coal for Canadian manufacturers and Canadian citizens generally; the matter should not be left to the cupidity of foreign coal miners and railroad owners. The matter of the supply of coal is a national question, and the freight charges should be so adjusted as to ensure the movement of Canadian coal from one point to another in our own country so that all our communities can get it. If steps can be taken to loosen the shackles which at present encumber us in this connection; in other words, if the necessary arrangements can be made whereby we in this part of the country can secure an ample supply of Alberta coal, the benefit conferred on the people will be second to none. There are possibilities in the use of peat, oil, Welsh coal, Nova Scotia coal; there are many ways in which we should be able to make ourselves independent of the United States for our ordinary fuel supply. There is no doubt about the fact that the day of anthracite coal is practically gone; it will never be cheap again. The coal measures are running out; as time goes on the cost of operation will increase, strikes will be frequent, and transportation difficulties will make themselves more felt. Let us therefore bring this coal down from Alberta to the head of the lakes; let the shipping men tell us what it will cost to distribute this coal in car lots to the ports of the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence.

Now, I sympathize with the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart); he has this matter of the coal supply to deal with as well as his other extensive duties, and I think he is doing very well. But speaking on the subject the other day he quoted a freight rate of $16 a ton on Alberta coal. The figures I have show that it can be brought down here for $6 a ton if coal got the same rate per ton as grain. I have a letter here from a gentleman who is an officer of the Canadian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy at Edmonton. I will quote only a few words:

> I submitted a memorandum to Sir Henry Thornton with a view to the inauguration of a through fast coal freight train service from the coal fields of Alberta to Ontario.

With the letter he sent me copies of educational material being used in the Alberta fuel campaign at Winnipeg during the past winter. I may say that Alberta is entitled to a great deal of credit for the propaganda it has carried on in this respect in Manitoba, and we ask the people of Alberta to come down to Ontario and make a success of that same

policy here. Alberta is very anxious to make Canada entirely independent of any other country in the matter of fuel supply. This communication states, in support of that position:

One reason being that we are good citizens of Canada in the West, and the other that the elimination of $11,000,000 for United States coal would reflect itself enormously in all industries of Canada, as well as establish the coal of Alberta.

This gentleman goes on to point out that in connection with getting coal from Alberta, ninety per cent of the difficulty is in the transportation end of it. He says:

The Hon. Mr. Stewart stated in the House that "Canada must depend largely on the United States for its fuel supply," and suggested that plants for coking American bituminous coals be set up in various points in Ontario. The matter has been taken up here by many public bodies, and particularly the Alberta branch of the Canadian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy, which sent on Saturday a telegram to Hon. Mr. Stewart, copy of which is enclosed. This telegram was also sent to the Canadian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy which is now meeting in convention in Montreal. . . . .

It is felt here that a very determined effort on the part of the Dominion government should be made to make Canada independent in the matter of her fuel supply, and by so doing add materially to the prosperity of the country as a whole, assist in stabilizing the coal industry of Alberta and largely increase the earnings of the Canadian National Railway. It might be pointed out that there is at present in effect a freight rate from Coal Spur, a branch of the C.N.R. west of Edmonton, to Prince Rupert on the Pacific coast of $3.40 per ton. If this rate were put into effect from Edmonton to Toronto we would then enjoy a rate of $8.02 per ton instead of $12.50 as at present.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): May I be permitted to correct the hon. gentleman? I did not say that $16.40 would be the freight rate on coal from Alberta. I said that Alberta coal should be sold in Ontario at about $16.40. I may say that is a mistake the people made out West with respect to my statement.

Mr. CHURCH: I do not wish to misquote the minister, because I think he has been very fair. I realize he has done a great deal to assist this matter. However, this is the statement made in this letter; I shall be glad to give the minister a copy of it. The letter continues:

It might further be pointed out that this Prince Rupert rate is on a mountain haul and on car lots. The suggestion made to Sir Henry Thornton was that coal should be transported from the various fields of Alberta to Ontario in train lots and if this mountain rate is profitable, which it presumably is, it seems reasonable to suppose that it should be possible to transport on prairie haul in train lots on a fast schedule at considerably less.

The minister said the other day that it would cost $4,000,000 to build a connecting line from the existing right of way of the railway to the coal mines. But I would say that even that expenditure would be relatively small. The fixed charges would be $250,000 a year, and when you consider that Canada burns over 12,000,000 tons of United States hard coal annually, the fixed charges on this railway extension would be saved a thousand times over. I believe it would be good business for Canada generally if a low freight rate on this coal from Alberta to Ontario and the East generally could be obtained. A gentleman in Alberta, one of the largest rate-payers in Edmonton, writes me as follows:

It is certainly a move in the right direction for Ontario to secure a supply of coal independent of the United States. It struck me, however, that possibly you were not familiar with Alberta coal and that Alberta contains about 17 per cent of all the known coal of the world. We have the Canadian National railway tapping the greatest portion of the coal area and reaching a large part of Ontario. The C.N.R. has a number of idle cars from say March first to September first of each year. Hundreds of train men are laid off during this period owing to lack of freight to haul. The cost of upkeep of the 2,200 miles of road-bed will be about the same whether coal is hauled or not, as if idle the rails and ties will rust and rot out instead of wearing out. Would it not be good business for Canada generally to secure a low freight rate on this coal to Ontario on train loads if necessary, during the period mentioned, and give the residents of Ontario a chance to use the best coal in the world for domestic purposes.

I believe for the Ontario climate, the best grades of Alberta coal will prove superior to even anthracite, as it can be controlled more readily, will hold fire for a longer period without going out, and quickly respond when heat is required. A freight rate of not more than $6 to $7 per ton from the mines in Alberta to any point touched by the C.N.R. is feasible and should be secured. I do not claim to be a railway expert but am informed by experienced railway men that coal in train lots can be hauled profitably at $2.65 per train mile with half of this for the returned empty cars. On a 2,000-ton train of coal from an average point in Alberta to the average point in Ontario, mileage 2,200 would leave a profit of almost 25 per cent at $6 per ton. This matter is, I believe, being taken up by the various boards of trade, the Rotary Club, the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, and by many others.

I shall not go into the history of Nova Scotia coal, as that was referred to in the House the other day. I am glad to see the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. McKenzie) present. I appreciate what he is doing to educate the public as to the vast importance of Nova Scotia coal and coke. It is true that there is not a market at the present time for any more Nova Scotia coal than can be disposed of in Quebec and other places, but as an Ontario man I want to say that we can take millions of tons of Nova Scotia coal. I believe Nova Scotia coke is superior to any other coal in the world, and if the government would give part of the bounty of $6,000,000 or $7,000,000, such as I mentioned a few moments ago, and, coking furnaces were established, I believe that Nova Scotia coal would go a

long way towards solving our fuel problem, and Ontario would certainly welcome such a step and would take all the Nova Scotia coke it could get—it would keep our merchant marine busy.

I shall touch on just one other matter and then I am through, and that is the development of a national policy as to water-power. I have referred to the Hydro Electric System, and a return has been brought down to the House by the Minister of Interior which shows the development along that line. It is only within the last two hundred years that scientific discoveries have given to the world the power inherent in fuels, namely, coal, gas, oil and falling water, distributed in the various forms of heat, light and electricity. It has been estimated that the total water-powers of the world amount to about 100,000,000 horse-power, of which only about 17,000,000 have so far been developed. The Dominion of Canada possesses about 20 per cent of the world's total water-power, and also approximately the same percentage of the world's water-power already developed. The people of Ontario and Quebec are especially interested in this power situation. In Ontario we have no coal. We have to depend for our coal suppy on the Maritime provinces, and the far West and the United States. The United States will run out of coal in about forty years, as has been shown by the report of the Conservation Commission of that country. The first of these stores of energy to be utilized by man was coal, as we all know. This fuel is very widely distributed and exists in immense quantities in various parts of the world, but there is no denying the fact that the supply is limited and that the world is not any too economical in its expenditure of coal. The supplies of oil and gas are also limited, and prices very high. Our remaining source of energy, then, is water-power. Sir Adam Beck, speaking at Belleville the other day, said that eastern Ontario next year could have no power, and he is urging the immediate development of the Morrisburg dam—by the municipalities east of Belleville. It cannot be constructed any too soon. As was said the other day by the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Lapierre), and by the hon. member for St. Mary (Mr. Deslauriers), American capitalists to-day not satisfied with grabbing the timber wealth of this country, are now trying to get control of our water-powers not only in the St. Lawrence river but in other parts of Canada. They know that their own country will run out of coal in a few years, and that is why they wish to get control of the main water-powers in this country. I think it is the duty of the government to lay down a national policy with regard to the export of our power.

In conclusion, I believe that an educational campaign should be conducted to educate the people as to the necessity for a national fuel policy along the lines I have suggested. The people have accepted a national policy as to food and clothing, and I say that the time has come for us to lay down as a national policy the using of our own coal from coast to coast—close our ranks, declare a closed-door policy, develop the mines of Alberta and the mines of the Maritime provinces, and use our merchant marine to bring out coal from Wales and Nova Scotia. If the Mother Country can send about fifteen millions of coal to South America and South Africa and parts of the world not under the British flag, it can afford to give Canada five or six million tons of Welsh anthracite to help replace the 12,000,000 tons we get from the United States. We have a merchant marine in this country with deficits. What is it doing? It could not be put to any better service on behalf of the people than to bring out coal from Wales, and to transport Nova Scotia coal up the St. Lawrence through the Welland Canal to the head of the lakes. Alberta as well can do its part, as it is doing now, to supply Manitoba, and then they can come over and help us in Ontario. If Alberta will do that, she will find us good customers. I send to the Solicitor General also the Macedonian cry—to come over and help us in Ontario with Nova Scotia coal. Let us lay down here and now a national policy with regard to fuel, so that every ton of coal used in Canada shall be mined and coked under the British flag. Not because we do not want to trade with the Americans; they are good neighbours, and we want to keep on friendly terms with them; but we should not sponge on them any more for our coal. If we have a merchant marine, let us use it, and let us use the national system of railways and develop a national coal policy. The National Railways and merchant marine will prove a great asset to the people of the country if they will engage in this work, instead of being unsuccessful as at present and going behind millions of dollars. Let us not wait for commissions to report but let the government now give notice to the mine owners of Alberta and the mine owners of Nova Scotia to get ready now, to wait no longer, but put on extra men and get the coal out. The time to get ready for next winter is right here and now. Let us notify them to put on their extra men and work night shifts, if necessary, in order to get out

the coal required. Let us utilize the National Railways and the merchant marine. I hope the minister—and we have a good one—will lay down a policy in this House when his railway estimates are before us of utilizing these national transportation means along the lines I have suggested. The government should first ensure a supply of all-British coal, and then invite this parliament to enforce and extend the glories of the good old national policy and put on a duty that would keep every pound of American bituminous and anthracite coal from being sold in Canada.

I want to thank the House for the kindness and courtesy with which they have so patiently listened to me, and on my own behalf I want to thank them for their patience.

Mr. SPEAKER: I wish to remind the House that though the motion is quite in order and the principle involved in it quite an important one deserving to be debated, yet one phase of this same principle, namely the shortage of coal, has already been debated in this House the other day in Committee of Supply, under item 368 of the Main Estimates, and quite properly, I think, because the question then was a vote for the Honorary Advisory Council of Industrial and Scientific Research. What I wish to remind the House is that there is a rule in our parliamentary procedure that debates must not be anticipated, and there is another rule that debates must not be repeated. That is one of our unwritten rules. While I do not wish to prevent anybody from speaking on this question of the shortage of fuel, I would remind hon. gentlemen that their remarks should be limited to the essentials, as the question has already been largely debated by this House.

Mr. W. F. CARROLL (Cape Breton South and Richmond): I think the thanks of the House and the country are due to the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Church) for his very interesting and instructive speech. I did not intend to make any remarks upon this question. When the debate on the Address was before the House, I made a few remarks with reference to our coal supply and pointed out at that time that although we had in this House a standing committee on Mines and Minerals it had never functioned in the last twelve years, and I suggested that perhaps it would be the proper thing for this whole question of our fuel supply to be referred to that committee during this session of parliament. Had I known, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Church) would reach his resolution so early in the day I would have consulted him regarding a possible amendment, or an addition, which I would like to make to his resolution. There is no doubt in the world that the question of a fuel supply for Canada is, perhaps, the most important domestic and national proposition that this country will have to deal with from now on. I am sorry to say that the people of the large cities of central Canada—Montreal, Toronto, Ottawa, Hamilton and other great centres—are, for some reason or other, prejudiced against the use of soft coal as a domestic fuel. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the minister entrusted with the administration of the Mines branch would be doing a thing of national importance if, next summer or during the course of next year, he would get his coal experts at work in the large centres referred to and have the public instructed in the use of bituminous coal as a domestic fuel.

Now, the resolution in its present form may not get us anywhere, and I would like to suggest that the following words be added to it:

> And that the whole question of fuel supply for Canada, together with the question of costs, transportation, desirable interprovincial action, and other means whereby Canada may be made self-sustaining and self-supplying as regards fuel, and to inquire into the necessity and possibility of supplying substitutes for coal, be referred to the standing committee on Mines and Minerals, and that said committee report to the House.

Mr. R. B. HANSON (York-Sunbury): It had not been my intention to speak on this resolution, but I cannot allow the offering of the amendment to pass without making some reference to it. I am very strongly of the opinion that this whole question should be referred to the standing committee on Mines and Minerals, and that they be empowered to investigate the matter and make a report to the House during the present session. We have in Canada supplies of coal that are very valuable in my judgment and I have given some study to the question. Making these supplies available to our people is, however, very largely a question of transportation, coupled with the ability of our mining and fuel experts in this country to disabuse the public mind in Canada of the prejudice which it entertains against the use of bituminous coal. I think that the question is of sufficient importance to warrant a considerable amount of time being given to it by this committee.

We are facing in Canada a condition which will become more and more acute from year to year, inasmuch as the supply of anthracite coal from the neighbouring states in the country to the south is becoming scarcer each

year. Therefore it behooves this House to take some steps that will ensure a supply of fuel to our people, especially to those of the central provinces of the Dominion. One of the members of the government speaking on this question the other day stated that the matter was one for commercial houses to handle. I think the situation has now gone beyond that stage and, in view of the fact that it has become of national importance, requires different treatment. In my own community, in New Brunswick even within a few miles of bituminous coal mines there has been, at times, a great scarcity of coal, especially of anthracite coal, and the people, of necessity, have had to turn their attention to the use of bituminous coal for domestic purposes. The possibility of using this coal resolves itself into a question of transportation. But even with the present rates in force on the railways and although coal be made a low grade commodity in the rate classification of railways, it is not feasible commercially to ship Maritime province coal by rail beyond Montreal. Unless that condition is remedied, and the railways are willing to accept a smaller return than they do at present, I do not see much prospect of coal from either the Maritime provinces or Alberta ever reaching central Canada. It is true that shipments of coal are made by water from Cape Breton collieries. That, of course, is a benefit, and reduces the price but not very materially, especially in view of the fact that there is no control over the rates of the shipping companies. Aside from any small benefit derived in that way the people of the central provinces of Canada have not reaped the benefit they should have reaped from the presence of large deposits of fine grade bituminous coal in the Maritime provinces. For this reason, and for others with which I will not weary the House by reciting, I very cordially support the principle of the motion, and the concrete principle contained in the amendment moved by the hon. member for Cape Breton South and Richmond (Mr. Carroll).

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York): I want to say a few words on this subject which is very important to the people of Ontario, and to the people of other provinces as well. One suggestion of a practical character I would make is, that there should be created in Canada, in connection with the government, a department of fuel and power which would give its main attention to the study of the production of power from our waterways and the procurement of fuel for our domestic and industrial needs. No outsider can imagine the hardship which the people of Toronto suffered owing to the lack of fuel last winter. I know something about it. I have seen the lines of people in front of the coal offices endeavouring to get coal, when many individuals offered as high as $20 a ton for coal but in vain. And yet we have immense beds of coal in our own country to supply all our needs, and there are new fields to be opened up. I hope that in the province of Ontario, northward in the direction of Hudson bay, some new fields will be opened up in the coming year; and there are other fields in the different parts of Canada where coal can be got. As a matter of fact, however, we have great fields of coal in Nova Scotia and Alberta where supplies can be obtained. The hon. member who preceded me went to the very heart of things when he explained the reason why this coal is not at present available for use. In connection with our transportation problem we must insist on a new freight classification on essential commodities like coal and grain, and some others. It is not feasible to carry fuel for long distances at present freights; and in the matter of wheat perhaps one of the main prospects of relief to the farmers in the West would be found in placing that commodity under a lower freight rate. And it is in measures of this kind that relief will come, but the relief will have to come from Parliament. The responsibility to take care of this question will be on the government. It will not do to trust the profiteers of the United States. We know that they will sell coal at a high price and make enormous profits. I am sure that as much as $6 a ton absolute profit has been made out of the anthracite supplied to the people of Ontario and of Montreal in connection with this coal famine. They will take any price they can get, and they are only like other business people in that respect. The government must intervene and must have a policy in regard to coal, and that policy must go so far as to request for instance the directors and the management of our National railway to consider the question of a new classification of freight rates, on the lines of a lower freight rate for basic commodities, like coal, ores, and articles of that kind. If we adopt that course we will get some relief. Canada should be independent of every country in the world in regard to fuel.

The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Church) referred to water-powers. We should prohibit the export of water-powers when it comes to be a menace. The suggestion the hon. member made in reference to bounties is well worthy of consideration. If there is that immense export of our pulpwood which is

absolutely necessary to the people of the United States they should perhaps pay an export duty on that. In that way we could get sufficient money to pay a bounty on the shipment of coal, or we might lower the freight rates and reclassify all these articles such as I have mentioned, especially coal and wheat. If we adopt that course and the government and parliament realize their responsibility, we will get relief in a short time, in regard to a matter which promises to be a menace and to cripple the interests of the country. If it had not been for Sir Adam Beck's hydro-electric policy in Ontario, I do not know where we would have been. There are four millions of horse power on the northern slope of the Hudson bay which could be utilized to electrify the National railway and other railways from Winnipeg to Quebec, and give enough power to work all the mines and probably save fuel in other ways.

I heard some of the details of the proposal to establish coke ovens using bituminous or soft coal. The cities of Montreal, Toronto and Winnipeg could very well afford to start immense coking plants there for the conversion of soft coal into coke, and the production of many other by-products, mainly gas, which may or will be used in five years in those cities for the production of heat. You can convert coal into coke and get an immense amount of gas, which can be distributed by pipes through a city. They have now a much better and simpler system for hot-water heating of houses by gas than by coal. All it requires is capital and science, and some kind of encouragement by the government, and our fuel problem will be solved. I hope some one on behalf of the government will tell the House that this question is to be considered, and that an effort will be made to remove a great public grievance at the present time.

Hon. D. D. McKENZIE (Solicitor General): This matter has been very ably discussed by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Church), the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Carroll) and the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean). The question is not at all new to this House. It has been said to-day that it is of a national character, and it certainly is. While speaking for myself, I cannot say that I have not a more or less selfish interest in the matter, as I come from a province where they sell coal. Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker I assure you that I am sufficiently broad and sufficient of a Canadian to have the widest possible national interest in this question, and without boasting in any way, I am sure my record in this House will show that for the last fifteen or twenty years I have always endeavoured to bring home to the Canadian people the necessity of being independent in regard to their fuel supply. It is impossible to accomplish that independence without using the fuel supply we have within our borders. It is only a question of bringing the fuel to the place where it is now most needed. It is a great satisfaction to be able to say that the quantity of coal which we possess both east and west is not a matter of speculation or doubt. There is in Nova Scotia to-day—and this is not mere miners' talk about prospective minerals—to be seen and handled enough coal to last for many generations yet to come and supply the whole country. Can you imagine a territory along the northern coast of the county of Inverness, from twenty-five to sixty miles along the coast, of a virgin solid block of coal not yet touched? This stretch of coal area for sixty miles has an average width of four miles, with seams 13 to 16 feet. one underlying the other. Those who are familiar with coal mining know that it is not only one seam of coal that is usually found in these places, but one underlying the other, and it is only a question of cutting through the upper one to get to the lower, or to all the seams that you may require. This coal area in Inverness is not regarded as the largest coal area. In Cape Breton there is the virgin territory of which I have spoken. There is an equally large coal area in the county of Cape Breton and other counties. So that we can speak with assurance of the quantity of coal we have in Nova Scotia. Our coal fields in Nova Scotia are not confined at all to Cape Breton. Coal fields exist in Pictou county and in Cumberland county as large as in Cape Breton. I am making these observations to encourage our friends in Ontario and Quebec, and to show them that we have the coal and that we have the proper facilities for the bringing of that coal to the place where it is required. Let me say that from a national standpoint we have not been treated quite properly by the people of Ontario, the people of Quebec, and of other parts of Canada, in relation to our exports during and after the war. Our miners in the county of Cape Breton and in the whole of the province of Nova Scotia, but particularly the county of Cape Breton, are sturdy, loyal, fighting men. As soon as war broke out, they were immediately ready or got ready, left their work, threw down their tools, and as quickly as possible they were found in the trenches in France and Flanders. We were all glad to see them go, but nevertheless the result was

that we could not produce the coal. In our province, every man is not permitted to take up the pick and go and cut coal. He must pass an examination, like any other professional man; he must be permitted by license to cut coal, and for that reason, when our miners went to the front, we were crippled as regards producing the quantity of coal required. Moreover, the ships which we had for the conveyance of coal from ports of the island of Cape Breton to Montreal and other ports, were commandeered. In that way, our miners and our means of conveyance were taken away, and we could not meet the contracts which we undertook to fill. The result was that the Americans got our markets at Montreal, Toronto and every other place in which we had a market, and people when they start dealing in a certain direction, are not very ready to break off dealing in that direction when the old source of supply again becomes open to them. The difficulty was that after the war was over, we lost connection with the ports and places which I mentioned. It also took some time to get our ships back, and in that way we were largely crippled in our coal industry. I am glad that our capitalists, our miners and the men generally engaged in that business have fought with that difficulty and are back again pretty much to the condition in which they found themselves before the war. The reason why I mentioned that we were not treated fairly in that regard was that because our miners left their vocations and went overseas for the protection of Canada and the Canadian people, and the reason for which our ships were taken from us was also of a national character. Therefore, stock should have been taken of this situation by our friends, and as rapidly as possible we should have been restored to normal conditions as they existed before the war.

We have the coal east and west; the market for it is in the great centre of this country, and we must provide the means of utilizing the resources which we have for the benefit of our own people. As regards the places where this coal is produced, supposing, for instance, Nova Scotia could provide the major part of this coal which now comes from the United States. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Church) informed us that over $56,000,000 goes out of this country every year for the purchase of coal. Let us suppose that at least 75 per cent of that money could be expended in Nova Scotia. It is only a matter of calculation to show the number of men that could be employed, and the advantage that would come to our people through keeping this money in Canada and utilizing the resources

[Mr. McKenzie.]

of our province. This would be good, not only for the workingmen, but for Nova Scotia which derives a revenue from the sale and production of coal.

I am glad that this question is once more going to a committee. If I were not as well acquainted as I am with the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Carroll) and the mover of the motion, the hon. member for North Toronto, I would be disposed to think that they are sidestepping this question and shelving it for a while. But I am sure that such is not the case, and I trust that no time will be lost in the committee submitting to this House and to the government whatever practical decisions they may reach upon this subject.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Is there a committee on this subject now in existence?

Mr. McKENZIE: There is a standing committee, appointed not especially for this purpose, but for the purpose of dealing with mines and minerals, to which committee I understand it is the intention to submit this matter. I was just going to say, in conclusion, that two years ago we had what was known as the Fuel committee, or a committee for the investigation of the fuel resources of Canada. There was a very exhaustive and full investigation lasting over quite a number of weeks. A late member of this House, Dr. Steele, an excellent gentleman, who was very much in earnest about this question, was chairman of that committee. They made a report, and gave very useful information as to the quality of our coal; the means of transportation and so forth, received exhaustive attention before that committee. Let me inform the hon. member for North Toronto and the members of that committee that this report is in the form of a blue book, and that they will find in that book very useful information. I trust they will take advantage of it. I see that the Senate is at present taking an interest in this matter, and that it has a committee at work gathering information in connection with this very question. Let me suggest that there should be no overlapping in connection with this matter; that there should be no estrangement of any kind between the committee of the Senate and the proposed committee of the House of Commons. If possible at all, they should work and co-operate together, and let parliament and the country have the full fruition and benefit of what conclusions they may reach.

5 p.m.

We used to hear the expression that "somebody could not wait." It is an old expression in this House that "somebody could not

wait," for the emergency was too strong for time to be lost; but I need not assert in my own way that the people of this country, both those who are producing and those who are in need of coal, cannot wait very much longer, for the time is at hand and fully mature for practical and active co-operation and the producing of satisfactory results in this country.

The hon. member for North Toronto hoped that some member of the government would speak on this question. I am speaking, not as a member of the government, but simply as the representative in this House of Cape Breton North and Victoria, one who has the good fortune of representing many sturdy, hale and hearty good miners and producers of coal. I have been representing them in this House for many years, and I am glad as such, not as a member of the government, to have this word to say on a question which, I think, is of vital importance to them as well as to the country generally.

Mr. E. J. GARLAND (Bow River): Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the mover of this resolution (Mr. Church) for having brought before this House a question of such vital importance to the Dominion, I was inspired by the attitude of mind he expressed in approaching this subject. I was inspired by his great Canadianism and the fact that he hoped we would develop a Canadian policy, all-British, all-Canadian. With everything that he has said in that respect, I wish to associate myself. Also with what has been said by the hon. member for Cape Breton South and Richmond (Mr. Carroll) and the hon. member for Cape Breton North and Victoria (Mr. McKenzie). The resolution as introduced appeared to generalise to a great extent, the nature of the subject would, of course, render that necessary. It was therefore with pleasure that I heard the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Carroll) introduce a concrete proposal that a committee go into this whole question. I think it is vital that this should be done. A mere platitudinous expression of opinion with regard to policy, will hardly get us very far; but I think if such a committee is appointed to consider all the various factors to be taken into consideration and report to this House we shall make decided progress.

I may be permitted, without, I hope, the stigma of sectionalism applying to my remarks, to present to this House, the point of view of the province of Alberta, just as the last speaker did that of his own province. In Alberta we have every known variety of coal from the anthracite of the Hoppe fields —fields that I hope will be preserved to Canada—to the lignite deposits in other parts of the province. In the Cadman field we have a variety of steam coal unequalled anywhere in the world. It has passed every test of the British navy, and we have a sufficient supply to coal every vessel on the Pacific ocean continuously.

Whether it is a westward or an eastward development of our coal resources, the question boils down after all to one of freight rates and storage facilities, and to a lesser extent to hampering impediments to the industry. To one of these impediments in particular I would call the attention of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding). Under the Fordney tariff a duty was placed on any class of coal from Canada that bears a duty if imported by us from the United States. Anthracite coal is admitted into Canada free of duty. There is therefore no retaliatory duty in this instance. Unfortunately the greater part of the coal mined in Alberta at the present time is a sub-bituminous variety and this, being on the N.O.P. list at the present time, is being charged a duty of 53 cents a ton going into the States. Now, our operators being enthusiastic and energetic business men have developed quite a coal market in the Dakotas, Minnesota, Idaho and Washington, and they could still further develop this market if this impediment were removed. I would therefore appeal to the Minister of Finance to take into consideration the requirements of the coal industry in my province when he brings in his budget. I have here a resolution from the Red Deer Valley Coal Operators Association which I will read to the House. It is as follows:

> Whereas the United States government has recently enacted tariff laws of such a nature as to impose a customs duty of fifty-three cents per ton on domestic coal from the Drumheller field, being exported to the United States.

I may say it applies to the whole province, not merely to Drumheller.

> And whereas the said United States tariff on coal is only made applicable to coal from countries imposing duty on coal from the United States such as Canada and
>
> Whereas the schedule of customs duties of the Canadian tariff, admits anthracite and coke when imported into Canada, free of duty, but imposes a duty of fifty three cents per ton on "Bituminous round and run of mine and coal not otherwise provided" and
>
> Whereas the coal from the Drumheller field is not anthracite or bituminous and cannot be classified under either head, but is classed by all governments and competent mining authority as "sub-bituminous" or lignite and therefore does not come under either of the specific classifications mentioned in the Canadian schedules, but is covered by the general clause "Coal not otherwise provided for" of item 588 and
>
> Whereas all coal imported into Canada from the United States is either anthracite or bituminous and

little or none of such imported coal could be put in the sub-bituminous or lignite class with Drumheller, Edmonton or Lethbridge domestic coal, it follows that the duty levied by our government on this grade of coal under the general clause "Coal N.O.P." of item 588 in not productive of any revenue to our government and the placing of this grade of coal on the free list in Canada would not cost the government any loss of revenue, but would automatically operate to place our coal on the free list in the United States and admit coal exported by us to the United States markets without payment of duty and

Whereas the general market conditions in the states of North Dakota, Minnesota, Idaho and Washington, have recently developed opportunity to secure outlet for our excess production and the production from Lethbridge and Edmonton which is now being marketed in the above named territory in growing quantity and

Whereas the railways serving the coal fields named are now ready, willing and able to furnish cars for transportation to this territory in greater quantity than they have ever been able to do in the past and are now soliciting this export business as a means of augmenting their own earnings.

Therefore be it resolved by the Red Deer Valley Coal Operators Association, of Drumheller, Rosedale and Wayne, Alberta, in session this 9th day of January 1923—

And, I may add, by the Edmonton Board of Trade and other influential bodies.

—that we petition the government of Canada, to amend the schedule of the customs tariff of Canada, items 586 and 588 of schedule "A" group "2", by striking from item 588 the words "and coal N.O.P." and by inserting the same in item 586 along with anthracite coal and coke, so as to put coal of the class of Alberta domestic coal on the free list in Canada.

I trust the Minister of Finance will take that question into consideration, for it is of vital importance to us out there now, and it will continue to be of vital importance even after we have developed the entire Ontario market for coal.

I was surprised a little while ago to observe that apparently some hon. members are under the impression that Alberta coal cannot be economically placed on the Ontario market. It is my opinion that with a very slight reduction in the freight rates on coal we could supply the entire demands of Ontario with Alberta coal. And not only would the lower freight rate not reduce the revenue of the railroads in my opinion, it would probably increase them. During the months of April, May, June and July, traffic from the West is practically at a standstill, but of course there is a continuous westbound movement of supplies. During those months why could we not have a reduced rate, say 32½ cents per hundred pounds, that would enable our Alberta coal to be laid down in Ontario in unlimited quantities? At the present time the mines there are operating only at half time. Such a reduction of the freight rate would enable our coal to be laid down in Ontario at about $11 per ton. This is a sub-bituminous coal of excellent quality

[Mr. E. J. Garland.]

that would compete with the anthracite coal of the States and be very satisfactory to the people of Ontario.

I do not need to go into this question very much further now because I hope the proposed committee will be instructed to consider the matter in detail. But touching the question of transportation again, I would call the attention of the House to a resolution passed by the Red Deer Valley Coal Operators Association in reference to the fixing of the freight rate to enable Alberta coal to be sold in Ontario at competitive prices. The resolution reads:

Whereas there is a great shortage of coal in Ontario and Canada is paying millions of dollars for American coal, and

Whereas the province of Alberta is in a position to supply any quantity of coal suitable for both domestic and power purposes as shown by its success in supplying the market as far east as the Great Lakes, and

Whereas the mines in Alberta are only running part time on account of insufficient trade;

Be it resolved that this association make representations immediately to the Dominion government to secure a freight rate that will enable Alberta coal to be sold in Ontario at competitive prices.

When the proposed committee is appointed I hope it will be empowered to consider the feasibility of the appointment of a permanent fuel commission—a commission to sit continuously and be ever watchful of the fuel interests of Canada. We require such a commission I believe to deal effectively with our fuel needs. The question has too many ramifications; it lends itself too easily to the influence of monopolies, combines, and so on; and to protect the people I think it would be essential to have a federal commission. If the powers of the committee are to be broadened to that extent I suggest that it should consist, we will say, of a mining engineer, one of the best you can get in the whole Dominion—indeed, if you cannot get a good one there, go where you can get the best; a freight expert, a business executive, a representative of the miners, and a representative of the operators. That commission would not be a very large body; it could sit continuously and guide the destinies of Canada so far as coal matters are concerned—and that, surely, is an important consideration.

One more word on the freight rates question: I took the matter up some time ago with the province of Alberta. Mr. A. Chard, supervisor of freight and traffic for the provincial government, states:

If a $6 a ton rate on train load lots could be provided from mining centres in Alberta to Toronto, this coal could enter competition successfully with the American product. The present rate is $12.70 a ton, which makes the price of the product in Ontario

prohibitive. American bituminous, a coal very inferior in quality to Alberta coal, is selling in Toronto at $7 a ton. Anthracite is selling at $18 a ton. If Alberta coal could be put on the market at Toronto at $13 a ton, it could compete successfully.

I believe that could be done by putting into effect a rate of 32½ cents per 100 pounds.

I do not wish to delay the House any further in this matter, especially as I hope that the amendment offered by the member for Cape Breton South will be adopted. I hope we shall have an opportunity of going into this whole question in great detail and that as a result of the investigation carried on by the standing committee, a satisfactory solution of this national problem will be arrived at.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou): Mr. Speaker, I represent a constituency which for over fifty years has produced large quantities of coal. By a strange dispensation of Providence the coal supplies of Canada are situated at the extreme east, at the base of the Rocky Mountains, and in British Columbia. When in the past it had been urged that a duty should be imposed to enable coal from the east to come to central Canada, the two great central provinces took the ground that that should not be done, and seemed to be anxious to trade with our friends in the United States. I am very glad indeed that the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Church), in his resolution, indicates that he is in favour of a new national policy, one which will mean that the people of central Canada will purchase the coal they require from Canadians.

The figures show that in the year 1920-21 there were imported into Canada 15,902,632 tons of bituminous coal and 4,912,964 tons of anthracite. These importations were almost entirely into the two central provinces, central Ontario importing approximately 10,000,000 tons and Quebec nearly 4,000,000 tons, the balance largely going to the head of the lakes. This means that the Canadian people have annually sent to the United States about $100,000,000 of good Canadian money that ought to have remained within our own borders and would remain if the fuel supply of the central part of the country could be obtained from our own eastern and western districts. Last year, for the first time in years, nearly 850,000 tons of coal were purchased by Canada in Great Britain. It was possible to get this coal owing to the fact that shipping rates were lower than they had been for years and return grain cargoes were available from Montreal. But the rates laid down by those in charge of the Canadian National Railways have been prohibitive so far as internal trade in Canada is concerned. The hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Garland) has stated the rates that have been charged from the west, and the same conditions apply in respect to our eastern coal. In the summer months we are able to ship by water from our mines which are on the seaboard to Montreal; last year we shipped in this way over 2,000,000 tons of coal, a portion of which, for the first time in years, went to Toronto. But during the other portions of the year we are entirely dependent upon the railway for the shipment of our coal to other parts of Canada. The management of the Canadian National Railways have in the last four years increased the rates upon coal by practically 300 per cent, and it does seem to me that this is a matter that will require the closest examination by the committee which I trust will act as a result of the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Carroll). These enormous increases—and I assume the same condition prevails in the west—have made it impossible for us to promote interprovincial trade. It cannot by any process of reasoning be urged that such action will make for the prosperity of the railway, or will achieve what the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean) used to tell us was the aim and object of the Canadian National Railway system. I find, for instance, that in 1921-22 the Board of Directors of the Canadian National Railways purchased, for the purpose of the operations of the railways, over $12,000,000 worth of coal, of which $9,000,000 was bought in the United States. In other words, at the time the road was under the direction of Mr. Hanna, $9,000,000 went to the United States for coal, while in my province the miners were walking the streets, unable to get employment of any kind. Now the situation has changed; our friends in central Canada are animated by the proper idea. They ought to be able to get coal either from the east or from the west to take the place of this tremendous importation of 20,000,000 tons that was made last year and that is made practically every year. Public sentiment, I say, is changing in respect to this matter. I notice a very marked change in the attitude of hon. members of this House. I am quite sure that the committee on Mines and Minerals, to which the matter will go, ought to be able to inquire into all the facts, to point out where the difficulties are and where a remedy ought to be applied, so that we may have, as suggested by the hon. member for North Toronto, a national policy under which the coal producers of Canada may sup-

ply this material to those of our own citizens who desire it.

Mr. A. W. NEILL (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, I just wish to remind the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) that the argument adduced by the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Garland) as regards the duty on lignite coal in Alberta also obtains in respect to British Columbia as regards bituminous coal. So far as I know, practically no bituminous coal is imported into British Columbia from the United States. But the fact that there is a duty of 53 cents a ton on bituminous coal allows the United States, under the terms of its fiscal policy—indeed, compels them—to impose a duty of 53 cents a ton on our bituminous coal mined on Vancouver Island, which would otherwise find a market in the western states through Seattle and San Francisco. The result is that without any apparent advantage in the way of revenue to Canada we are seriously handicapping the operations of our mines on Vancouver Island, which are already seriously handicapped by the competition of fuel oil. I am sure that the member for the Nanaimo district (Mr. Dickie) would, if he were here, endorse my attitude on this very important question.

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I did intend to go into the question of fuel supply at a little length, but now that it seems to be the unanimous wish of the House that the matter be referred to a committee, I am quite satisfied to let the committee go into the details.

I want to direct the attention of the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Garland) to this point: He asks the government to assist in developing a market in the United States for Alberta coal. But that cannot very consistently be done without our saying on the other hand that we do not care to trade with the United States in other parts of Canada in the matter of coal. We have to be consistent, or we shall not get very far in the matter of our fuel supply.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Does the minister mean that anthracite is not admitted to this country, as it is into the United States, free?

Mr. GRAHAM: That is not what I was saying. We want to be consistent. We will do everything in our power to make the country self-sustaining in the matter of fuel, but we must be careful about passing resolutions under which we shall direct our efforts against the sale of coal to us by the United States, and at the same time endeavour to sell coal to them. It may not amount to much, but we have to be consistent as a parliament in working out these problems.

As to the question of rates, there are two ways by which railway rates can be brought down. One is by lessening the cost of operation, and I see no great prospect of any considerable reduction of the cost of operation for some years. The cost of operating railways will never be what it was before the war. The men who are engaged in this operation will never again accept the rate of wages that they accepted in pre-war times, and it would be unreasonable to expect them to do so. The other way to bring about a reduction of rates is to have more produce for the railways to carry—in other words, to increase traffic. And how are we to increase traffic? By having more people in Canada. We cannot one day say, "Do not bring immigrants into this country," and the next day say, "We want the freight rates or the passenger rates reduced." In the United States with the same territory they have 110,000,000 people; we have 9,000,000 people. Their density of population to railway mileage is very much greater than ours. The only possible way, to my mind, by which freight rates can be reduced is by having greater traffic for the railways, and that greater traffic can only be secured by having more people to carry on production in this country. If Canada cannot support more than 9,000,000 of people, then the Creator made a mistake in flinging it across so vast a territory—and I believe in the Creator. This country can support at least 50,000,000 people and our object—this is only by the way—should be to go about this settlement of many of our difficulties, including the railway problem, in the fundamental way, and that is by producing more traffic for the railways, and to do that you must have more people in this country to produce it.

What I rose particularly to do was to call the attention of the House to the work that has been done during the past season by our own Fuel Committee. In July last the United States government appointed such a committee, and a little later they appointed what they called a Fuel Distributor. In July last the government of Canada appointed an Advisory Fuel Committee, composed of Mr. Magrath, the late Mr. Kennedy, Mr. McCourt, and Major Bell. These gentlemen have not used many billboards in advertising, but they have done a great deal of work just the same for the benefit of the people of Canada. Each day during several weeks this committee was in touch with dealers in Welsh coal, finding out the quantities on hand, the quantities

that could be shipped, and the prices that might be expected to be paid. Some people have asserted that there is not real anthracite coal in Wales. I must differ from that view, because in a test some Welsh coal that was brought to Canada this winter proved to be in every particular a little superior to the Pennsylvania coal.

Mr. COOTE: Does the minister know whether that particular brand of Welsh coal was brought to Ottawa or not?

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not know whether it reached Ottawa or not, but some of it was brought to Canada.

In addition to their work in connection with Welsh coal, the Advisory Fuel Committee was in constant touch with the Fuel Distributor at Washington as well as with a similar body in Pennsylvania. Some person has said that the state of Pennsylvania passed a law prohibiting the export of coal, which law had been upheld by the Supreme Court of the United States. I am not a lawyer, but I cannot quite grasp how the state of Pennsylvania would have the right to pass a law prohibiting the export of coal. They might pass a law in reference to mining leases, which leases might contain a clause in effect against export unless certain conditions were complied with, but my own view is that no state could pass a law prohibiting export, that that would rest with the federal authorities at Washington, just as it rests with the federal power at Ottawa in this country.

Our Advisory Fuel Committee met several times with the Pennsylvania body having the same work in hand. Their task was not an easy one because there was in the United States as every person knows a feeling among a class of the people that coal should not be exported to Canada during the time there was a scarcity; but this same scarcity applied to the New England states as much as it did to Canada, and at a meeting held at Washington in the autumn, I think it was, it was arranged that Canada was to have about sixty per cent of her regular quota of coal. Later it was thought that that amount should be reduced to fifty per cent in order to encourage the people to use substitutes for coal, but as a matter of fact by the end of this month, March 31, it would appear that Canada will have received sixty-three per cent of her usual quota of hard coal. I am speaking altogether of anthracite.

It will be remembered that the Interstate Commerce Commission had an investigation at which Mr. Magrath appeared, and that about December 16 an order was passed restricting the export of coal to Canada until such time as relief would be had in the New England states. But feeling ran strong among some classes, and I want to call the attention of the House to a bill that was introduced at Washington on February the 17th. It reads as follows:

A Bill

Authorizing the President to declare an embargo on coal.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled. That whenever the President shall find that the public interest so requires he is hereby authorized to declare an embargo on the exportation of coal from the United States to foreign countries; such embargo may include either anthracite or bituminous coal or both and may be complete or partial: Provided, however, that without further authority of the Congress no such embargo shall continue in operation for a period of more than six months at any one time.

It is needless to say that that bill did not become law. I now wish to read some of the evidence given by Mr. Bermingham, President of the Delaware, Lackawanna, and Western Railway,—who appeared before the Interstate Commerce Commission just as Mr. Magrath did—in order to show that all the people in the United States are not of the same mind as the gentleman who introduced that bill into the House of Representatives. Here are the answers given by Mr. Bermingham to questions put to him:

Q. Mr. Bermingham, have you any information as to whether, assuming there was an embargo against any further shipments of coal by your company in Canada, you would have any difficulty in sending that into New England, over lines leading into New England instead of sending it to Canada? The question is, do you think you have enough information on that to answer the question?

A. I think, as a matter of record, I would refuse to ship any coal any place, if any such purpose as that was put over, after the record that I have made in the 32 years I have been in this game. I tried to ship coal to New England last year. Why did I close down the mines? Why did we only produce 400,000 tons in December instead of 750,000 tons? Why did I carry $11,000,000 worth of coal on hand? New England didnt come to me with any open arms for coal.

Q. You are not prepared to speak as to any operating difficulty; any traffic congestion that you might encounter if you tried to divert your Canadian allotment to points in New England?

A. I don't quite catch what you mean by diverting my Canadian allotments, when I shipped over 1,000,000 tons and have only shipped 300,000 tons below my allotment. I hope I am going to play just as fair with everyone in the United States as I do with the people in Canada, and also the fellow in Canada. His money has been good all these years, and I needed his line of business there. These sizes of coal—I had barley coal there that nobody would take six weeks ago, and I shipped some of it to Canada, and was awfully glad to get the order.

I could read more along the same line, but I am merely trying to point out that the American coal operator is very happy because he has had a good market and that,

outside of a few legislators and some mayors of cities, the United States coal operators, as well as the transportation men over there, were glad and anxious, so far as possible, to give Canada the amount of coal to which she was entitled in other years. A good deal of this happy feeling, I may say, was due to the work of the Advisory Fuel Committee that I have named.

Now, just one more word as to the question of freight rates. I forgot, however, to mention this: My hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Church) said there were a lot of empty cars going west. Well, that is the trouble with the situation. We have so few people, comparatively speaking, occupying such a vast expanse of territory that when you bring a car of coal east that car has to go back empty instead of returning full of goods. It can readily be seen that the longer the freight car has to be hauled the more difficult it is to get a cheap freight rate; because, unless the railway is to go behind more and more, and eventually go into bankruptcy, it must obtain the cost price of operation at least, and that cost price is the cost, as figured out, of hauling a ton of coal from one point to another point; it is the cost price in a great many cases of hauling a ton of coal from point to point, and hauling the empty car back again. A numerous and well distributed population would remedy this to a large extent.

Mr. SHAW: Does the hon. gentleman give it as his opinion that the people of Alberta, for example, cannot reasonably expect a train load of coal to be hauled from that province to central Canada at a rate that will permit Alberta coal to compete with coal from the United States?

Mr. GRAHAM: I would not like to be put into the position of saying that; but the people of Canada cannot continue to pay the price for coal which they have been paying for the last three or four years. At the present time it might be possible to do that; but when coal gets back to its normal price again, or nearly so, unless some means has been found of reducing freight rates in one way or the other it will be a difficult matter for coal hauled from a point 1,800 miles away to compete with coal hauled from a point 500 miles or even 800 miles away, that is the situation. It is a matter of economics and freight rates. Everything else being equal, coal can be hauled from mines only 500 miles away and brought to your door more cheaply than coal hauled from a point 1,800 miles away. However, I want to say this: I am in favour of the National Railways, as far as I can control the system, doing everything possible to help to assist in developing the coal areas both east and west in the Dominion. We have coal deposits in the East and we have coal deposits in the West. The coal in the East, in recent years, with few exceptions, only came as far as Montreal; on one occasion it did come as far as Brockville. The steamship haul from the Cape Breton mines is comparatively cheap; it may be utilized also for coal from other mines. Nova Scotia coal is brought to Montreal, I think, by that route at the rate of 85 cents to $1.10 per ton and thus, so far as freight rates are concerned, comes within reasonable distance of the consumer.

But one of the difficulties of the whole situation is that in the summer months when we could haul the coal cheaply there is not —there has not been in past years at any rate—a demand for it.

There would be a prospect of a reduction in coal rates, particularly in trainloads, if the hauling could be done in the months in which there is not a very great traffic in other products. But the trouble with freight originating in the West is that it is nearly all eastward. Perhaps I should not put it that way, but the major portion of the traffic is east bound, so that when we bring coal east we add to the traffic without having any return traffic to carry back. Notwithstanding these difficulties I believe something can be gained by referring this matter to a committee for investigation. We have no coal in central Canada but I am not despondent. I believe that anthracite coal will yet be found in the province of Ontario. At any rate we have coal in the East and coal in the West and the time has come when we ought to take active measures without spending too much time upon rediscussion of theoretical ideas, to ascertain if there is a possibility of getting the unity of action between the East and the West to the end that may become self contained in case of needs. That cannot be done in a day or in a year; but as scientific processes are improved and developed there must be some way by which if we cannot use the soft coal itself we can use the products of that coal. Some person has compared bituminous coal to hard coal. There are, of course, different grades of bituminous coal, but a first class bituminous coal, properly fired, will dispense as much heat as a ton of anthracite. At any rate that is my opinion. That being the case we ought to be able in this Dominion to devise a means of transportation and so improve our processes of handling and of development, to make use of our bituminous coal to the best advantage. Because the time may come in future when

it may be imperative for us to use our own coal for domestic and industrial purposes.

I believe the Canadian National Railway, and in fact the Canadian Pacific and all the railways, will find it to their advantage to develop Canada first, not as against other countries, but to develop Canada first, and one of the things that will assist in doing that will be the intensive development of our coal areas for our own consumption. I would not be in favour of doing anything that would imply our saying to the United States "We do not want to deal with you in coal because Alberta wants to sell her coal in the United States", and rightly so as the haul is short and the demand likely to increase. But while being on terms with our neighbours across the border, it is a sign of true friendship and an evidence of hope for a strong nationality, that we should, so far as possible, use our own materials for the benefit of our own people, and I believe the Canadian National Railway will be found ready to do all it possibly can to bring that about.

Mr. WILLIAM A. BOYS (South Simcoe): I am in absolute accord with the purpose of the resolution, and believe that it raises one of the most vitally important questions for the people of Canada, and particularly the people of Ontario. I am also in accord with the suggestion contained in the amendment moved by the hon. member for Cape Breton South and Richmond (Mr. Carroll), but it seems to me that the two propositions are contradictory. The amendment proposes to add the following:

> And that the whole question of fuel supply for Canada, together with the question of costs, transportation, desirable interprovincial action and other means whereby Canada may be self-sustaining and self-supplying as regards fuel and to inquire into the necessity and possibility of supplying substitutes for coal be referred to the standing committee on Mines and Minerals and that said committee report to the House.

It will be borne in mind that the member proposes to add this paragraph to the resolution of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Church). The latter part of the resolution proposed by the hon. member for North Toronto reads:

> That further in the opinion of this House, the government should immediately consider the initiation of an all British and Canadian coal supply and that such a policy is both a social and economic necessity and in the best interests of the future of Canada.

Suppose the amendment carried and these words were added to the motion, it seems to me you would have a double-barrelled proposition. You have in the resolution a reference to the government of Canada and in the amendment you have the very opposite—a reference to the standing committees of this House—and unless there is a recasting of either the amendment or the resolution, the one is inconsistent with the other and would be out of order. It is highly probable that this debate will continue till six o'clock and the hon. members interested might get together. I do not rise to place any impediment in the way of either the passage of the resolution or the appointment of a committee. So far as I am personally concerned, I believe it would be better that this matter should go to a committee, where witnesses could be called and the whole matter could be thoroughly investigated, but as the matter stands, I cannot come to any conclusion but the one I have mentioned, namely that the amendment is inconsistent with the motion.

Hon. CHARLES STEWART (Argenteuil, Minister of the Interior): I am very glad that this matter is to be referred to a committee, notwithstanding the objections raised by the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Boys), who however, has expressed the hope that some way will be found by which this course can be taken. It has been represented in western Canada that in my previous utterances in this House I have said that it was impossible to bring western coal to Ontario. Nothing is impossible, Mr. Speaker. Having in mind the statement made by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Church) that during this winter strong efforts were being made to capture the market at Winnipeg for western coal, I might point out to my hon. friend that during the years of 1917, 1918, 1919 the Alberta government kept representatives in Winnipeg to make an attempt to capture that market against the product of the United States. One of the great difficulties we had to contend with was transportation. Another difficulty was that the cars carrying wheat eastward to Fort William and the ships carrying grain to Buffalo and lake Erie ports brought back coal and this naturally gave a very low freight rate to the actual products coming from the United States billed to western Canada. We had a great deal of difficulty with the rate of $4.25 per ton from the Alberta coal fields, to meet the strong competition upon these occasions. I am glad to say that has been abolished and Alberta coal is firmly established as far east as Winnipeg, and not only established, but giving entire satisfaction in a field where formerly it was looked upon with suspicion. As the hon. member for North Toronto has referred to this question, I may say that after looking up the reports from Alberta I find that there are 370 mines in that province, which are sufficient

to supply the whole of Canada, let alone Ontario. So far as western coal is concerned, it would not be necessary to build another mile of railway, or to open another mine so far as production is concerned, to meet all the requirements to satisfy this market. Then it comes down to a question of rates in its entirety. Therefore, I am glad that, for the purpose of disseminating information this matter may go before a committee, that you may call the rate experts and the officials of the Department of Mines who have made an attempt to study this matter, hear what they have to communicate and give that information to the public. We as westerners will be delighted to send the coal, which is our great natural product, from the province of Alberta as far east in Canada as possible and to sell it in competition with coal from any other portion of the world. I have been intensely interested in the scheme for bringing coal from Nova Scotia principally by water during the summer months as far west as possible. That is a matter to which we are giving a great deal of attention in the Department of Mines at the present moment, and we hope that by the coking process great results will be obtained, because already we have large interests who are prepared to back this project relying on the success of the work which has been done in this line in Minneapolis and other places in the United States. We hope to serve the market with coke where there is a possibility of the consumption of the by-products, thereby cheapening the cost to the consumer.

I want to add to what the Minister of Defence (Mr. Graham) has said with respect to the Fuel Board. These men have given their services freely and have met a difficult situation. By their tact and consideration they were able to overcome what at times promised to develop into rather a serious situation in Ontario and Quebec, and they did this without remuneration.

My department is one of investigation rather than one dealing with the situation as it exists at the moment, but we had hoped to assist in a very material way in solving the problem, in so far as it is possible so to do with regard to the Canadian people, with the products of their own mines.

Mr. EULER: Is there any real anthracite coal in Alberta?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I do not know. If you put it on a comparative basis with the anthracite of Pennsylvania, the answer would be, yes. But undoubtedly, we have a very high grade of semi-anthracite coal in Alberta, west of High River, in the foot hills and in the area known as the Hoppe leases on the Smoky river in northern Alberta.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. D. W. WARNER (Strathcona): Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to discuss this problem at any length, but I wish to support the first part of the resolution and the amendment. I should like this problem to be referred to the select standing committee on Mines and Minerals to gather information on the subject and lay it before the House. In fact, there may be available to the committee all the information that is needed.

I do not think we should do anything that would make the cost of coal higher to the consumer in the long run; on the contrary, our efforts should be directed not only to securing an adequate supply of fuel from our own mines but at no higher, and if possible at a cheaper, rate than we are now paying for American coal. Therefore it is important that we should have an investigation of this problem in order to ascertain what we can do for the advantage both of the consumers of coal and of those who have it to sell in Canada.

Several hon. members have referred to the necessity of having a back haul for the cars bringing coal from our mines. I grant that it is desirable to have just as much return traffic as possible, but I have wondered in this connection how much we have benefited in the case of cars sent back to the coal mines in the States. That would be something for the committee to investigate. It seems to me that when those cars reach the boundary line and are taken over by the United States railways our benefit ceases. Consequently it apapears to me that it would be worth considering that our coal miners would not only be advantaged by the fuel needs of the central portion of the Dominion being supplied by our western and eastern mines, but this traffic would also enure to the advantage of our National Railways. That is another factor that the committee might investigate for our information.

We need all varieties of coal. In Alberta good lignite, bituminous, and steam coal is being mined. Each of these varieties is required for domestic and industrial purposes, and it should be our purpose to make it economically possible to bring this coal to meet the domestic demand at the maximum distance from the source of supply.

I understand that a new railroad is being asked for running from Grand Prairie to connect

west of Edmonton with the main line of our National railway to the coast. That road would enable us to tap extensive anthracite deposits in northern Alberta. There is a great quantity of anthracite within fifteen or twenty miles of that projected road, which, I believe, will be built in the near future. If that is the case, anthracite coal will be mined there before very long, and we shall be able to send quantities of it to Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba. If we can send it to Ontario to compete with coal coming in from the United States, we want to see that done. An analysis of that coal shows that it is practically as good as Pennsylvania anthracite.

I mentioned in this House some time ago in discussing the Hudson bay project that we were sending out of our country $60,000,000 annually for coal. If that be true, and I believe it is, to save only half of that by using our own coal would be a good thing for Canada. I want to see Canadian coal used in preference to coal from any other country. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Church) asks that we have an all-British supply, but I do not know that we can do that. I do not know that it is feasible or possible to bring coal from the Old Country entirely to take the place of the United States coal. We shall want to send a considerable amount of coal from Alberta to the United States, and I understand that considerable quantities are going into that country from British Columbia. I do not know that I would go so far as to say that I would favour bringing British coal in instead of the United States coal, in view of the conditions, but I do want to emphasize the importance of our using Canadian coal wherever it can be used to advantage. I support the amendment. I want to see this matter inquired into by the Mines and Minerals committee so that we may know what is best to do in the interests of Canada as a whole.

Mr. M. N. CAMPBELL (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, I have no intention to occupy the time of the House at great length; I simply wish to make a few observations on this coal question before the resolution comes to a vote. I was afraid for a moment that the hon. Minister of Defence (Mr. Graham) was going to branch into the immigration question, but fortunately we got back to coal before very long. I quite agree with him, as I think all from the West do, that this country is capable of supporting a population of 50,000,000 people. But, Sir, there will have to be some economic readjustment and perhaps some changes in our fiscal system before that condition can be attained. An increase in the traffic does not necessarily mean a reduction in the overhead charges of our railways. An increase in the amount of grain handled on the western prairies might not mean a decrease in operating costs, because the railways are taxed to their utmost during the grain handling season. But one way, I should think, of reducing the cost of handling goods on the railway would be to have something to handle during the seasons in which ordinarily, most of the equipment and a great many of the men are idle. Mr. Hanna, former president of the Canadian National Railway Board, giving evidence before the freight rates committee here last summer, pointed out that grain was the most profitable commodity that the railway handled, and that the ideal situation for the railways would be to have a sufficiently large quantity of grain to handle all the year round. Grain is handled to-day much more cheaply than many other commodities; it is the long haul in large quantities, solid trains of grain, with very little switching between divisional points—that makes for minimum cost of transport. It seems to me that on the same basis coal could be shipped from Alberta to eastern Canada, but it would have to be done in the season when the railway equipment was otherwise more or less idle.

The Minister of Defence pointed out that coal was not needed during the summer season. That is something like the Irishman who had a leaky roof and was asked why he did not repair it. He replied that when it was raining he could not fix it, and when it was not raining it did not need to be fixed.

Mr. GRAHAM: Do I understand the hon. member to quote me as saying that we did not need coal in the summer?

Mr. CAMPBELL: Perhaps the hon. minister misunderstood me—that it would not be needed so far as the railways were concerned.

Mr. GRAHAM: I did not say that.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I am sorry I misunderstood the minister.

Mr. GRAHAM: I said the experience was that the western people themselves did not order their coal in the summer.

Mr. CAMPBELL: That is what I meant; perhaps I did not express it quite clearly—that so far as the railways were concerned the coal was not available to be handled. It seems to me that the only way to bring that about would be to have lower rates in the summer season. If the householders in the

East found they could save four or five dollars a ton on their coal by buying it in the summer, undoubtedly they would put in a stock of coal during that season. The rate on coal from Drumheller to points in Ontario is 63½ cents per hundred pounds, or $12.70 a ton. Taking the rates on grain from the western prairies on the same basis, it would figure out about $9 a ton. We can assume that if the railway can handle grain in large quantities at $9 a ton over that mileage, they could handle coal at the same price; and the longer the mileage, the cheaper it could be handled. In the summer season, with the more favourable conditions of transportation then prevailing, I believe, Sir, that the coal could be handled at the rate of $6 a ton. In Alberta the coal is put on the car for about $4 a ton, and they have facilities for handling a great deal more coal than they have orders for. If the output is increased the cost of the coal on the cars will be greatly reduced. I believe that is one of the solutions of the difficulty to-day. If we can keep our railways occupied in the summer; if we can get something that will be the equivalent of grain—taking Mr. Hanna's word for it—the railways could be busy all year round and engaged in a profitable business. I suggest that the rates should be increased in the fall when the cold weather comes on; the railways would be kept sufficiently busy during the summer in transporting coal both ways between Alberta and Nova Scotia. That would very largely reduce overhead costs, because no extra equipment and no extra men would be needed.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I just wish to refer the mover of the resolution to a point that was made by the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Boys) this afternoon, who mentioned that the motion as it stands with the amendment proposed, is somewhat contradictory, the first part of the motion having special reference to the government, and the second part referring more particularly to a reference to a committee. If my hon. friend who moved the resolution is agreeable to dropping the second part of it, that will remove the conflict that has been pointed out. The motion would then stop at the word "supply" at the end of the first sentence.

Mr. CHURCH: That is quite satisfactory.

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion as amended will then read:

That, in the opinion of this House, the time has arrived for Canada to have a national policy in relation to its coal supply and that no part of Canada should be left dependent on a United States coal supply, and that the whole question of fuel supply for Canada together with the question of costs, transportation, desirable inter-provincial action and other means whereby Canada may be self-sustaining and self-supplying as regards fuel, and to inquire into the necessity and possibility of supplying substitutes for coal be referred to the standing committee on Mines and Minerals and that the said committee report to the House.

Motion as amended agreed to.

EQUALIZATION OF RAILWAY RATES

MOTION OF MR. CLARK STANDS FOR MR. SPEAKER'S RULING

Mr. J. A. CLARK (Burrard) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, railway rates westward from the prairie provinces should be reduced to an equality with railway rates eastward from said provinces for similar goods and distances.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the hon. gentleman proceeds with his motion, I am informed that the question which is involved in it is presently sub judice and a question being sub judice must not be discussed in this House. The practice is well known. You will find in Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, under rule 19:

Besides the prohibitions contained in this rule, it has been sanctioned by usage both in England and in Canada, that a member, while speaking, must not:
(c) refer to any matter on which a judicial decision is pending.

But in order to do justice to the question, if the hon. gentleman would agree to suspend the presentation of this resolution at the present moment, I would like to refer to the Railway Act to see whether or not an appeal from the Railway Commission to the Privy Council would be considered sub judice. If it was an appeal to the Supreme Court, then there would be no hesitation on my part in saying that the question was sub judice, but the appeal, I am told, is from the Railway Commission to the Privy Council, that is to say, to the government. I have not the Railway Act under my hand at the moment and have not had time to study the question. It is rather a fine point, and if the hon. gentleman would kindly suspend the discussion of his motion for the time being, I will take the opportunity to look up the Railway Act and be in a position to give a ruling later on. Meanwhile I would like to invite the opinion of the Acting Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) and that of the ex-Chairman of the Railway Commission (Sir Henry Drayton), as I would be largely guided by the opinion of hon. gentlemen who are absolutely au fait with the powers of the Railway Commission. Just at the present moment I am not ready to give a decision and I would not like a debate to start which would be irregular and contrary to the rules and practice of the House.

Mr. CLARK: If this motion might hold its place and be called in this order, if it is found on consideration to be in order, I would be very pleased to have it stand under those conditions, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not wish to prevent the hon. gentleman from bringing the question before the House, but I want to be quite sure that the motion will be brought regularly before it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: As to the hon. member's request, the government will be only too happy to comply with anything that will help to serve the purpose he has in view, and to meet your wishes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CLARK: And keep its order?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes.

Motion stands.

TITLES, HONOURS AND DECORATIONS

MOTION BY MR. LADNER TO DEFINE INTENT OF ADDRESS TO HIS MAJESTY

Mr. L. J. LADNER (Vancouver South) moved:

Whereas a certain address respecting titles, honours and decorations was on motion of this House (May 22nd, 1919) forwarded to His Excellency the Governor General praying him to transmit the same to His Majesty the King.

And whereas it is expedient to define more clearly the intent and effect of said address in certain respects.

It is therefore the opinion of this House that an address should be presented to His Most Excellent Majesty the King, in the following words:—

To the King's Most Excellent Majesty

Most Gracious Sovereign:

We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled, humbly approach Your Majesty, praying that Your Majesty may be graciously pleased to accept the request of this House that the effect of the said address shall not henceforth preclude the granting by Your Majesty, or by any foreign ruler or government, of decorations (save those carrying titles) for distinguished service or high attainments in education, literature, art and science.

This House is also of the opinion that appropriate action be taken by legislation or otherwise to correct the last paragraph of the report of the committee on titles, honours, and decorations made to this House 14th May, 1919, and adopted 22nd May, 1919, so that the said paragraph shall not henceforth preclude the granting by any foreign ruler or government of decorations (save those carrying titles) for distinguished service or high attainments in education, literature, art and science.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in 1919 a committee was appointed by this honourable House to consider the question of titles, honours and decorations. On the 14th of May of that year that committee brought in a report dealing with the question which in substance recommended the conferring of no more titles or titular distinctions on British subjects ordinarily resident in Canada, and the extinction of hereditary titles of honour or titular distinctions. In order that the House may be accurately apprised of the wording of that recommendation, and in order that they may understand the purpose of this resolution, I propose to read the two paragraphs which deal substantially with the problem of that day. In the petition referred to it was recommended that an address be presented to His Majesty the King praying that His Majesty might be graciously pleased:

(a) to refrain hereafter from conferring any title of honour or titular distinction upon any of your subjects domiciled or ordinarily resident in Canada, save such appellations as are of a professional or vocational character or which appertain to an office.

The other important portion of the petition is contained in paragraph (b) which it is unnecessary for me to read but which practically disposes of the granting of hereditary titles in the future. Then at the end of this report is a recommendation that is responsible for the resolution I am bringing in this evening. That recommendation is thus worded:

Your committee further recommends that appropriate action be taken by legislation or otherwise to provide that hereafter no person domiciled or ordinarily resident in Canada shall accept, enjoy or use any title of honour or titular distinction hereafter conferred by a foreign ruler or government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it was never intended that the wording of that resolution should go to the extent of precluding the granting of such decorations without titles as would be given to a student or, let us say, to a scholar of high attainments in science, literature, art and education; but subsequently we had an actual instance in which the working and interpretation of that clause was determined. In that case—and there are several but I will take one in order that the House may understand the effect of this resolution—we had in British Columbia the case of Dr. Ashton, who is Professor of French in the University of British Columbia. That gentleman engaged for some years in research work in French literature. In the course of his investigations he produced a book, and several other works, that surpassed the other authorities at that time upon certain features of old French literature. The result was that the French authorities in recognition of the scholarly attainments and literary achievements of this professor made him a member of the Order of the Legion of Honour, but in the process of passing the declaration formally through the foreign office and the British Embassy it was found that owing to the Nickle resolution, and owing to the latter portion of

the committee's report which I have read to you, it was impossible for the French government to confer this honour upon this distinguished professor. In reading the debates of that period in the Dominion House, it is very clear that it was never the intention of the House that men of such standing should be denied the right of being honoured in a manner such as this. I have read carefully the speeches of that time. The present Solicitor General discussed the matter very fully and it is very clear from his remarks—it is clear from the remarks of the members of the opposition—that what was really intended in Canada was to do away with the abuse which it was alleged appertained to the granting of titles and hereditary distinctions at that time, but the wording of the report created the impression that something further was intended. Accordingly it was held, in this actual case, that the award of the Legion of Honour by the French government to this professor came within the prohibitory section of the report in question. Rulings have been made by the proper department of the government on the subject, and I wish to assure the House that that is the effect.

The purpose of this resolution is to change it so as to make it possible for men like Dr. Banting and Mr. Best, who discovered the insulin cure for diabetes, and who perhaps in the future, we can hope, will make other discoveries that will benefit mankind, to be honoured by any government. Because, after all, competition in the intellectual world is a competition of a world wide nature; and I submit, Mr. Speaker, there is no reason why eminent men who distinguish themselves in such activities should be deprived of the rewards which come in the nature of honours. We all know that scientists, educationalists, and other men of that class, do not work and slave for the material reward derived by other people engaged in business, who win for themselves affluence and the comforts which go with it. Their chief reward is the honour of their intellectual attainments. I am therefore appealing to the House that it may correct the error which was involved in the Nickle resolution, and make it possible for Canadian students in the intellectual world of Canada to be recognized by another country.

It is contended in some newspapers that this resolution may be a measure for the renewing of the granting of titles. I wish to assure the House—after considerable investigation, after consulting with the Under Secretary of State, and after making other inquiries in reliable quarters—that there is no intention of that kind, nor does the wording of the resolution permit of such an interpretation. The resolution is very clear. It simply says that the British government, or a foreign government, may grant decorations, save those carrying titles, for distinguished services or high attainments in education, literature, art and science. It is an impossibility for persons to receive a decoration with which a title is connected. They can only receive the decoration, or the recognition for their accomplishments, or the good which they do mankind. It can only be a recognition which has no title, and it must be limited to distinguished services or high attainments in education, literature, art and science.

Some may ask, why should not men work for the honour without the recognition? The simple answer is that it is not in accordance with human nature to do so. If you make it impossible for Canadian scholars and Canadian students to be honoured by foreign governments—for after all the intellectual kingdom is world wide, it is not limited to Canada—if you make it impossible for them to be honoured by foreign governments you create a situation as a result of which these men will be disinclined to pursue their educational or scholarly careers in Canada. We might take the instance of patriotism. It may be said that patriotism should not need a flag, but I submit that a flag does no harm to patriotism; it serves as a rallying point. You may say that services to humanity should need no bauble; but decorations do no harm, they serve as a rallying point for public appreciation. Again, Mr. Speaker, I submit that if this country continues in a course—either out of prejudice, narrowmindedness, or any other cause—when it becomes necessary for our professors to journey to the Old Country they will not be able to stand on the same plane as the men from the United States, and you prejudice and handicap the future of the university world of Canada. Because at the present time men may go over to Europe, they may engage in congresses and conventions of various kinds there and they are confronted with an anomalous situation. The United States which is alleged to be the most democratic of all countries—although it is not admitted by all of us to be so—can send over their representatives to Europe and they are able to take a stand in the congresses and conventions of the literary, scientific and educational world, superior to that occupied by the students and scholars of Canada.

I submit that hon. members of this House will not be so prejudiced, that they will not be so narrow minded, and that they will not be so ungenerous, as to deny our own Canadian scholars the privilege which is accorded to

those in the United States and in every other country in the world. It is an unthinkable thing to me, and I do not believe hon. members here, upon reflection, even from the fear that there may be some question of titles or honours involved in this resolution, will be so prejudiced as to deny our men the rights other people enjoy. We need in Canada just as much of the brain as we do of the brawn of the world. We have lately listened to an address by the hon. Acting Minister of Immigration (Mr. Stewart) in which he advanced quite a comprehensive scheme with regard to immigration and with regard to bringing into Canada by the thousands people that have the muscle and the arm, and I submit you should give them equal advantages with the men who have the brain and intelligence to direct the affairs of this country. You will find—and I think it was well proven during the war—that in Great Britain and in France it was the intellectual power of the leaders of the men which made victory possible for the allies. It combined necessarily the brawn and the muscle, but both go hand in hand.

It can be truthfully said, I submit, that decorations are purely democratic. Democracy has always recognized and rewarded personal endeavour, as distinguished from inherited privilege. It is purely democratic to reward self-sacrifice and abnegation in the work of peace, just as we reward those qualities in time of war. Why should the people of Canada extend to the eminently successful citizens of the country great distinction in time of war, a rare period in our national history, and then during a long period of peace, turn a deaf ear to the men who have become benefactors of their country and mankind, merely because of some prejudice or perhaps some abuse of the granting of honours or declarations in the past. I do not think hon. members here will allow their minds to be perverted into a prejudice that will draw a conclusion of that kind.

I submit there is no homage so true and unprejudiced as that which the foreigner or the foreign government offers. A foreign nation in conferring an honour anticipates the verdict of posterity and is impersonal in its judgment. There is no intrusion of personal feeling. It gives a fair verdict which is neither won by favour nor withheld by prejudice. Whatever has a tendency to make great nations forget those things in which they differ and remember those only in which they have a common interest is a benefit to them both, and such is the granting of honours of this kind mutually by great nations of the world. Proceedings of this kind and recognitions of this class by the citizens of different countries make us blind to the faults of each other and make us kind to their virtues. This is an appeal on behalf of the men who rank high in the intellectual world of our country.

We have examples, as I mentioned, in the case of Dr. Banting and Mr. Best. We have also Dr. McLennan, who has made some wonderful discoveries with regard to helium. We all know of Dr. Alexander Graham Bell and I will draw the attention of hon. members to such men as Pasteur, who made the wonderful discovery of a certain serum, Professor Roentgen the discoverer of the X-rays, Monsieur and Madame Curie, the discoverers of radium, and Dr. Flexner, the discoverer of a serum for spinal meningitis. The names of many others will readily be called to recollection. The activities of these men are world wide. Their great discoveries are for mankind. They are not for nations, but for the whole people of the universe, and I wonder if to-day there are hon. members here who on account of some bogey imagination with regard to the question of titles will rise in their seats and say that the Canadian scholars shall be denied recognition by every other country of the world.

Mr. JACOBS: Would the hon. member be in favour of a Canadian accepting decorations from the Chinese or Japanese governments?

Mr. LADNER: The hon. member's question is easily answered. I most certainly would. It is not the Chinese or Japanese government that the people of British Columbia have a contest with. It is the inferior and lower class of people who come into our country and make economic conditions under which it is impossible for the working classes to exist. The problems are different. My hon. friend seeks to inject just a slight political jab which is not relative to the subject matter of my discussion.

I wish, Mr. Speaker, to act upon the advice of a speaker whom I once heard—and perhaps other members of the House would find it useful and enlightening to follow the same course—and to limit my speech to the smallest possible amount. This is a broad subject but it is not very involved. The purpose of my resolution is very simple. It seeks to interpret and to correct an error which unfortunately crept into the report of the special committee in 1919. It is confined to the intellectual world of Canada. I appeal to hon. members to forget their prejudices, to be generous to Canadian scholars, students and members of the universities from Vancouver to

Halifax, who are looking to parliament for enlightenment by the example of their decisions, to realize the attention which is being given to this question, and to rise to the occasion and say to those who work, not for any reward in life, but for the service of Canada and for the service of humanity, that they will recognize their claim for special consideration, and that the spirit of this resolution and this debate will be understood, so that the people of this country cannot say that the lawmakers of Canada denied them the right of being recognized in the intellectual world and of receiving the honours to which they may be properly entitled.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I should have preferred to have heard some general expression from members of the House before venturing to express an opinion of my own on this question. However, the absence of any expression of view by any hon. member would seem to suggest that the subject is not one which is greatly concerning parliament at the present time, and the question which I would submit to my hon. friend is whether any circumstance has arisen, since the House, after investigation by one of its committees, reported against the acceptance of titles and decorations by Canadians, which affords reason why at this time the House should alter the decision it then made.

Mr. LADNER: Does my hon. friend not understand from the resolution and my remarks that the proposal in no way conflicts with the Nickle resolution? It is merely interpreting it for the benefit of the classes of whom I spoke.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: There are two observations which I would like to make with respect to this matter. The first is that I am entirely in sympathy with my hon. friend in his desire to have all possible recognition given to intellectual attainment and scholarship. By limiting, however, decorations to scholarship alone, to art, letters and science, there is established a somewhat invidious distinction between that particular class of attainment and attainments in other directions. If decorations or titles are to be given for service, the recognition should be made general. It would appear it should apply to public service in all fields as well as to service in what my hon. friend calls the intellectual world.

But that is not the only observation I wish to make. The one I regard as being more important is this. Distinctions of the type to which reference is made in the resolution are largely of two classes—titles and decorations. Of the two, decorations are of an inferior order. The effect of the resolution being passed would be to limit recognition of Canadians as regards the intellectual world, to the lesser order of distinction. It would still be impossible to give to any Canadian, no matter how meritorious his public service might have been or how high his intellectual atainments or achievements, the same high distinction which would still be open to citizens of other parts of the British Empire or to citizens of other countries, for service in the field of letters, science or art. That, I think, is possibly one phase of the question which may have escaped my hon. friend's notice. I confess I had not thought of it particularly until it was drawn to my attention, because I am sympathetic with him in his endeavour to find every possible avenue for the recognition of the class of merit to which he refers in his resolution. Realizing, however, that the effect of his resolution will be to limit our scholars and men of science to a recognition of a lesser order, but yet to have them denied the higher recognition which men in other countries and in other parts of the British Empire would still be entitled to for a possible lesser service, I am inclined to think it would be just as advisable to have matters remain as they are at the present time, and not to recognize either titles or orders of any kind. For that reason I shall not support the resolution.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I take a different view of this question from that expressed by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King). I wish in what I have to say to confine myself to the merits of the resolution alone. But I want to be perfectly frank with the House; so far as my views go on the general question, they would not be expressed by the mere terms of the resolution. I was a member of the House at the time of the debate of 1919, at the time of the report of the committee referred to in the last paragraph of this resolution, and at the time of the decision embodied in an address to His Majesty, praying for a cessation of all titles and decorations to Canadian people.

I did not vote for the acceptance of the committee's report. I voted against it. I did not think it was a fitting act on the part of the Canadian parliament; I did not think it did honour to the people of Canada; nor did I think it embodied a becoming attitude towards the Throne. I would not for a moment argue that in our country, as in other countries, there had not in the past been abuses of the title-granting privilege, and particularly that there had been too much confining

of the honour which titles bring to those engaged in what is usually known as public life and as well to those engaged in business life. Because of those abuses, because of that error of policy, a very considerable agitation arose against the entire practice, and in 9 p.m. that wave of so-called democracy that succeeded the war and that swept this, as other countries, like a hurricane, we took in 1919 the step that brought us where we are now. I was of judgment myself that the solution of the question proposed by the then Prime Minister in one of the ablest state papers that, I think, I ever read, was a solution that met all the exigencies that were reasonable, a solution that was based on sound common sense and that as well brought into conformity with present democratic ideas, the title-granting privilege. I thought it was a solution that would have done greater credit to our parliament than the course that was finally adopted. That is only by way of expressing my general opinion on the subject.

Coming to the resolution, I want to say something more definite. I do not agree at all with the Prime Minister in either of the reasons he advances. He says that it is illogical to confine this to this class of men or of women, those who attain eminence and do great service in the cause of education, literature, art and science. He says that to admit them to the privilege of decoration at the hands of our own country or another, is to do for them something to which they are no more entitled than would be other classes of people, and he cites particularly those engaged in public service. With that position I do not agree, to begin with; but even if that were the case, it would not be an argument against doing justice to some, that at the same time, we are not doing the same justice to others. We are doing no injury to any. But in the next place, I want to impress this. The class, the admission of which would be the best for the whole country, is just the class denominated in this resolution. There is no reason, to begin with, why recognition by a decoration should not be the reward of service, just as much as the attainment of money should be the reward of devotion to duty and toil. Whatever reasoning gets to that conclusion, for myself, I cannot comprehend.

What might be the division of peoples in respect of this subject? One might say: Some attain eminence, do great service in public life; others attain eminence, great success, and do great service in business life; others, on the contrary, do their work in less remunerative fields. The latter come under the terms of this resolution. But those who attain success in public life get a reward that none of those obtain who do service to their country, their race and their time in the spheres that are named in this resolution. There is a certain claim; there is a certain glamour; there is a certain obvious honour which all or, at any rate, most human kind loves, in the reward of public life. Public men are not without those incentives to activity, aside from money, that animate and inspire mankind. Nor is the business man without rewards that appeal to our race. The reward of money is perhaps more within his reach than it is within the reach of the man engaged in any other pursuit. The business man therefore does not need recognition by other methods as do those who are in the class named in this resolution. I always thought that far too many of these recognitions came to men in public life and to men in business life, although they were already in the enjoyment of rewards which, if not wholly consonant and adequate to their success, were at least something in the way of recognition.

But coming now to this class, no man enters the field of education, no man enters the field of science, no man enters the field of art hoping that the reward of great wealth will be for him if he succeeds; no man enters any of these activities save out of love of the service that the activity brings. Consequently I arrive by that method at the conclusion that it is men and women engaged in these pursuits whereby they serve their fellows to whom a denial of recognition by the usual decorations means the most. So I think if it is impossible to be somewhat broader, let us at least do this. Why should we say to a Canadian scholar or to a Canadian scientist who toils day by day and week by week, who denies himself that remuneration which his fellow, perhaps not half as well endowed, perhaps not half as strenuously at work, gains—why should we say to him, "Because you live in Canada we will not allow you to accept the ordinary recognition that your fellow across the border is entitled to receive even in republican United States."

Now, it seems to me that the spirit animating this attitude is not a spirit that becomes the Canadian people at all, I do not know that I could improve on the class of those who would here be admitted to a responsible degree of recognition by the terms of the resolution. I think it is wide enough to include all who enter the service of art, literature or science, and who, as a result of that service, have been successful but have been denied those rewards that wait on men in public and business life. So I say, let us be big enough

to open the gates so far. If we do not want to go any further, all right, I am not going to complain; but let us go at least far enough to say to those who are engaged in these unselfish walks of life, "Though others may not be admitted to these rewards, to you who are in walks of life that mean the greatest sacrifice and the greatest service we will not deny them."

I have in my mind—I cannot mention his name—a man who has served his fellows, not only in our country but in the world, perhaps as few others, if any, of this generation have. That man might have entered other work, and was qualified by powers of concentration and application to attain the distinction and reward of professional activity. Instead he laid before himself a scientific goal which, if he reached, he believed would be a great boon to his race. For five years he denied himself almost everything save the bread of life, for five years he denied himself not only those things that go to make for human comfort, but those things that go to make for human society, those amenities of social life which we all love so much. I cannot tell the House all that that man went through, though I have the information. He ends by a great success. At the time of his success and for the future, so far as ordinary rewards of the world are concerned, he is just where he began. And we say to him—though I did not doubt for a moment that he would be the last to seek anything of this kind—"We are so desperately democratic that we won't let our own country nor any other country in the world put a few letters after your name or give you an insignia of honour in recognition of the services you have done the world." Is that democracy? Is that common sense? For that reason I am not in accord with the first argument advanced by the Prime Minister.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Before my right hon. friend proceeds, I understood him to allude to the United States and to intimate that Canadians were denied recognition which is permitted in the United States. Does my right hon. friend say that titles and decorations are permitted by the United States government?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not say titles. The resolution does not refer to titles. Decorations are permitted.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Are they granted by the government of the United States? That is the real point.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Perhaps it is. This man could get a decoration if he lived in the United States; but because he lived in Canada he could not.

Mr. JACOBS: My right hon. friend does not pretend that the United States government hands out decorations?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, I do not so pretend. But if I were a citizen of the United States I would rather have my own government hand out such recognition than have a fellow-citizen honoured by a foreign government. At any rate, if a man lived in the United States he would not be denied a decoration at the hands of those who were big enough to give it to him. That is the statement I make.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Well, it is a mistake.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The second reason given is that because this resolution does not admit men to titles it is illogical to admit them to ordinary decorations. Really I cannot follow my right hon. friend's reasoning. I do not know how to put that reason in a sufficiently plausible form to make it appear serious. If we cannot admit a man to a title, why in the world should we prevent a man from accepting an ordinary decoration not carrying a title? It seems to me it would be just as illogical to say: Do not admit a man to a title because you do not admit him to any hereditary titles. No one wants hereditary titles here. That is not the point. There is no reason behind the suggestion that because you cannot go further and allow a man to wear a title, you are not using good judgment in letting him accept a decoration. Both reasons seem to me unsound.

Therefore because I think the purpose is right, because I believe in incentive, because I believe in rewards other than mere money in this world, I support the resolution.

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, as I had some little share in bringing about the result in 1919 which is questioned to-night, I desire to say only a word or two. My right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) states that this step was actuated by a spirit of so-called democracy. May I assure him that it was actuated by a spirit of real democracy, and that the parliament of Canada in 1919 did not commit any mistake? I do not think that the people of Canada have ever regretted the decision then arrived at, and I do not think this House should reverse that decision to-night. My right hon. friend says that he voted against it. I understand his position to-night, but the resolution of Mr. Nickle was adopted by an almost unanimous vote and well repre-

sented the sentiment and public feeling of the country. If there is one thing for which I am grateful to the parliament that was elected in 1917—and there were few things in that parliament, of course, that I admired—it is that it made possible the abolition of titles of honour in Canada. Titles had been lavishly bestowed throughout the country and the people became aroused; a spirit of resentment was manifested everywhere, and the result was the abolition of a practice that had certainly had a demoralizing effect.

The mover of the resolution says that the purpose of his motion is merely to interpret the resolution of Mr. Nickle. Surely the mover of the resolution adopted by the House in 1919 knows as well as my hon. friend what he meant, and Mr. Nickle himself has indicated his opposition to the motion now before us. The reason why the committee which studied the question reported that in their opinion these decorations should be abolished at the same time that titles of honour were abolished is a very simple one. The Imperial government could not very well allow foreign governments to carry on a sort of propaganda in this country by distributing decorations or orders of high standing in their own lands while the Imperial government was prevented from conferring titles of honour which really corresponded to those foreign decorations. After all, has anybody in Canada suffered because these titles and decorations were abolished in 1919?

Mr. BUREAU: Some have, in their pride.

Mr. JACOBS: The Tory party has.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I do not know that any person has really suffered. But let me tell you another thing which perhaps is a little personal. I had the honour, with my colleague, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) to represent my country at the meeting of the League of Nations. We attended certain functions, dinners and other things, where almost everybody present was decorated with ribbons, medals, and so on; only two had none—the Minister of Finance and myself. And let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, we were proud to represent Canada there; that was sufficient for us; and we were well received by everybody, without any titles or medals or ribbons. I admit that real merit deserves special recognition, but I deny that that recognition should take the form of titles or empty decorations. The people always discern real merit and recognize it. When I spoke on this question in 1919 I referred to the case of M. Thiers, of France, who had been created a baron by King Louis Philippe but refused to wear the title. But, Sir, the French people, who knew the real merit of Mr. Thiers, called him the "Liberator of the Territory" after he had delivered his country from the Germans in 1870. That title, given him by the whole people, was better than the title of baron which King Louis Philippe had bestowed upon him against his will.

I really think, Mr. Speaker, that this resolution should be rejected by the House. It is the thin end of the wedge; and I do not think the country will suffer very much if we go on without any titles.

Mr. ROBERT FORKE (Brandon): Mr. Speaker; I think the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) missed one point in his remarks with regard to this resolution, namely, the great joy of success and achievement that comes to anyone who has done something worth while. To add a few letters to a man's name when he has really achieved greatness is simply trying to paint the lily and adorn the rose. I have noticed that all the great men of past days were not known by their titles. The people generally have shown a peculiar tendency even to drop the courtesy of titles and speak about men like Gladstone, Disraeli, Napoleon and other great men by their surnames, forgetting all the trappings that their admirers or posterity tried to wrap around them. I am proud to think that Canadians are quite content with their simple names; they are satisfied to be known by those names and by any achievements they may have accomplished, without any extra adornment. The hon. Minister of Marine (Mr. Lapointe) stated it well when he said that abuses crept in when such titles or adornments were given to individuals; favouritism and special notice began to breed jealousy and ill feeling. I think, therefore, we can safely leave it to the people themselves to place the laurels upon the proper heads.

Mr. A. W. NEILL (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, I hope this resolution will pass, if only to afford a measure of honour to a celebrated British Columbian.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. NEILL: I assure my hon. friends that I have no anticipation of receiving the Order of the Yellow Dragon in the near future. But I am surprised at the moderation of the hon. member who introduces this resolution (Mr. Ladner); it is not characteristic of him. He is less than modest; he is inconsistent. Both the leader of the Government (Mr. Mackenzie King) and the leader

of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) rather indicated their appreciation of that fact. I would go further; indeed, I would be frank and go the whole length; I would abolish what is known as the Nickle resolution in its entirety. If we accept the resolution now under consideration, then it is logical to go on to the conclusion and abolish the whole thing. I always did think it was churlish that we should get up upon a pedestal and say to our honoured ruler: "We do not want the honours you may be pleased to confer upon us." We might well have provoked the retort; "I never intended to give you any." I do not think there is any other dominion that has taken the same attitude. New Zealand, and I think Australia, object to hereditary titles, as I am sure we all do, but they do not object to the granting of life titles in recognition of the honour a man may achieve in one form or another.

One hon. member suggested that we might be flooded with foreign propaganda in the form of orders and decorations. That could easily be prevented by having those honours bestowed only with the permission of the Canadian government. There would never be any refusal of them under reasonable circumstances, and under that arrangement foreign propaganda would not be possible.

The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe) spoke of the banquets and so forth that he attended with his colleague and how they sat among lords and dukes, and all did them honour, and I have no doubt they too well upheld the honour of Canada. But they would have upheld it just as well if they had had a title of distinction. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries said that they had received the greatest politeness and courtesy from these other men and I am quite sure they did. But I am quite sure that they would have received the same politeness and courtesy if they had appeared at these functions without a dress coat but there was no honour to be gained by going without a dress coat nor was there any honour to be gained by going without a decoration if they had earned it. But there are disadvantages when our representatives go abroad without having some honour or title of that kind and move amongst men who have such distinctions. As the hon. gentleman has said they invariably have a prefix to their name. If we are going into this thing of abandoning titles let us go into it in its entirety. Why allude to an hon. member as the hon. member for so and so? That is a title of honour. Away with it! Why write to our constituents as so and so. Esquire? That is a feudal title. Away with it! Why should a gentleman or his wife be referred to as Mr. or Mrs.? That is another title. Let us go back to the days of the French Commune and refer to them as Citizen and Citizeness. It is only carrying out an illogical position to its conclusion. Do we not feel a certain amount of pride when we hear Sir John A. Macdonald or Sir Wilfrid Laurier alluded to or see their names recorded in the pages of our history? We do not feel any indignity associated with that, surely. Would not any of us feel honoured if this resolution were to be passed as I suggest, and we saw the venerable leader of the Finance department honoured in the evening of his days with a title of honour? We would not feel that there was any shame attached to a title given to such a man. We would all be proud of his distinction.

I am entirely against any hereditary titles, but I think my position is sufficiently obscure to do away with any suggestion, as I said at the outset, that I have any personal interest in this matter, and to put the thing to an issue, if any hon member will second my resolution I would move to strike out the words "save those carrying titles" and the words "in education, literature, art and science."

Mr. SPEAKER: May I ask the hon. member to put his amendment in writing?

Mr. NEILL: I will do so, Mr. Speaker. Are the rewards of public life so great that we should begrudge to any man who has given the best years of his life—and they are not gained by a few years in office—recognition of this kind?

Hon. R. J. MANION (Fort William and Rainy River): As one of those who were here in 1919 when this question came before the House on the Nickle resolution, I should like to say what I think I said then, that there seems to be very frequently some confusion between titles and decorations. Those who went to the front, for example, and were given the Victoria Cross were given a decoration, but it carried with it no title. Take, for example, the hon. gentleman who represented Skeena in the last House, Colonel Peck; he was given the Victoria Cross, but Colonel Peck was still Colonel Peck. He carried his military title, it is true, but no title went with the decoration. I think as one of those who voted I quite well remember with my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe) that there is a confusion between titles and decorations.

My hon. friend for Vancouver South (Mr. Ladner) stands up in this House and takes the attitude that those, for example, who distinguish themselves in literature, if they should receive from the French government the decoration of the Legion of Honour, such as you, yourself, Mr. Speaker, carry, should be permitted to accept it. That is the position of my hon. friend for Vancouver South. But the Legion of Honour, as you well know, Sir, does not carry with it a title. It is a decoration in virtue of the fact that some man has distinguished himself from the standpoint of literature; or in the case of Colonel Cy. Peck of whom I spoke a moment ago, the Victoria Cross was awarded for gallantry on the field, and it is the highest decoration that any man could receive.

The idea of the Nickle resolution, to my mind—though Mr. Nickle did not vote for it, and I did—was to cut out the giving of knighthoods in this country whereby some men were called Sir so-and-so and their wives Lady so-and-so. I do not wish to mention names, but that was the idea of the Nickle resolution, to cut out the titles but not the decorations. My hon. friend for Vancouver South takes the attitude, and I think he is perfectly right, that decorations might well be given, but he distinctly says in his resolution "save those carrying titles." So far as I have been able to see, and I have tried to understand the question in a general way, I do not think that I would be voting against my vote of 1919 at all in supporting my hon. friend for Vancouver South on this resolution. What he is suggesting is that you give decorations, but not titles. The whole idea of the Nickle resolution, if I understood it aright at that time—and if I did not, I voted without understanding it—was to do away with the title of Sir and Lady and so do away particularly with hereditary titles. I think my hon. friend the Minister of Marine will agree with me that that was the idea.

Mr. LAPOINTE: But does not my hon. friend know that the report of the committee was in favour of doing away with all these decorations except those awarded for military or naval valour?

Mr. MANION: I understand that was the effect of the report, but certainly that was not my understanding of the report, and the debates do not show that that was the understanding of the report. My understanding of the report was that the report as presented did away with all titles or decorations of any kind which conferred a title on the people who received them—the K.C.M.G., Knight Commander of St. Michael and St. George, for instance which carried the title of Sir. Take, for instance, the decoration which you, Mr. Speaker, so well deserved and received the decoration of the Legion of Honour of France. It confers no title. Therefore that was not done away with. I remember reading just a few days ago an article in one of the papers—I think it was an English-speaking paper, but I am not sure, perhaps it was a French paper—to the effect that a number of learned gentlemen in the province of Quebec, had received decorations. I am sorry I did not cut it out at the time, but at any rate a number of learned gentlemen in the province of Quebec, professors, received decorations from the French government, but they carried no title with them.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Those gentlemen were citizens of France living in Canada.

Mr. MANION: I did not know that. The paper did not say that. I do not dispute it for a moment, but if these gentlemen were citizens of the republic of France, is there any harm in giving to a citizen of the Canadian nation, since we now speak of the Canadian nation, the same decoration? I assuredly do not wish to speak about myself but, I have the privilege of using certain letters which were given to me at Edinburgh, for example as doctor of medicine—

Mr. BUREAU: That is different. That is not a title conferred by a government.

Mr. MANION: —but I assure you I do not wish to speak of that in any spirit of vanity. Yet I have the right to use those letters which give me the title of doctor. Is there any reason why the French republic should not be able to give a decoration to some worthy gentleman such as he who was spoken of by my hon. friend for Vancouver South (Mr. Ladner)—providing it does not carry with it a title which places him on a different footing from the ordinary citizens of this country.

Now, I think I can vote for the amendment; if I cannot then I am mistaken. I certainly can vote for the resolution of my hon. friend which, as he distinctly pointed out again and again, does not mean that a decoration will carry with it a title. I think I can vote for the resolution without incurring any such reflection as is contained in the speech of the Minister of Marine. Certainly I have no idea of changing my point of view of 1919. I have no hesitation whatever in supporting the attitude of the mover of the resolution. I cannot see that there is anything wrong in it. I care not whether it

is a decoration conferred by the French republic, the English monarchy or some other country. I see no wrong in any citizen of Canada accepting it so long as it does not place him, in a general way, above the ordinary citizenship of this country.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is moved by Mr. Neill, seconded by Mr. Bancroft, in amendment to the main motion, to strike out the words "save those carrying titles" and the words "in education, literature, art and science."

Mr. MANION: May I just say one word. I did not hear the amendment distinctly when it was moved but now, having heard it read, I certainly shall vote against it. So far as the resolution is concerned I still adhere to what I said. I shall unhesitatingly suport the motion of my hon. friend for Vancouver South.

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (North Toronto): If we are going to pass this motion we might as well repeal the Nickle resolution altogether. The Nickle resolution does not apply to professional men who aid science. It would be far better, instead of granting decorations along the lines proposed in this resolution, to do something financially practical for men of science, like Dr. Banting, and not leave them to apply for the benefits of the Rockefeller Foundation or the Carnegie Institute. I read the other day a newspaper article in a British medical paper alluding to the neglect of men of science by the country, and perhaps it would not be inappropriate for me to make a quotation from that article here:

London, February 28.—The world's neglect of its men of science was the theme taken by Col. Sir Ronald Ross, the eminent authority on tropical diseases in addressing the British Science Guild here yesterday.

"You throw your geniuses on the dust heap," said Sir Ronald scornfully. He recounted the brief recognition accorded to those who solve important scientific problems although he made no complaint of his own treatment, which the record shows, has been liberal.

"The genius who saved countless lives in India by discovering methods of inoculation against cholera and plague," the speaker asserted, "is not employed by Great Britain in any capacity whatever to-day."

Sir Ronald added that he was not at liberty to divulge the name of this man, but his hearers assumed that he referred to Waldemar M. W. Haffkine, former bacteriologist with the government of India. Continuing, the speaker said:

"Walter Reed, the young American, who discovered that yellow fever is carried by the mosquito, was given a menial medical job after his discovery, seeing people's tongues and prescribing castor oil. He was allowed to fall ill and die feeling the greatest apprehension as to the future livelihood of his wife and children."

Sir Ronald referred to Sir David Bruce, who discovered the cure for sleeping sickness. "England doesn't even think it worth while to employ him now," the speaker declared.

He added that there were three or four other eminent scientists in this field who were equally neglected, and continued:

"It has often been said that the man who could find the cure for tuberculosis or who could discover the cause and cure of cancer would become a millionaire. On the contrary, it is more likely that he would die in the workhouse."

Sir Ronald urged that the country liberally pension such men, encouraging them to pursue their investigations.

I maintain that even under the Nickle resolution there is nothing to prevent the monarch, or government of any outside country conferring degrees or honours on men renowned in medicine, science or art. No government went further than the Union government in the tin-pot title business. I was a member of the executive of the exhibition board at Toronto. We had nine members on the executive and I was the only one who was not an honorary colonel. There is nothing within the four corners of the Nickle resolution to prevent the conferring of honours for any such purposes claimed in the resolution—and there is nothing in international law to stop it.

There was a commission of inquiry in Great Britain which made an investigation and brought in a report on the subject of granting of titles. Our Canadian public men seek titles more than those in England. The leading public men over there do not want them. Gladstone and Bright did not want them. Mr. Asquith, Mr. Lloyd George, and Mr. Bonar Law are not asking for titles. There is no demand for such action as this resolution proposes. I repeat that if you pass this resolution you might as well repeal the Nickle resolution in its entirety; you might as well go back to the days of the Union government when they conferred titles on everybody. If there was any person who did not receive a title from that government all he had to do was just to stand up and ask for one; he could get it for the asking. The commission which investigated the matter of titles in the Old Country did not recommend any extension of the present system of title granting, but a huge curtailment. In that respect the committee displayed admirable common sense.

Mr. R. J. WOODS (Dufferin): We are today living in very strenuous times. Efficiency is one of the most important qualities required of men, but I cannot see how the granting of titles or decorations is going to add in the slightest degree to the efficiency of those engaged in education, science, art or statesmanship. I am opposed to the resolution on this ground. I do not think it is going to add anything to the efficiency of individuals in this country, or that it is going in any way to make this land better than it is at the present time.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York): In my opinion the inevitable result of doing what is proposed here is for Canada to assume the responsibility of setting up a bureau of decorations. That is not democratic. They have not done it in the United States and they do not intend to do it. For that reason I do not think we should do it here. That is the whole issue. One would infer from the arguments advanced here to-night that we had a poor system of democracy in Canada, because there are certain services rendered to the public that are not recognized by the awarding of decorations. If the state is to make any recognition of such services it should be in a financial form rather than in the form of decoration. If that is not expedient then there ought to be an expression of appreciation by this House as representing the people. The proper thing to do is to recognize by resolution the services of those who have won distinction, and not recognize any services by the conferring of a decoration. Decorations do not count in a real vote of confidence. But recognition is something that should be forthcoming in this House. Mention has been made of Canadian scientists and doctors who have rendered great service to the public, and I believe they should be recognized in parliament or in the legislature, but it should be, not by a decoration, but by a vote of recognition or grant of money.

Mr. S. W. JACOBS (George Etienne Cartier): It will give me great pleasure to vote against both the resolution and the amendment. I can do so without torturing my conscience very much, seeing that in 1919, the time of the Union government, I voted for the resolution abolishing titles. Any person who has read the English newspapers must remember that a short time ago the question was discussed in those papers respecting the purchase by English gentlemen of titles at so much each. Knighthoods had a certain price and the cost of baronetcies was a little higher.

An hon. MEMBER: What about dukedoms?

Mr. JACOBS: I do not know what the price of dukedoms was. They were not hocked about as the others were. That being the case in England, does the mover of the amendment not think that such a condition would obtain to a more or less degree in Canada? We had had a large number of titles conferred upon Canadian citizens; why, the Lord only knows. Those gentlemen who were decorated during the closing days of the war were Tories, and during the Grit days it was the Grits that were decorated. But those of the Grit party found that when we needed these gentlemen at certain periods in their career they were all Tories. We scratched the Grits and we found they were Tories. I have in my mind's eye half a dozen Grit gentlemen who were decorated and later, deserted us.

Mr. MANION: Name them.

Mr. JACOBS: I am sure their names will suggest themselves to my hon. friend. When we needed them they were not there. They became so loyal to the Crown that they felt it was almost treason to vote for the Liberal party on certain occasions. I was reading in the reminiscences of Sir Charles Tupper's life some rather interesting stories respecting the conferring of knighthoods upon Canadian citizens in his day. Any person interested will find that Sir Charles Tupper boldly and bluntly tells us in his own reminiscences written by his own hand, that on one occasion it was found impossible to appoint a gentleman to the Senate although he had the promise of it in his pocket a year or two before the vacancy occurred. He says: "I consulted Sir John Macdonald and a letter was written to the gentleman in which we asked him if he would forego his right to be nominated to the Senate provided we would make him a K.C.M.G." The letter was sent, and in due course a wire was received saying that he was willing that his eminent services should be withheld from the Senate and from the people of Canada, in consideration of his being made a Knight Commander of St. Michael and St. George. That is a very high honour in certain cases, but not a very high honour in that particular case. We find a rather amusing incident about Sir John himself which Sir Charles relates. In 1885 or 1886, when Sir John Macdonald was in England, Sir Charles said, "I think it only right we should advance you a grade in the order which you hold." He was at that time, I think, a Knight Commander of the Bath, and Sir Charles thought he should be a Grand Commander of the Bath. He said "I saw Lord Derby about it and he acquiesced that there should be an advance in grade. The next day I notified Sir John Macdonald what I was able to do, and in due course before Sir John left London he was made a G.C.B." The following is the substance of a letter from Sir John Macdonald written to Sir Charles Tupper—

Thank you very much for what you have done, in seeing to it that I was advanced a grade in the order which I hold. Would you be good enough to see the correspondents of the Montreal Gazette and the Mail Empire and have a cable sent across to Canada, something to this effect.—

"Appointment was altogether unsolicited and was made by Mr. Gladstone"

Sir John said it would make the Grits so mad. I will say for Sir John Macdonald that he had the saving grace and the gift of humour, which my hon. friend who is moving the resolution has not developed to the same degree. I cannot see the consistency of asking that we give permission to foreign governments to decorate Canadian citizens when we have taken away from these people the right to receive decorations at our own hands or at the hands of the British government.

Mr. LADNER: Does my hon. friend understand that my resolution is limited only to foreign governments? If so, he has not read the resolution.

Mr. JACOBS: I understand that it applies only to foreign governments.

Mr. LADNER: That is a wrong understanding.

Mr. JACOBS: I may be wrong in that respect. But once we have laid the axe at the root of the tree, and have felled the tree, we do not want to let any part grow again. We did a good day's work in 1919, and I do not know that the members composing this parliament are any wiser than the members of the House in 1919 in that respect. The vote at that time was, I think, 96 to 43 or 44 in favour of the Nickle resolution. We do not want to encourage the camel to put his head into the tent, because he will end by getting his entire body in. My hon. friend evidently is oblivious to the famous words of Robert Burns:

> The rank is but the guinea's stamp,
> The man's the gowd for a' that.

I have very much pleasure in opposing both the amendment and the resolution.

Mr. H. A. FORTIER (Labelle) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, I well remember the debate which took place, in 1919, on the resolution moved by Mr. Nickle, then member for Kingston. However, after glancing over the Hansard of that date, I perceive that I was not present in the House when the vote was taken. I therefore feel perfectly at ease today in expressing my views on the present resolution and amendment before the House.

The purport of the resolution moved by the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Ladner) is that Canadian citizens may accept only such decorations as might be conferred upon them by Great Britain or by foreign countries. I do not like the phraseology of his motion. It strikes me that the hon. member is too modest in respect to Canadian citizenship. In his modesty he wants Canadians to accept decorations; only he will not grant other countries permission to bestow higher honours, such as those, at present, bestowed by Great Britain on her citizens. If we admit that Canadian citizens have a right to decorations, to my mind we should also allow them to accept all honours that might be conferred either by Great Britain or foreign countries.

In certain countries, decorations have no titles attached to them, and perhaps the hon. member had in mind such decorations, which are the highest honours that these countries can bestow. But, on the other hand, among the royal honours conferred in the British Empire, are to be found decorations bearing titles, and I state that the resolution of the hon. member is certainly too humble, since it runs shy of these decorations. I therefore cannot support this resolution. I would rather favour the proposed amendment. I think Canadians should be allowed to accept the highest honours that the British Empire or foreign countries can confer. In my opinion all decorations should be acceptable or else none whatever. As Canadian citizens we are not strangers in the British Empire and since we form part of the latter, we should stand on equal footing with all British subjects. If we adopt this resolution, it would be admitting that we, Canadian citizens, may but accept certain decorations carrying with them no titles, while those domiciled in the British Isles could, themselves, accept titles. I think that this implication of inferiority which this resolution carries with it should not be endorsed by the Canadian parliament. Again I state, since we are part of the British Empire, we have a right to all the honours that are therein conferred, and we should not be content, because we are domiciled in Canada, with a little second or third rate decoration. To my view, we should accept all that is forthcoming or nothing whatsoever, and this is why, I am rather in favour of the amendment moved by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill).

At the time we took up the question of titles, a spirit of democracy seemed to sweep over this country. We then desired to abolish certain titles, and, considering ourselves democrats, we wanted to follow the example of the United States which from times immemorial, never conferred honours on their citizens. Was it wise for us, in 1919, to follow the precedent of the United States and deny to our distinguished men well deserved honours and who certainly formed an elite in our country? Was it fair, in 1919, to abolish titles? I think this question has

been in the past and is at present much debated both on the floor of the House and all over the country.

A further argument in support of my views is that, in all civilized countries, a legion of honour imposes itself so as to create an elite which becomes an object of admiration for other nations. How do you expect to choose this elite? Who is going to raise it above the common level of all citizens? It behooves the authorities to do so. To my mind, the principle involved in honours and titles is one that has been acknowledged by all civilized nations and it is still necessary to perpetuate it so that there be an elite within the nation. It is quite proper for Canada to have an elite including not only those who have distinguished themselves on the battlefield, but also those who have devoted themselves to the public service in the field of science, art and literature, in fact in all spheres of human activity. These people certainly are deserving of recognition and I state that honours emanating from the sovereign should be conferred, unreservedly, to any eminent citizen who has given his services to the country at large, and not exclusively to the army or universities. We have no right to discriminate.

For the reasons enumerated, should we be called upon to vote on the two motions, I shall support the proposed amendment because it agrees more with my views.

I do not advocate hereditary titles. The latter are perhaps not necessary in a colony and probably not as popular as the others. I am aware that the general feeling in this country, is that hereditary titles be not conferred here; but so far as other royal honours that have been granted to eminent Canadians, for many generations past and have been honourably borne by them, we should still retain the right of accepting such titles and decorations as it was the usage of conferring upon those who have proved worthy of them. Canada, like other nations should have the privilege of creating this elite necessary to all civilized countries.

Mr. LADNER: Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to observe that the trend of this debate has centered on the question of titles. Whether that has been a deliberate in-

10 p.m. tention on the part of some hon. members or not, is not for me to say; but this is not a resolution affirming the principle of titles. This is not a resolution, in the words of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe) a moment ago, to reverse the decision of 1919, approving the abolition of titles of honour in Canada. The question is asked: Has anybody suffered because titles have been abolished? Mr. Speaker, this is not a question of titles at all. It is an effort to draw as clearly as is humanly possible a line of demarcation between men who earn recognition by their outstanding ability and men on whom honours are thrust without justification of personal merit. I submit to hon. members to-night that if they reject this resolution—I stated it before and I re-affirm it now—they are simply saying to the scholars of this country: "We who sit in authority in parliament are afraid that if we allow some great scientist to receive nominal recognition for his work at the hands of a foreign government it will mean"—to adopt the simile used by an hon. member to-night—"the camel's head entering the tent and soon we will have his body inside". My hon. friend took his information from a newspaper report of Mr. Nickle's remarks and from one other quotation which he did not very accurately give. But I submit that the point there stated is not the point in this debate at all. I would ask hon. members to direct their attention to the wording of the resolution. It refers simply to—

> decorations—save those carrying titles—for distinguished service or high attainments in education, literature, art and science.

Mr. JACOBS: Who is to decide whether the service is distinguished or not. The foreign government?

Mr. LADNER: That is a matter which must pass through governmental hands.

Mr. JACOBS: The party intended to be honoured would not have to pass an examination to ascertain whether his services were distinguished or not. I should fancy he would get the distinction because he had "pull".

Mr. LADNER: My hon. friend's mind runs in pulls. He has been pulling around so much that he cannot pull straight. With all due respect to him, he has distorted my words and has presented arguments that are not pertinent to this resolution at all. As I was about to say, Mr. Speaker, the decorations I refer to are purely academic, and I must confess that I am somewhat amazed to find an hon. gentleman in the position of the Prime Minister of Canada, eminent in the world of letters and possessing a few decorations to which he is worthily entitled—I have had the honour of reading some of his works—take the attitude that because the resolution goes in the direction of giving recognition to our scholars and students, and because it does not go further and give recognition to another

class—which I submit is less worthy—therefore the resolution should be rejected. I submit that this is no argument against the resolution.

Mr. MARTELL: If my hon. friend will permit. It is all very well to speak about academic decorations and so on, but so long as we are a portion of the British Empire why should not citizens of the Empire be permitted to accept honours from their sovereign?

Mr. LADNER: Mr. Speaker, that question is an example of the ideas which have been injected into this debate and have, I think, confused many hon. members. That is not the question before the House. I am not arguing whether or not we should interfere with the right of the sovereign to confer titles.

Mr. MARTELL: If my hon. friend will permit me again. Is it not preferable that a man should receive an honour from his sovereign, who is the head of his country, rather than that he should accept an honour, whether academic or otherwise, from the head of any foreign country? That is my idea.

Mr. LADNER: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is asking the same question which another hon. member put and which I answered. Apparently my hon. friend has not been following the debate.

Mr. MARTELL: I was out; that is the reason.

Mr. LADNER: The resolution is not of the intent the hon. gentleman suggests. It covers both British and foreign governments. Now, I wish again to emphasize what the point of this resolution really is. It is to enable the scholars and students of our country—and the wording is confined to them—to have the right to receive a distinction conferred on them by the British government or by any foreign government. What right have we as members of this House to say to the intellectual giants of this country: "We will not permit you that right; we are afraid that you will become some sort of a camel and get your head into the tent and later we will have your whole body in."

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Does my hon. friend really believe it will be adding to the standing of any Canadian in the intellectual world to confine his recognition on the part of governments to an inferior order of merit, if I may use that term, which I think is correctly applied? The orders that my hon. friend's resolution covers are second or third class, so to speak. A Canadian who received a second or third class honour would be judged in European circles by that recognition and would be prevented from receiving anything higher. That is the point to which I should like my hon. friend to direct his attention.

Mr. LADNER: That is a question for the recipient to determine. If he wishes to accept a second or third class degree of the Legion of Honour instead of some higher degree in that order, it is for him to say whether he will or will not. But what right have we as members of parliament to deny him the privilege of receiving even an inferior order?

Mr. JACOBS: We want to save him from himself.

Mr. LADNER: Mr. Speaker, I have seen many generous gentlemen of that kind, but we do not always take them at their word.

Mr. MARTELL: Will my hon. friend permit me again? If that is the case, what right has parliament to come in and say to a citizen of the British Empire that he shall not receive from his sovereign, if the latter sees fit to honour him, the highest honour in his gift?

Mr. LADNER: The hon. gentleman is back again to the old question of titles, and that is what is confusing this debate. This is not a question of titles; this is a question of academic distinctions. I would point out to hon. members that throughout Canada there are in our universities many professors from all parts of the world helping to build up our institutions. They slave all their life and the only thing they can expect in return for their unstinted effort and distinguished service is what? It is not money. It is recognition in honour of distinguished accomplishment in their particular field of work. But is there anything wrong in asking that that honour should be ear-marked by a decoration from some foreign government or from the British government? I am at a loss to understand any reason why hon. members should exercise their authority here to preclude the granting of such decorations to our academic world. In my judgment it is a blind submission to a prejudice of mind which arises from the old Nickle resolution. I am frank to say that I think it is a very narrow viewpoint, for it is ungenerous in our law-makers to deny to our educationalists, our artists, our scientists and our authors any recognition of their merits.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me say that this resolution relates only to the distinguished accomplishments of men in the

fields of education, literature, art and science, and it does not permit them to receive a decoration which in any way carries with it a title. I appeal to members of this House to throw away their prejudice, to be more generous, and to give to the classes to which I have referred the opportunity to receive honours. The right still remains with parliament to correct any abuses which may arise if this proposal is adopted. From the days of titles the pendulum has swung very far to the other extreme. Let us be moderate; let us be sensible; let us be reasonable. Let us do justice to the men who are struggling in the educational fields of Canada.

Amendment (Mr. Neill) negatived.

The House divided on the main motion (Mr. Ladner), which was negatived on the following divison:

YEAS

Messrs.

Baxter,	MacLaren,
Chaplin,	Martell,
Fortier,	Meighen,
Hanson,	Neill,
Jones,	Spence,
Ladner,	Stevens,
MacKelvie,	Stewart (Leeds)—14.

NAYS

Messrs.

Baldwin,	Forrester,
Bancroft,	Fournier,
Benoit,	Gardiner,
Binette,	Garland (Bow River),
Bird,	Gauvreau,
Black (Huron),	Gervais,
Black (Yukon),	Gordon,
Boucher,	Gould,
Bourassa,	Graham,
Brethen,	Halbert,
Brown,	Hammell,
Bureau,	Hatfield,
Cahill,	Healy,
Caldwell,	Hodgins,
Cardin,	Hoey,
Carmichael,	Hudson,
Carroll,	Hughes,
Carruthers,	Humphrey,
Casgrain,	Jacobs,
Chevrier,	Johnston (Last Mountain),
Church,	Kellner,
Coote,	Kennedy (Glengarry & Stormont),
d'Anjou,	Kennedy (Port Arthur & Kenora),
Delisle,	King (Huron),
Denis (Joliette),	King (Kootenay),
Denis (St. Denis),	King, Mackenie (York),
Desaulniers,	Kyte,
Deslauriers,	Lanctôt,
Desrochers,	Lapierre,
Drummond,	Lapointe,
Elliott (Dundas),	Leader,
Elliott (Waterloo),	Leger,
Euler,	Lovett,
Fafard,	Lovie,
Fielding,	Low,
Findlay,	Lucas,
Fontaine,	Maclean (York),
Forke,	Macphail,
	McBride,
	McGiverin,
	McKay,
	Malcolm,
	Marcile (Bagot),
	Mercier,
	Michaud,
	Milne,
	Mitchell,
	Morin,
	Motherwell,
	Munro,
	Murdock,
	Ouimet,
	Papineau,
	Parent,
	Pelletier,
	Pritchard,
	Raymond,
	Reed,
	Rinfret,
	Robb,
	Robichaud,
	Robinson,
	Robitaille,
	Sales,
	Savard,
	Séguin,
	Sexsmith,
	Shaw,
	Sinclair (Queens, P.E.I.),
	Speakman,
	Spencer,
	Steedsman,
	Stewart (Argenteuil),
	Stewart (Humboldt),
	Stork,
	Sutherland,
	Thurston,
	Tobin,
	Wallace,
	Ward,
	Warner,
	Woods,
	Woodsworth—121.

RULES OF THE HOUSE

MOTION BY MR. JOHNSTON FOR A SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Mr. J. FRED. JOHNSTON (Last Mountain) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House a special committee of eleven members be appointed to inquire jointly with Mr. Speaker into the advisability of adopting a rule of the House which will provide that an amendment to an amendment be allowed on the motion that the Speaker leave the chair for the House to resolve itself into committee of Supply or Ways and Means; with power to send for persons, papers and records, and to report from time to time.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I draw the attention of the hon. member to the fact that the motion calls for a special committee of eleven members to inquire jointly with Mr. Speaker into the subject matter of the resolution? As the Speaker is called upon to give rulings on questions of this nature, he would prefer not to be included in the committee. But I shall see that while the committee sits, if it is agreeable to the House, the Clerk and the Assistant Clerk will give all the assistance needed.

Mr. JOHNSTON: I am quite agreeable to that, Mr. Speaker. In drafting the resolution in the form in which it now is I thought I was following the best procedure. My remarks at this time will be very brief.

The resolution that you have just read, Mr. Speaker, is, to my mind, self-explanatory and needs very little comment from me or from those in support of it, but its subject matter is one of very great importance to those of us in this quarter of the House. The House will remember that last session the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar), then leader of this party, moved a certain amendment, which you, Mr. Speaker, ruled out of order. While

we are hopeful that the budget to be brought down by the Minister of Finance will be of such a character that we can give it a wholehearted support, we do not want to find ourselves in the same predicament that we were in last session. If the government's proposals, as set forth in the budget, do not meet with our approval we want to be in a position to place our opinion before the House and that, under the existing rules, we will be debarred from doing. It may be thought that in asking for this special committee at this time we are asking for a great deal, but in my opinion the work of such a committee should not be unduly prolonged. As a matter of fact I think the object sought could be accomplished in a very few hours. Therefore, in view of the importance of the subject I feel no hesitation in asking the House to grant this request.

Conditions have changed. The rule which governs in the case of amendments to a motion to go into Committee of Supply, or to go into Committee of Ways and Means, was drafted when there were only two parties in this chamber. To-day we have three.

Mr. FIELDING: Five.

Mr. GRAHAM: Four or five.

Mr. JOHNSTON: At any rate we have three great parties. The opinions of a great many of the electorate of this country are represented by over sixty members sitting in this quarter of the chamber. We should, therefore, be able to give expression to those opinions by way of resolution and formal motion, and yet we are debarred from doing that by the rules of the House. In a procedure debate in the British parliament, in 1861, Lord Palmerston used these words:

> This House has another function to discharge and one highly conducive to the public interest—namely, that of being the mouthpiece of the nation, the organ by which all opinions, all complaints, all notions of grievances, all hopes and expectations, all wishes and suggestions which may rise, may be discussed, examined, answered, rejected or redressed. This I hold to be as important as the other two (namely legislation and the granting of supplies.)

I hope, therefore, the House will accede to our request and grant us this special committee.

When this matter was brought up last year the Finance Minister said this in reply to the leader of the Progressive party:

> If I may be permitted to make a comment on what my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Crerar) says, I would remind him that being the second largest group in the house it was his undoubted right to take the place of the official opposition if he had so desired. Of his own motion and for good reasons, satisfactory to himself and his friends he elected not to take that position. There is an advantage under the British practice in occupying the position of the official opposition. My hon. friend waived his right to that advantage, and I do not think he ought now to complain of the consequences of his action.

Had the hon. member for Marquette chosen to take the position of leader of the Opposition in this House, which no doubt was his right by virtue of the number of members he represented, we would have found hon. gentlemen to my right in the position we occupy to-day; and I for one would not want to see them so placed that it would not be possible for them to put their views before the House in a concrete form. Yet that is exactly the situation in which we find ourselves at the present time. Without offering any further remarks at this stage, I hope the House will grant our request as set out in this resolution.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): If I felt, as my hon. friend from Last Mountain (Mr. Johnston) feels, that by the rules of the House, he and his colleagues are precluded from an opportunity of giving expression to their views I should be willing to join him in the desire for a change. But I think he is mistaken in that respect. It is true that on this particular motion in relation to the budget, and in certain other cases, it is only possible to have one amendment. I think there is a good purpose in that. The object is that you shall concentrate the attention of the House upon a particular matter, whereas if you are to have various amendments brought forward confusion would be created. This rule is one of long established practice in this parliament and, I think, in the Mother of Parliaments as well. There are many opportunities where hon. gentlemen opposite, any hon. member in fact, may find means of expressing their views. Every time the House is moved into Committee of Supply on certain days of the week it is the right of any hon. member to move an amendment setting forth his views on any particular question. Therefore the opinion entertained by my hon. friend that there is no opportunity under the rules for these hon. gentlemen to give expression to their views is, I am sure, an erroneous one. The rules of parliament have been well established for a good purpose. I think it is not wise that we should too hastily change them. In the present case I am quite sure that every time the motion is made for the House to go into Committee of Supply there is abundant opportunity for any hon. member to bring forward a resolution giving expression to his views. Feeling, therefore, that there is not that lack of opportunity that my hon. friend has in his mind, feeling that the rules that are established have been estab-

lished for good purposes and should not be hastily changed, and feeling assured that under the existing practice there is ample opportunity for any hon. member in this House to bring forward a motion to give expression to his views, I hope the hon. member will not press his motion for a change in the rules.

Mr. A. B. HUDSON (South Winnipeg): When this matter came before the House at the last session I supported the motion moved by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) and supported it on this basis: that under the rules and practice of the English House of Commons a second amendment was permitted. I think I am correct in saying that it is still permitted. However, some 50 years ago there was an apparent misapprehension, and a different rule was adopted in this House, and that rule was subsequently followed. It seems to me that the practice as established in England should be adopted, particularly under the existing composition of the present House.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): Perhaps it is incumbent on me, owing to the special privileges of the leader of an official opposition, referred to by the hon. member for Last Mountain (Mr. Johnston) in his quotation from the Finance Minister, to declare myself on this matter. If I had regard only to party advantage I would be in favour, while I am in opposition, of the motion of my hon. friend and the object he has in view. The more amendments that can be moved the easier for an opposition to make the position of a government difficult. I am against the object of the motion, and being definitely against it, I cannot consistently support the motion itself looking to the appointment of a committee. I agree with the reasoning of the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) and agreeing with it. I think I should say so.

I do not know that it is the British practice to have an amendment to an amendment to the motion for Supply. I am not affirming that it is not. I have not looked into the question for some time. Even if it were, it would not persuade me that we should adopt that practice here. It must be recalled in this connection that in Great Britain they have not only a closure rule but a more drastic—I might almost say, a destructive—closure rule. They have not only one but several. They have powers vested in the majority that we never dreamed of exercising in this parliament—powers of forcing to a conclusion any debate, no matter how many amendments may be moved. For that reason there is not any particular danger in admitting of an amendment to an amendment to Supply, in the British House. We however have not in our parliament seen fit to adopt the extreme closure rules they have there and which they exercise almost daily. They do not always go to the last limit to exercise it, but they would, only for the fact that it is there, and members, knowing it is there, accede to a condition that does not require its exercise all the time. But as a matter of actual practice their control over the debate is exercised in a way we know nothing of in this parliament.

Parenthetically let me say I have been waiting now for eighteen months, or almost that, for the members of the government and the members of the party who support the government to come forward and destroy that awful monster against which they railed some years ago when the mild form of closure we have now in our rules was first adopted. I can recall how there were predictions of the collapse of the institution. Freedom was at an end, and it must be remembered that at that time these hon. members were in opposition; they rose and followed the lead of one distinguished orator among them who declared that in matters of trade, as well as in matters of rules of the House, he was for freedom on both counts of the indictment, and he demanded that this awful closure preventing freedom of speech be voted down. Even since the closure rules were adopted in 1913 up to the going out of power of the late government they were a constant subject of denunciation at the hands of hon. members opposite who saw in them something that really meant the destruction of free parliamentary government, or responsible government as they called it. I have been looking then for this government to bring in an amendment to the rules abolishing the closure that was adopted in 1913. So far I have waited in vain for any sign. Why? Because in every party, as the duties of parliament multiply, it becomes necessary that there be some control over the lengthening of debate and of discussion, if the business of the country is to be attended to and despatched, and we in this parliament have, I think, a rule that bears less heavily and harshly on oppositions than that adopted in any other parliament either in Great Britain or in any country where parliamentary government prevails.

Having regard to the nature of our closure rules, I think it would be a mistake to admit of an amendment to an amendment to Supply. I believe at the hands of an unscrupulous opposition business might be blocked. Such

things have been known in this House, although hon. members to my left have had no experience of that kind. I have often wished they had sat in this parliament and known what it was to have an opposition conducted without any regard at all for any principle of fairness to the government, without any regard of the public interest. I often wished they had witnessed it. But if an amendment to an amendment to Supply is to be permitted, under our closure rule it seems to me that it would be possible to so block public business that reasonable expedition could not be exercised and reasonable progress could not be made. Nor do I think any hardship results under the present rules. I followed the reasoning of the hon Minister of Finance in that regard. There is no special right on the part of the official opposition in regard to amendments. The right to move an amendment to Supply is open to any group or any member just as it is open to me. It might be moved by myself or any hon. member behind me. It might have been moved by any member of the Progressive party at least a score of times this session, but no such motion was made. Hon. members say "But when a motion is made we cannot find ourselves just satisfied with either the amendment or the main motion". Then if they are not satisfied the thing to do is to vote against it.

Mr. SHAW: My right hon. friend, perhaps, does not quite understand. Suppose an amendment such as the one proposed last year by the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) were voted upon, and we presume voted down, would it not then be in order for anybody else to move an amendment at that time, after the disposition of the first amendment?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think that can be done on an amendment to Supply, or Ways and Means. Supply Ways and Means are in the same category as respects the rule. This motion calls for a committee to inquire "into the advisability of adopting a rule of the House which will provide that an amendment to an amendment be allowed," so that the point brought up by the hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Shaw) would not be pertinent to this resolution.

Mr. SHAW: I quite agree to that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I was confining my remarks to the resolution. I think if the resolution read differently, I would oppose it too; but we do not need to discuss that now. The resolution as it reads calls for permission to move an amendment to an amendment. I do not know why there is any embarrassment. What hon. members vote on as regards an amendment to Supply is this; they vote on the merits of that amendment. If my hon. friends to my left, on a motion to go into Supply, desired to move an amendment, I am sure that that amendment would contain no embarrassment for me, nor, I believe for any member of this group. If it were an amendment such as was proposed by the hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Shaw) some time ago, in line precisely with what we had urged ourselves, we would support it. If it was opposed to that, inconsistent with that, we would oppose it. We would not need to express our views by moving an amendment to it. We could simply wait for Supply the next time and then move our amendment. There are no restraints that fall on us particularly, and consequently we have nothing we can complain of. For that reason, I do not see why there is any need to amplify the rule in this regard. I think it will tend to prolixity of discussion, to the hampering of public business, and for that reason I am opposed to such an amendment to the rule, were such an amendment to the rule before the House. Being of that opinion, I do not see why I should support the appointment of a committee to consider arriving at a result, which result I do not think would be beneficial to the business of the House.

Mr. ALFRED SPEAKMAN (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, I rise on this occasion with a good deal of diffidence, because I recognize that a large part of the debate upon this question, if there be a debate must centre around parliamentary procedure of the past, and from that point of view, I acknowledge myself incompetent to speak. I shall not attempt to discuss the matter from that point of view at all. I shall endeavour rather to give the reasons why we feel it would be fair and right that we should be in a position to move an amendment to the amendment if we so wished; or that if we were not in a position where we were debarred, any other considerable body of opinion as represented by a third party in this House, should be placed in that position. We believe it would be in the public interest that any considerable body of opinion as represented by any large party in this House, should be given the right, not only to express their views by way of debate, not only to advance their views by way of argument, but to be able to put their ideas forward in concrete form and to back those ideas by their vote at the time that they wished to exercise that

11 p.m.

right. That is the reason why we have now moved for the appointment of this committee.

We recognise to some extent the objections. During the debate of last year, objections were brought forward very eloquently. We also presented our point of view, and I am not going to repeat what was said at that time. But we felt then that we were placed in an almost impossible position. I do not mean, as is suggested, that we were embarrassed by either the amendment or the budget itself; but we were placed in this position, that our vote had to be a purely negative vote, not a positive vote. We were not voting for something in which we believed; but we were giving a purely negative vote, voting against two things, neither of which were satisfactory from our point of view. We do not believe that is a fair or just position in which any large body of opinion in this House or in this country should be placed, and that again is our reason for bringing this matter forward at this time. During the discussion, it was pointed out, and I have no doubt quite correctly,—we have no quarrel with the decision rendered at that time— that it was impossible for us, under the rules of the House, to bring in such a second amendment, and while we, of course, challenged the decision, this was merely for the purpose of reaffirming our position in the matter. But we were also told at that time that if we wished to have the rules of the House amended, the proper procedure was to bring the matter forward by way of resolution and to have the matter discussed on its merits at that time. That is the form which our motion is taking at the present time. Several objections have been advanced to that. One is that it would so lengthen the discussion on the budget as to hamper public business; that there would be a great deal more discussion, more debate on the point, if we were allowed to introduce a second amendment To my mind, that is hardly consistent with the view that has been expressed that we are at liberty to advance our arguments at as great length as we wish on the budget itself. A discussion would take place; a discussion, no doubt, will take place whether we are allowed to move a second amendment or not. The only point will be that without our amendment on which we can speak and vote, the discussion will have to be largely academic, and we wish to have it to the point.

If I understood the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) correctly, he stated that the right to move that amendment was not confined to the leader of the official opposition. Possibly not; but most certainly we, the new members in this House, believed it was the custom of this House to accord that courtesy to the official leader of the Opposition, and to give him the first right to move an amendment if he so wished We felt this was so much in accord with procedure that we did not criticise that right at all.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Conceding that for the moment, was the hon. gentleman or his leader not in a position the very next day, when Supply would come up again, to move the exact position of those he represented? So, where is the hardship?

Mr. SPEAKMAN: That is quite possible. I am not, of course, going to get into an argument on the matter of rules and procedure with the leader of the Opposition; but we feel that the one time when our views can be advanced with force is at the time when the budget is brought down and the amendment to the budget brought in. We can no doubt bring our views forward at other times; but we wish to bring them forward when we shall have an equal opportunity for discussion, and when our amendment will carry the same weight in the country as the budget or the amendment to the budget. It is for that reason that we ask this House to appoint a committee to go into this matter and, if possible, to amend the rules of the House so that they will conform, not so much with the ancient practice of this House, but with actual conditions which now confront this House. We may be correct or incorrect in believing that the day of the purely two-party system has gone; but that is a matter of conjecture. It is not, however, a matter of conjecture that at the present time the two-party system has ceased to exist, and it is in order to bring the rules of this House into accord with actual conditions as they now exist in this House and in the country, that we make this motion.

Mr. T. W. BIRD (Nelson): Mr. Speaker, this is a matter of very great importance to the party in this corner of the House, and I fail to see the force of the argument of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) as to the need for concentration. As I apprehend it, the only way to centre the mind of the House upon a question is to eliminate in an orderly fashion the minority views that prevail on a given question. If you do not permit us by an amendment to the amendment to do that, to discuss our views, the result will be that when we get back to the main motion we will express our views just the same. Then where is your concentration? I have great faith in the time-honoured rules of order

that have obtained in debate from ancient times, methods of accelerating the business of a meeting or of a legislative assembly by eliminating one by one the views of the various elements therein.

With regard to the argument of the right hon. leader of the Opposition, (Mr. Meighen) relative to the closure, I do not see why the privilege of moving an amendment to the amendment need be abused and become a tool in the hands of an unscrupulous opposition, as he says, for dilatory purposes. If there is any danger of this happening, cannot we overcome it by permitting not many amendments to the amendment, but only one? So long as there are three parties in the House I think it is a fair proposition to allow an amendment to the amendment. This need not invite trouble from an unscrupulous opposition. Oppositions have not any right to be unscrupulous anyway. Therefore I think this objection could be overcome in the way I have indicated.

Mr. MORIN: My hon. friend says there are three parties. What about the Labour party.

Mr. IRVINE: Hear, hear.

Mr. BIRD: Well, as soon as the labour party attains to such dimensions that it can reasonably claim the right to another amendment I would be very glad to extend that privilege to it.

Mr. IRVINE: What are the dimensions?

Mr. BIRD: With respect to the argument of the right hon. leader of the Opposition as to the privilege which any one of us has of moving an amendment to the amendment, will not that fact place the Speaker in rather the awkward position of having to discriminate between the two oppositions? Will it not put him in this position, that one year he will have to permit the official opposition this privilege and the next year the unofficial opposition? Now, I do not think we ought to place the Speaker in that position. I think it would be more consonant with the dignity of this House to frame a rule to permit the third party to move an amendment to the amendment.

Then in regard to discussing the merits of a motion, what are the merits of a given amendment? What were the merits, for instance, of the amendment moved last session by the official opposition? Did its merits consist in its verbal construction or in the motive that lay behind it? I guarantee that under the circumstances in which we are at the present time the official opposition carries on its duties

with no other purpose than some day to attain power at any price, because after all that is the time-honoured duty of an official opposition. Under traditional usages an official opposition is not expected to offer any constructive suggestions that may be of benefit to the country, but is always to direct its energies to destructive criticisms, to a strenuous effort to oust the government from power. Therefore I say it is impossible for a third party to judge of the merits of an amendment moved by an official opposition. The amendment last year, while it was agreeable to us verbally, was so disagreeable to us in its motive that we could not support it. We believed that its purpose was not only to embarrass the government but also to embarrass us. Undoubtedly its purpose was incidentally to align us with the official opposition as being in favour of what practically amounted to a resolution of want of confidence in the government. I repeat, it is impossible for a third party to decide at a given moment upon the merits of an amendment moved by an official opposition, because this official opposition is actuated primarily by a desire to attain office.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will my hon. friend permit me a question? He was arguing a moment ago, was he not, that the duty and regular practice of an official opposition is to oppose the government's position irrespective of the merits? Am I right in that?

Mr. BIRD: Yes, that is what I was arguing.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the hon. gentleman reflect on what is being done at the present moment? Am I not supporting the government and is he not opposing?

Mr. BIRD: The exception sometimes proves the rule.

Mr. RINFRET: There are other cases.

Mr. BIRD: But I was arguing not the present position of the leader of the official opposition, but his usual practice, which I think bears out what I was setting forth as the traditional attitude of an official opposition.

Mr. CALDWELL: There is a morganatic alliance once in a while.

Mr. BIRD: Under the two party system as it has obtained here and in Great Britain, the duty of the official opposition is to obstruct and criticize, never to help, and under all circumstances its one motive is to oust the government from office. So long as the right hon. gentleman occupies his present position he will have to approximate to the traditional

standard, otherwise I think he will not be fulfilling the duties that his party will demand of him.

If this usage had any reasonable tradition behind it one would hesitate to suggest its removal, but so far as I can see it came into being through pure accident and has maintained itself simply by its own inertia. For that reason, for its lack of support in tradition and in general usage, and for the injustice it works on this party in muzzling and preventing us from expressing our views on the merits of a question, I certainly shall most cordially support the resolution.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I shall not take up the time of the House in speaking at any length on this resolution because I realize that in our rules and practices there is nothing which counts for so much as experience in parliamentary affairs, and in comparison with that of many hon. members my experience has been exceedingly limited. I would feel that the House was entitled to give every consideration to any expression of view by so old and distingushed a parliamentarian as the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding). And may I also say that I think the House should receive with great respect and consideration the views of one who has been a member for so long a time as the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) and who takes so thoughtful and so keen an interest in all matters pertaining to parliamentary procedure.

The hon. member for Last Mountain (Mr. Johnston) proposes a change in a rule which has been in existence ever since confederation. I would draw attention to the circumstance that the support likely to be given his motion comes almost exclusively from hon. members who have been at most one or two years in parliament. I think our experience thus far goes to show that many hon. members sitting opposite are beginning to find that many rules and practices which at the outset they were inclined to look upon as irksome or cumbersome, have, after all, the weight of experience behind them and are not by any means useless or burdensome, but that, on the contrary, they make for expedition in the work of parliament, and, indeed, for clearness in all matters pertaining to public discussion.

Reference has been made by the hon. member for South Winnipeg (Mr. Hudson) to what he alleges to be a somewhat different practice in England; and the last speaker (Mr. Bird) has suggested that in our present practice we are not following the English rule but are taking a less enlightened view. May I quote from a decision which was given by His Honour the Speaker on June 6, 1922, a passage which is pertinent to this point. At that time Mr. Speaker said:

> In Great Britain, more than one amendment may be moved on the motion that the Speaker leave the chair for the House to go into committee of Supply or Ways and Means, but it is done on conditions quite different from the practice in this House. Whenever an amendment is moved striking out all the words after "That" from the main motion, the Speaker puts the question "That all the words proposed to be left out stand part of the question." If this is voted in the negative, amendments and sub-amendments are allowed, but if it is voted in the affirmative, they are not.
>
> The practical meaning of this procedure is that the House grants leave to move the amendment. In another sense it is nothing more nor less than the previous question.

When one comes to look into the rules of the British House and compare them with our own, one will see that the same object is sought to be obtained by both.

The hon. member who has just taken his seat and the mover of the resolution have urged that conditions are different at the present time; that we have three groups in the House, whereas the rules were intended to meet conditions where there are only two. There are one or two observations I should like to make in this connection. First, there is no reason why a subsequent parliament might not have four groups, each of which may wish to press its particular view at the same time and in much the same way as hon. gentlemen opposite who belong to the present third group. The danger of amending the rules to meet any particular situation is that they then become applicable for all future occasions, and the possible mischief that is being worked in an unseen direction may be greater than the evil it is attempted to cure. The circumstance that we have three groups at this time does not, it seems to me, justify our changing practices which have been established ever since the days of confederation.

Moreover, having three groups in the House is not a thing which is entirely new to British parliamentary institutions. In the British parliament there have been at different times large and important groups, and the British government and parliament have been called upon to consider what was the best practice to adopt to meet such situations. They have not, however, on that score altered their procedure. May I in this connection quote a further paragraph from the decision of Mr. Speaker to which I have just referred, and which seems to be very pertinent to the subject. It is to the effect that, after all, the duty of the Speaker is not to recognize groups but to regard all individuals in the House as hav-

ing equal rights in his presence. The paragraph I wish to quote is as follows:

As to the suggestion—

It refers to the case that was alluded to a moment ago.

—to give the hon. member for Marquette and his supporters the opportunity of expressing their views upon the budget proposals, I must say that the Speaker, in his interpretation of the rules, is not at liberty to recognize the existence of parties or groups in the House. Although he has to observe certain amenities in giving precedence to leaders in debate, he presides over an assembly of the people's representatives where every member has an equal right of using the rules and usages to express his views on public matters.

In England, although the Home Rule party under Mr. Parnell and his successors consisted of a large group, it never was given an official status in parliamentary procedure. Even to-day, there are at Westminster several groups or parties, but they are all subject to the same rules of procedure. All the members are on an equal footing. I think our rules and practice based on precedents, traditions, and usages give every hon. member ample opportunity to put himself on record upon any question.

That, I think, summarizes conclusively the position we have been discussing, and the force of that view ought to carry weight with hon. members in considering whether it is wise at this moment to endeavour to meet a present situation by changing rules that have been found to be of advantage in the carrying on of the business of the House for some fifty or sixty years.

I would like to say this further word. There are already a number of special committees of the House at work. The time of a good many hon. members is taken up in that connection, and if there is to be a special committee to consider this matter it would seem advisable that other rules—and there are some that would stand revision—should be taken into consideration at the same time. I submit it would be better for the House to examine all the rules which it thinks are in need of revision, and when appointing a special committee give to the committee the work of an entire revision.

However, coming to the main point, namely, the opportunity of hon. members to express their views, I can only repeat what has already been said so effectively; that the rules of the House are such as to permit every hon. member and every group, not only in one particular but in many, to present the views they wish to put forward either as individual members or as expressing the sentiment of the groups to which they belong. The old established rule of the limitation to one amendment on the budget has been in existence, as I have said, for a long time without a change, simply because of the virtue it holds in itself—and that, I trust, the House will not readily sacrifice.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

Mr. SPEAKER: The reply of the mover will close the debate.

Mr. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, despite all that has been said, I still think that the rules of this House are made to serve the purposes of hon. members of the House, not the government. This being the case, I still feel that the House should grant our request and give us a special committee.

The right hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) referred to the fact that there was no rule—I am afraid I shall not be able to state this in exact language—that the Speaker should see the leader of the official opposition first in case of an amendment to any motion being moved. Well, it would seem to me that if our request were granted and we were given the right to move a second amendment, it would relieve you, Sir, from a very embarrassing position. Having seen the leader of the official opposition first last year, I would take it that it would be only just and fair under existing rules if you were to see the leader of this group first this year. If that is the case, I would for the time being accede to the request of the right hon. the Prime Minister and withdraw my motion, with a view to having a special committee appointed to inquire into the whole matter of the revision of the rules at another session. But this particular rule, Mr. Speaker, is not so well founded as some hon. members would make it appear. In 1855 Mr. Speaker Smith gave a ruling that but one amendment could be moved when the House was moved into Committee of Supply, but in 1860 he reversed that ruling. So we have precedent for the change we are asking for at this time.

The hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Shaw), put a question to the right hon. leader of the Opposition whether if one amendment had been moved and voted down could a second amendment to the main motion be moved? We have a direct ruling on that to the contrary. No second amendment to the main motion may be moved. I feel that if these rules are to serve the purpose of this House at the present time an amendment is necessary. The Minister of Finance in speaking on another matter in this House this session made use of the phrase "We are dealing with a condition, not a theory." That is what we are confronted with here to-day. There is no use conjecturing about how many parties may come to this House in the future. There may be a score. We shall have to deal with that condition when we meet it. At the present time we have three parties, and I think it is only right and fair that a group consisting of sixty members of this House

should be given the right to move a second amendment when the House is moved into Committee of Supply or Ways and Means.

Motion negatived.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

TESTING OF DAIRY CATTLE

Mr. CALDWELL:

For a copy of all correspondence between the federal Department of Agriculture, or any official of the Department of Agriculture, and the town of Moncton, New Brunswick, or any official of the town of Moncton, or any official of the Department of Health of the province of New Brunswick, regarding the testing of dairy cattle, under the Animals Contagious Diseases Act in the vicinity of Monton, New Brunswick.

NIPISSING INDIAN RESERVE

Mr. LAPIERRE:

For a copy of all papers, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents which have passed between the government or any minister or official thereof, and all persons who have obtained land in the Nipissing Indian reserve, near Sturgeon Falls, Ontario, since its opening to settlers.

ORIENTAL IMMIGRATION

Mr. McQUARRIE:

For a copy of all papers, correspondence, letters, documents, telegrams, and other writings which have passed between the present government, or any minister or official thereof, and the government of the province of British Columbia, or any minister or official thereof, on the subject of oriental immigration, or in any way affecting or dealing with the rights or privileges of orientals in Canada.

GRAND TRUNK ARBITRATION

Mr. d'ANJOU:

For a copy of the bills for living allowances and disbursements, retainers, certificates of taxation and authorities to act on behalf of the government, of W. N. Tilley, K.C., H. A. Lovett, K.C., Hector McInnes, K.C., J. C. H. Dusseault, K.C., E. F. Newcombe, Z. A. Lash, K.C., Pierce Butler of Minneapolis, T. Ludlow Christie of New York, Laurence Jones & Co. of London, England, Charles Russell & Co. of London, England, in connection with the Grand Trunk Arbitration and the legislation upon which such proceedings were based.

VERMILION TOWN LOTS

Mr. SPENCER:

For a copy of all papers, correspondence, letters, documents, telegrams and other writings which have passed between the government of the day, or any minister thereof, and any person or persons connected with the sale to the government of lots 31 and 32, block 8, in the town of Vermilion, Alberta.

SIX NATIONS INDIAN RESERVE

Mr. SENN:

For a copy of all correspondence, papers, writings, petitions, telegrams and other documents passing between the Department of Indian Affairs, the minister and officers of this department, and the Six Nations Indian reserve, its council or members or residents thereof, since 1st January, 1922, having to do with the relations of such reserve to the government of Canada and to the complaints of such council regarding the Department of Indian Affairs.

EQUALIZATION OF RAILWAY RATES

STATEMENT BY MR. SPEAKER

Mr. SPEAKER: Before I leave the chair I would ask the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen), who was not in his seat when this matter came up, to study with some of the older members of the House the point which was raised when the motion of Mr. Clark came before the House a short while ago. I have examined the question since, and my mind is perturbed. I am not decided to give a ruling, and I would like to have enlightenment from the older members of the House. The question will likely come up on Wednesday, if I mistake not, and before giving the ruling I would like to hear the opinion of some of the older members of the House.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In that point, Mr. Speaker, I think it has been arranged that the motion will come up on Monday instead of Wednesday.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the House adjourned at 11.27 p.m.

Tuesday, March 20, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

REPORT

First report of the select standing committee on Marine and Fisheries.—Mr. Duff.

GREAT LAKES DISARMAMENT

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I beg to lay on the Table copy of papers, correspondence, documents, etc., passed between the government of Canada and the government of the United States relative to the Great Lakes disarmament question. This is the correspondence asked for by my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) a few days ago. The return includes only such correspondence as took place betwen the termination of the war and the taking of office by the present administration. The correspondence that has taken place since relates to matters still under negotiation and is therefore not brought down at present.

ALLEGED INCOMPLETE RETURN

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. STEVENS: On March 12 the House passed an order for return of all correspon-

dence, etc., between the Attorney General of British Columbia and the Solicitor General. The return contains one letter from the Attorney General in which the following occurs: "With reference to the above matter and my letter of the 16th," etc. Another letter indicates that a communication not included in the return had been sent by the Solicitor General; the reference is to "your letters of the 16th and 26th." I would respectfully direct the attention of the ministry to the fact that this return is incomplete and that the letter of the 16th ought to be brought down in compliance with the order of the House of March 12.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The Solicitor General (Mr. McKenzie) is not in his seat at the moment. I shall have pleasure in directing his attention to my hon. friend's remarks.

PRIVILEGE—MR. BANCROFT

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. BANCROFT: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. In the morning papers it is suggested that I supported the amendment moved last night by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill) to the titles resolution. I think you called my name, Mr. Speaker, as seconder, but I did not understand that that implicated me in any way. I may say that I took a geat deal of satisfaction in voting against both the amendment moved by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni and the main motion moved by the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Ladner). I may say also that I take a great deal of pleasure in sharing this desk with the hon. member for Comox-Alberni, but I do not want to be put in any postiion where I have to support all his amendments or all his resolutions, or his bills on immigration.

Mr. SPEAKER: I may say that I read the motion in amendment as being moved by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni and seconded by the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Bancroft). The names were written on the motion.

Mr. NEILL: I took the precaution, Sir, to write the name on the motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: As we say in French, "L'honneur est sauf." The incident is therefore closed.

HALIBUT FISHERIES TREATY

On the Orders of the Day:

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): I wish to refer to a return brought down on Friday evening, for the purpose of asking a question of the ministry. The return embodies the correspondence relating to the recent signing of the Halibut Fisheries Treaty. By the return it is disclosed that the government has attempted to make a treaty binding only on the inhabitants and nationals of Canada on our part and on the inhabitants and nationals of the United States on the other, and it appears that in respect of the execution—the negotiations having been, properly, conducted by the Dominion—the courtesy of signature by the British Ambassador was denied by the Prime Minister and denied in the name of Canada. The result of the terms of the treaty and of its execution in this new fangled manner appears to have been a rider on the part of the United States Senate in its resolution of ratification, which rider provides that the treaty shall be applicable on our part as respects not only our nationals and our inhabitants but as respects also those of Great Britain. What I wish to put to the government is this: as the correspondence, according to the file brought down, closed on the fifth of March, and as the United States ratification is conditional on its application to Great Britain, whose sanction, of course, does not appear, owing to the absence of any signature representing the British government, what is the present position of the treaty? Will there be a treaty upon ratification by this House, and what is the intention of the government as respects the United States Senate's proviso on ratification?

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries): I do not think that what my right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) has called the rider will create any difficulty as to the ratification of the treaty. The United States senate ratified the treaty on the understanding that the nationals of "other parts of Great Britain"—the phrasecology is rather queer—would also be prevented from fishing for halibut in those waters. This is very easy to do. As far as the territorial waters are concerned both countries, the United States and Canada, will by legislation prevent any halibut fishing. As far as the extra-territorial waters are concerned no vessel from any country can carry on halibut fishing without using either United States or Canadian ports. It will be easy in the legislation which will have to be enacted by the United States Congress and by the parliament of Canada to close Canadian and American ports to any vessel carrying on halibut fishing. Consequently, I do not see any difficulty in the ratification of the treaty.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Do I understand that the Canadian government proposes to carry out the terms of a treaty which by the ratification is applicable to British citizens generally and not to Canadian nationals alone, by means of prohibitive Canadian legislation against other British citizens and not by securing the voluntary concurrence of those other citizens by means of the signature of the ambassador of Great Britain.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The Canadian legislation will apply to all the countries of the world. The fishing of halibut will be prohibited in those waters and the restrictions which will be enacted by the parliament of Canada will apply to everybody in the world.

Mr. S. W. JACOBS (George Etienne Cartier): I see a statement in the press this morning to the effect that this convention will not be considered completed until such time as the British government ratifies it. Will the government give us any information on this point?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I think probably there is a great deal of misuse of terms in some of the expressions that appear. Ratification is an act of the sovereign. No treaty will be complete until the sovereign has ratified it. I presume in regard to this treaty that His Majesty will act upon the advice of his government in this country, and such advice as the government will give His Majesty will be based upon the approval by this parliament of the legislation that is brought down.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I observe as well that in the correspondence the assurance is given by His Majesty of the prevention to the utmost of his power of all infringement and of all acts on the part of his subjects contrary to the terms of this treaty. Is that assurance still relied on inasmuch as the British government's representative at Washington has since been denied the right to sign?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do not know that the expression is correct that my right hon. friend uses, that the British representative at Washington was denied the right to sign. The government asked that one of its ministers be given full powers to sign. The British government aproved of that request and gave full powers to the minister to sign. These full powers were regarded as sufficient both by the Canadian government and by the British government. I think that ought to answer the point which my right hon. friend raised. As to any assurance which the British government or His Majesty has given, there is no doubt in the mind of anyone, I presume, that that will be carried out.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Just one statement—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is nothing in the correspondence to indicate—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. MEIGHEN: —that the British government approved of this new method of signing treaties.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I have allowed the questions so far because this is an important matter which may well be brought up before the Orders of the Day, but I would ask hon. members to kindly reserve any further questions on this subject until we come to discuss the various clauses of the treaty.

OLEOMARGARINE

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. MEIGHEN: I want to ask the government whether, having regard to the resolution passed by this House last session on the subject of the admission of oleomargarine, and to the fact that the bill subsequently introduced expires in its effect on the 31st of August, it is their intention to introduce legislation providing for an extension of the time, permanent or temporary, for the admission of oleomargarine? Perhaps I should address my question to and ask for reply from both the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Finance.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: As these two gentlemen could not reply at once, I might answer my right hon. friend on their behalf. There is on the order paper a resolution on the subject, and the government has been withholding its decision in the matter until the subject has been discussed. After it has been debated the government will be in a better position to answer my right hon. friend's question.

MR. JAMES LARKIN

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Perhaps the government is in a position now to answer the question I asked several days ago as to why Mr. James Larkin was refused admission into Canada.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Mr. James Larkin was rejected at Highwater, P.Q., on the 13th instant because he refused to answer questions put by the examining officer. He was rejected because of refusal to answer the

ordinary questions that are asked those seeking admission to Canada. He appealed, and I was somewhat doubtful whether the proper grounds had been taken. I consulted with the Justice department, who are of the opinion that Mr. Larkin was properly rejected under subsection 2 of section 33 of the Immigration Act, which reads as follows:

> Every passenger or other person seeking to enter or land in Canada shall answer truly all questions put to him by any officer when examined under the authority of this act, and any person not truly answering such questions shall be guilty of an offence and liable on conviction to a fine of not more than one hundred dollars or to a term of imprisonment, and if found not to be a Canadian citizen or not to have Canadian domicile, such offence shall in itself be sufficient cause for deportation whenever so ordered by a board of inquiry or officer in charge, subject, however, to such right of appeal as he may have to the minister.

The Justice department found we were quite correct in our contention. In addition, Mr. Larkin had just been released from serving a prison sentence, and on that ground I confirmed his rejection.

BANK ACT REVISION

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved that the House go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

> Resolved that it is expedient to revise the law relating to banking, to continue until the first day of July, 1933, the charters of the several banks to which the provisions of the Bank Act apply, to authorize the payment out of Consolidated Revenue Fund of remuneration to auditors for special examinations of the affairs or business of banks which the Minister of Finance may require to be made, and to provide for the charge of fees in connection with the registration of securities taken under the authority of the provisions of the act.

Motion agreed to and House went into committee, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

Mr. FIELDING: Mr. Chairman, the resolution before you is a formality, necessary under our parliamentary practice, as the basis of a bill which is to be introduced immediately on the adoption of the resolution. I think, perhaps, the House will be convenienced if I proceed at once, on the motion before us, to state the nature of the bill which I shall have the pleasure of introducing shortly. In that measure the government will bring the best possible judgment they can to bear upon a question of the highest importance, and one of wide-spread interest. I cannot venture the hope that the conclusions we have reached will be received with unanimity. I am well aware that the question is one concerning which there there will be differences of opinion, but I am going to ask, and I think it reasonable to do so, that hon. gentlemen reserve their judgment in the matter, until they have had an opportunity of examining the bill, and, what perhaps is of more importance, an opportunity of participating in or observing the inquiry which will take place before the committee on Banking and Commerce. So soon as the early stages of this bill are disposed of, it is my intention to ask the House to refer the bill to the committee on Banking and Commerce, where there will be abundant opportunity for raising every question in relation to it, and the fullest possible opportunity for inquiry and discussion.

The Bank Act is the fruit of the study of a long line of ministers of finance, of governments and parliaments, and I feel that in the main it has served a good purpose; it has proved itself adapted to the needs of Canada; and I venture the opinion—which, possibly, will not be shared by everybody—that any radical change in the act at present would have a disturbing effect upon the business of the country; it is a class of question upon which we shall do well, I think to go slowly.

At every revision of the Bank Act a question of paramount importance has been raised concerning government inspection. Every minister of finance who has preceded me has, after consideration, reached the conclusion that it was not wise to adopt a system of government inspection. I have myself—in my own experience where I have had to do with a former revision—taken that view, and I adhere to that view at present. With our wide-spread system of branch banks any adequate system of inspection would call for a small army of officials; it would involve large expenditure, and my own impression is, that in the end you would have no better guarantee of the soundness of a bank, after government inspection, than you have under the present system. If the auditors who passed on the affairs of the Merchants bank had had a label on their caps denoting that they were government officials I have no reason to suppose that they would have been more capable, more intelligent, or more energetic. I have great respect for government authority in some cases, but it may be overdone. I do not believe government inspection would give you any greater real protection than you now have, but it would, I think, give a false security, it would create the impression in the minds of the people that the government were guaranteeing the transactions of a bank, and whenever trouble might occur—and it is worth while remembering that where government inspection prevails bank failures are not rare—wherever trouble might occur and a bank failed, then, if you had a system of

government inspection, there would unquestionably be a desire to hold the government responsible. Embarrassment and trouble, perhaps material loss to the government, would follow. In declining at present to concur in the idea of government inspection I want to protect the public—that is the people at large, and parliament—against the responsibility which I think they should not be willing to bear. So, after much reflection and with the knowledge that that is one of the big questions of the day, I am not of the opinion that we should advise parliament to adopt a system of government inspection.

I have said that I believe the general framework of the Bank Act is a good one. Nevertheless, with every revision we learn something. We have learned something undoubtedly during the past ten years, and we will endeavour, in the suggestions we offer, to show that the lessons of these years have not been lost. We will endeavour to improve the Bank Act while not making any radical departure from its general outline.

While we are not going to adopt a system of government inspection, we will endeavour to improve the present system of audit, and I think that is an important point. The present system of audit, shareholders' audit, is that a list of proposed auditors is prepared by the Canadian Bankers' Association and sent to the Minister of Finance. He has the right to strike off from that list any name of which he may not approve. I am proposing to adhere largely to that system but to make it, I think, more rigid, so that the public will have a better audit, a better guarantee of audit, than they have at present. Under the law of to-day the Bankers' Association forwards this list of persons who desire to be auditors, but there is no particular qualification required of them. I propose that the Bankers' Association shall still prepare a list, but that that list shall be confined strictly to chartered accountants; that those who are to act as auditors for the shareholders must be chartered accountants, and must have practised their profession as chartered accountants for a period of six years in a city or town in Canada where there is a head office of a bank. I think when we put that condition in we go a long way towards obtaining capable auditors. Many of the firms of chartered accountants comprise quite a number of members. I propose that in no case shall more than three members of any one firm be allowed to have a place on that list. We think that in this way we shall get capable auditors, members of the Chartered Accountants' Association of Canada. I believe there are chartered accountants' organizations in the various provinces, and they are federated into a Dominion association. We propose that the Dominion association shall supply a list of the members who are eligible under the condition I have laid down. I think it will necessarily follow that if you take chartered accountants who have been practising their profession for some years in one of our cities where there is the head office of a bank you have a reasonable assurance that you will obtain capable men of good standing. I think in that respect we shall give to the House and to the public a better guarantee of audit than we now have. We propose that every bank must have two auditors; under the Bank Act to-day you may have one or more. We propose that there shall be two auditors chosen by the shareholders, and that they shall not both be members of the one firm, they must belong to different firms; and they shall not be auditors for the one bank for more than three years in succession. We think these several suggestions will give to the public a guarantee that the auditors will be capable, that they will be independent; and the auditors will be changed with sufficient frequency to guard against anything going wrong.

Another question that is of very much importance, upon which I am going to make, shall I say?—a disappointing remark, is in relation to bank mergers. Bank mergers are not popular. The merger of any two banks, particularly the merger of two of the larger banks, undoubtedly makes towards a restriction of banking operation. It tends towards the creation, if there be such a thing, of a banking monopoly. I know that usually bank mergers are not popular. I know that more than one suggestion has been offered that no bank should be allowed to amalgamate with another unless they obtain authority by a special act of parliament. Some members may be disposed to approve of that suggestion; my own judgment is that it is too drastic a change. There are times when mergers may be useful, and not only that but I know of a case where a bank was beginning to get into trouble, but the matter being taken up in time it was amalgamated with another bank, the situation was saved and all went well. So I think there will be occasions when, if you do not use the power which exists under the present law to authorize a merger through the Treasury Board, the Minister of Finance, and the Governor in Council, you may have a financial disaster which could have been avoided had you dealt with the situation in time. I am willing to have the matter fully threshed out before the Banking

and Commerce committee, but my impression is that you must trust the government of the day, the Minister of Finance of the day and the Treasury Board, to exercise due precaution and to see that mergers are not approved of, unless they are clearly and undoubtedly in the public interests. I am persuaded that to deny the government, and the Minister of Finance and the Treasury Board that power and to say that there can be no merger until you have a special act of parliament, is an arrangement that would not work well and might at times prevent a merger which is really desirable and necessary in the interests of the public. On this point there may be disappointment in some quarters. When we talk about protecting the public in banking matters, we had better stop and think, who are the public we want to protect? There are various interests in the public, when we use that word.

In the first place, you have the note-holders. If the government and the parliament of Canada give to the bank the right to issue notes for circulation, then surely the government and the parliament of Canada must take measures to see that the notes are protected. That is done; the notes to-day are secured in two ways. In the first place, they are a first charge upon all the assets of the bank, and that is usually almost in itself a sufficient protection. Then, besides, there is an insurance fund created by all the banks, to which they all contribute in order to create an additional guarantee that the notes will be protected. Thus the notes are protected, I think I may safely say, beyond any question.

Then you have the depositors. They are not as well protected as the note holders. The protection in the case of the depositors is the protection given to any creditors who have a claim against the bank. But then you have besides the double liability of the shareholders, which stands between the depositors and loss. In most cases it will be found that the existing provisions with regard to depositors work fairly well. If something can be found in the course of discussion which is better than these provisions I am willing to receive it with an open mind. The depositors do not often suffer. There have been eight bank failures in the last 20 years. In the case of five of those failures the depositors never lost a penny. In three of those failures the banks which were smaller institutions, are still in liquidation, but the depositors stand to lose. I think it is desirable we should protect the depositors, and if anybody can suggest, in the course of the inquiry, any better method of protecting the depositor, I am quite willing to receive it and give it due consideration, though I do not think there is as much danger of the depositors losing now as in former days. However, that is a fair matter for consideration.

You come then to the shareholders, who are the bank. The shareholder is not exactly in the same position as the depositor. He is the trustee of the depositor, He is after all only a member of a trading corporation, and I think we have as much reason to ask the shareholder in the bank to look after his own interests as we have to ask the shareholder in any other corporation to do so. We are giving the shareholders—that is the banks—large privileges in the way of circulation, but I do not think that creates a special obligation whereby we should look after them, except in the general way that all corporations are supposed to have the protection of our laws. I do not think we can undertake to make the shareholder's position as good as we do the position of the note-holders or the depositors. I am afraid the shareholder must be asked, as in any other corporation, to look after his own interests as much as he can, and not to expect the government to give him exceptional and special protection.

There is another clause in the Bank Act which has given rise to much discussion, commonly known as section 88. That section gives a prior lien to the bank in certain cases. There has been much discussion of that clause in time past. There has been much criticism even in Canada, and outside of Canada it has frequently been the subject of criticism. It is claimed that the merchant abroad—and it might be true of those at home—who sells goods to a merchant in Canada, and is not able to look after his own interests, finds, when trouble occurs, that the bank has prior claim to everything. When the unpaid vendor comes to assert his claim, he finds the bank, by its prior right, has possession of the goods. When I was in England recently I was waited upon, by a deputation of the Bradford Chamber of Commerce, who made strong representations in that respect. They claimed that many English exporters had suffered severely in recent years. I think some measure of their loss was probably due to their rather reckless method of selling. However, there is some room for criticism in the fact that the bank has priority. There are men who would advocate the total abolition of section 88. I do not think such a course would be wise. That provision has performed a large and important part in the development of Canadian business, and I believe the repeal of that clause would work

injuriously. What I am proposing now is not to repeal the clause, but that he who desires to operate under section 88 shall give notice in a public way, so that all who are concerned shall know what he is doing. I propose that any merchant or manufacturer in Canada who desires to borrow from the bank under the provisions of section 88—that is the provision which will give the bank a prior claim—must give notice in the registry office of his intention to do so. The registrar will be the Assistant Receiver General in each province. The bank will see that he registers, otherwise they will not give him the money. If the merchant at home or abroad is concerned about section 88, all he has to do is to write or telegraph to the Assistant Receiver General in the province and ascertain whether any registration has been made. If the man who is proposing to do business has been registered under section 88, all who do business with him will know that they must recognize the priority of the bank. If he gives no such notice, the bank will have no priority. I hope we shall go a long way in removing the criticisms that have been made of this section 88.

There have been questions regarding the allotment of stock, by a bank. It has been alleged in some cases that it has been contemplated that stock dividends should be declared. I do not think it has actually been done. The question has been raised whether dividends of that kind could be declared. We propose to make it clear that, whatever stock of that kind is issued and allotted, the shareholder who purchases the stock must pay in cash. and that no stock dividends shall be allowed.

There are quite a number of small amendments with which I shall not deal. Amendments will be printed in the bill in italics when it is presented to the House. I do not think I had better detain the House by referring to more than the important sections. There are some clauses which have become obsolete, and which are omitted. For example, there is the clause respecting the bank of British North America, which was an institution operating under exceptional conditions. That institution has been amalgamated with another bank, and so the conditions regarding it no longer exist. There were also provisions regarding fifty-dollar shares, which are no longer necessary, as the banks now generally conform to the custom of issuing hundred-dollar shares. In the returns that are made showing the banks' property we are asking a change, we are asking that the bank, in dealing with the value of their property shall include not only the property which stands in their name, but the property which stands in the name of any corporation which they control. The banks have formed subsidiary companies which are practically branches of the bank and controlled by the bank in every way. We propose that, as respects the holding of property and as respects assets and liabilities, the returns shall show the operation of these companies the same as the operation of what I may call the bank proper. That will apply to any corporation that is controlled by the bank.

Most of the banks now have a pension fund for their employees—I am not sure whether they all have. It was found in the case of a recent bank failure that moneys designed to protect the pension fund were invested in bank stock, and when the bank stock took a tumble, the pension fund took a tumble, too. We propose that hereafter banks having pension funds shall not be permitted to invest money for the pension fund in stock of their own bank or any other bank whatsoever.

As regards bank directors, it is sometimes said that "directors do not direct." There are cases in which men who have long and honourable association with a bank desire to have their names retained on the board of directors, even when they have reached a condition where it is well known that they are not able to give close attention. I think there is an honourable purpose in that, and I would not say that it should not be done. We are proposing to introduce a clause to the effect that a record shall be kept of every bank board meeting, showing what directors have attended the meeting, and that before the next annual meeting is called upon to elect directors, that record, showing how many meetings were held and how many meetings each director attended, should be placed in the hands of the shareholders, who can then judge whether they wish to continue those directors in the service.

Some troubles have arisen owing to officials of a bank kindly lending themselves the bank's funds. We propose an amendment by which we declare that no general manager, assistant general manager, bank manager or any official, clerk or servant, can have a loan exceeding $1,000 without the consent of the directors, and he cannot have more than $10,000 even with the consent of the directors. If a bank manager or any one associated with him wants to do a little speculation, he will have to go to another bank and not get the funds out of his own bank.

There is one other provision of some importance. The bank law says, and has said for many years, that the word "bank" shall

not be used by any person or corporation other than a chartered bank. This is a wise precaution. But though the word "bank" cannot be legally used, there are men engaged in what is practically banking business, who do not come within the operation of the law, and more than once disastrous failures have occurred. One occurred in Winnipeg within the last few weeks, where a corporation having no bank charter was actually doing a banking business with disastrous results. We are proposing that whoever desires to receive money on deposit in Canada, shall obtain a license from the municipality in which he proposes to do business, and that he will have to make a substantial deposit with that municipality as a guarantee of his good faith. The local knowledge which is possessed by a municipality will enable the authorities to know whether the party is of good repute. We aim to prevent an irresponsible person establishing a private banking business and taking deposits, and then, by and by, having a disaster follow. We exempt from this certain co-operative and agricultural organizations, the character of which is well understood; but all these people who have been undertaking to receive large deposits and then involve depositors in heavy losses, will, we hope, be reached by the clause which we propose.

Those are the main provisions of the bill which I am presenting to the House. There are many minor things which I do not propose to mention now. Again, I want to say that I realize the fact that there are strong views held by many hon. members of this House and many citizens outside as regards the need of material changes in the Bank Act. I hope and believe that on a thorough inquiry such as that which will take place before the Committee on Banking and Commerce, some of the erroneous impressions regarding the present banking system will be removed. At all events, with the assurance of the desire of the government to have as full an inquiry as possible into the matter, I am going to ask hon. gentlemen to reserve their judgment until that inquiry takes place, and in the meantime to see their way clear to let this bill progress so that it may reach the committee on Banking and Commerce at any early date.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I entirely concur in the procedure outlined by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding). There is no use in discussing this bill at present and in advance of the evidence. I think we shall serve our common purpose, which is to get the best results we can out of this bill, by letting the matter take the course which my hon. friend now proposes, passing it through its initial stages and referring it at once to the committee on Banking and Commerce.

Mr. GOOD: This resolution on which the bill is to be based, calls for the full ten-year period. The date as stated in the resolution is 1st July, 1933. It might appear in the course of the investigation that it would be better to have charters extended for less than the full ten years. If this resolution carries, would it be possible to make such a change?

Mr. FIELDING: The bill will propose the ordinary ten-year period; but there is no reason why the committee might not adopt a suggestion along the line of my hon. friend's proposal.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Or in any other direction.

Mr. FIELDING: Yes.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Fielding thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 83, respecting Banks and Banking.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

Mr. SPEAKER: When shall the bill be read the second time?

Mr. FIELDING: Does my hon. friend desire to postpone the second reading or to take it now?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Now.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved the second reading of Bill No. 83, respecting Banks and Banking.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the select standing committee on Banking and Commerce.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): It was intimated last night that we should go to-day into Committee of Supply on the Post Office estimates, and after that on the Immigration estimates. There is no objection to the Immigration estimates. The minister (Mr. Stewart) is here. The Postmaster General (Mr. Murphy) is not here, there is an acting minister in his place. If the government is in a position to say that it is impossible for the Postmaster General to be back this session, then, if it is

also impossible to appoint someone in his place, there can be no objection to our going on. But it is very unsatisfactory going on with estimates in the absence of the responsible minister, particularly in a department where so much has taken place in respect of which the element of patronage has so violently entered in.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I regret to have to inform my right hon. friend that the Postmaster General (Mr. Murphy) has been anything but well for some time past, and has been advised by his physician that he must have a prolonged leave of absence. I doubt very much whether he will be back in the House for some little time; certainly he will not be back until after the Easter recess, and it is indeed a question whether he will be back for quite a while after that. Under the circumstances, therefore, I think it is best to proceed with the estimates.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am not satisfied with the statement of the Prime Minister. If there is any reasonable chance of the Postmaster General being back this session, I think his estimates ought to stand. There are lots of other estimates that we might proceed with besides those of the Postmaster General. But to go on with that minister's estimates in his absence is not advisable. If there is a reasonable chance of his being back after the recess, or at some time during the session, his estimates should stand, and we might go on with the estimates of the Department of Immigration.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I have no objection to having the estimates stand.

Mr. BUREAU: Leave an item open for discussion, but do not delay the progress of the House.

Motion agreed to and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

SUPPLY

IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION

Immigration and Colonization—immigration outside service—salaries, $700,000.

Mr. STEVENS: I do not intend to discuss the whole question of immigration at great length or in any general way, but I desire to direct a few remarks to the minister (Mr. Stewart) and to his colleagues on this very important subject. I am sure the House will have noted that the discussion which has taken place during the past week is receiving a great deal of public attention. It is generally recognized, I think, that the immigration policy of the government is a matter of primary importance to the country at large. My particular intention in rising to-day is to advise the minister and the government that in taking this important step which they propose in connection with their declared policy on immigration, they must do so with their eyes open. I should not like to sit silent in my seat and allow these estimates to pass and then next year, perhaps, find myself called upon to bring to the attention of the minister some of the results that might ensue from a policy of this character not in the best interests of the country. If I sat silent and allowed estimates to go through without any comment upon this important subject, the minister might well say afterwards that the hon. member having refrained from giving any expression of opinion, he was justified in regarding that silence as consent. In my estimation the bargain, or arrangement, or contract which the minister has entered into with the Canada Colonization Company is fraught with very grave possibilities. I think my hon. friend is entering upon a road that will lead him to possible chaos and perhaps even worse. I am not suggesting at this moment that there is any intent on the part of the minister or of those associated with him to commit any act of a dishonourable character, not at all; but what I do see in this bargain is, as I have stated, the danger of grave possibilities, and I want the minister to be fully apprised of my views on the subject, as also, I trust, the views of hon. gentlemen in the House generally.

Now, let us briefly examine this matter. The Canada Colonization Company has entered into an agreement or, as I choose to call it, a bargain, with the government. By virtue of that bargain, the government must accept, whether it does so in specific terms or not, the responsibility for the actions of the Canada Colonization Company, its agents and servants. And whether the government willingly accepts that responsibility or not, let the committee be assured of this, that if anything does occur that is calculated to be an injury to any of the expected immigrants, or any other people of the community, the public will place the responsibility on the government after the difficulty or trouble is discovered. The minister himself stated that the Canada Colonization Company and the government had fully discussed this matter. He informed the House that several conferences had been held; and I find in a statement by the company itself, set forth in a very great detail in a full-page advertisement in a newspaper I have

4 p.m.

under my hand, certain facts which I purpose bringing to the attention of the committee, so that hon. members may properly judge of their importance. For instance, there is a statement, which confirms what the minister says, that the whole project has been fully discussed with the government, with the minister, with the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) with the hon. member for South Renfrew, minister without portfolio, (Mr. Low), and with a committee of the cabinet. I recite this merely to show that the matter has apparently been the subject of concurrence on the part of the government as a whole. The minister says that a committee of the cabinet "have had many conferences with the association." The statement of the Western Canada Colonization Association shows that the working capital of the company has been over-subscribed to the extent of $1,500,000. Why should they, under those conditions, find it necessary to receive from the government a grant of $40,000 and further sums at the rate of $10,000 a month for the purposes of carrying out their project? That is a pertinent query, and one in respect to which I think the committee should be furnished with the fullest possible information. The association claim also that their project has been approved by the imperial government, the Dominion government, and the Canadian railway companies—meaning by the latter, I presume, the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canadian National Railways. If that is the case, do these three bodies share the liabilities of the colonization company? Are they jointly responsible? If so, in what way? Has the Imperial government definitely entered into this agreement? If it has, the documents showing to what extent they have accepted responsibility should be laid on the Table. The same applies to the railway companies; if they are equally liable we should know just to what extent that liability goes.

The next thing claimed by the association is that they expect to spend—I am quoting their own figures—$30,000,000 or $40,000,000 in the next five years. I want the committee to note this fact, because it is evidence of the enormous scope of this movement. To what extent has the government, which is a party to the association's activities, supervision or control, in sight or knowledge, of the expenditure of this large amount within five or ten years? That is another query that should be fully and satisfactorily answered to-day. The chief reason why I at least am a little alarmed about this part of the agreement is because the association states that the major portion of this $30,000,000 or $40,000,000 will be expended on commissions. The significance of that will be better understood if I point out to the House the nature of those commissions. In a full-page advertisement the association declare that they are securing in the United States and other countries efficient real estate agents to push the sale of Canadian lands. I will quote the minister at this point. He says, page 1148 of unrevised Hansard of this session:

> They—

That is, the association.

> —have in the United States to-day sixty agents who are operating on a commission basis, who receive for their service something like ten per cent per acre.

I am not questioning the bona fides of this association, but here is a body with which the Dominion government is closely identified, which has in the United States what are known among real estate men as high pressure salesmen, out selling Canadian lands on behalf of the Canadian government and this association, and receiving a commission of ten per cent. When you turn loose an accomplished real estate agent who has in view the possibility of a ten per cent commission, his main object is to make as much as possible—to earn the commission, no matter how he earns it. He will tell any story that he can "get by" with in order to earn that commission. I want the government to appreciate that point. Has the minister any supervision over these agents from the United States? So far as I can discover, he has none whatever. Does the minister know the names of these "sixty agents"—I quote his own words—"who are operating" in the United States to-day? Does he know their bona fides, their qualifications, their trustworthiness? Or is it not reasonable to assume that this great army of agents, which will multiply very largely as business proceeds, are not known to the government at all? On the face of it we must conclude that the government is wholly ignorant of the detailed administration of the association. But the government must be prepared to assume responsibility for the activities of these agents. My experience—which is not inconsiderable—in connection with salesmen who are working on a commission basis is that even though they intend to be honest, they very frequently, if not almost generally, overdraw the picture and seek to earn the commission rather than give accurate information. At the rate of 200 families a year, $10,000 a month for ten months means a cost to the government of $500 per family. If any figure of that kind is to be paid by the government for these settlers, the country

will be put to a very large expenditure indeed. I strongly advise the government against the expenditure of large sums of public money for the importation of immigrants. I do not think an examination of the records respecting immigration will encourage the minister very much from that point of view. The Atlantic Trading Company, for instance, and other institutions of that kind, the movement of the Doukhobors to western Canada, and such like, where there was encouragement, bargaining, or any assistance given, rarely resulted in any benefit to the country.

Let me take another point. Under this agreement, according to the minister's statement, and verified again by this full-page advertisement, it is purposed to arrange for 32-year agreements of sale with the intending settler, and an illustration is given in the advertisement to this effect. Take a 160-acre farm at $20 an acre; that would cost $3,200. The cash payment asked is $320—I want the committee to follow this bit of information. There is an agreement made for $2,880, and under the scale of payments set forth in this advertisement, and referred to by the minister himself in his speech, at the end of ten years the settler would still owe $2,883, or more than the face value of the agreement when he started out. But that is not all. What becomes of the $320 of cash payment? The whole of that $320 goes into commission.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I would like to understand how my hon. friend arrives at that figure, that the amount would be $2,883 at the end of ten years.

Mr. STEVENS: I have the statement worked out here on an actuarial basis by this company. The first year it is $2,880. There is a $320 cash payment, which, deducted from $3,200, leaves $2,880. I will not read the figures for each year, but will take one or two at random. The first year the principal balance is $2,880; the sixth year there is still owing a balance of $3,095.71; the tenth year it is $2,883.15; the twelfth year $2,756.77, and so you go on down till in the twentieth year it is $2,074. In the thirty-second year the principal is wiped out with the final payment, but for the first three years no payment is made at all, and the interest is added to the principal and it takes up to the tenth year for the purchaser to catch up what he has lost in the added interest in that period. So the statement I make is quite correct that at the end of ten years the settler still owes $2,883.15.

What I wish to draw attention to is that the minister has apparently accepted the scheme. He is so quoted here, and has so stated himself, and I am pointing out that this is not a very satisfactory agreement. Although the 32-year payment scheme sounds all right, if you say it quick and do not examine it too closely, you find when you come to examine it closely, that there is very little advantage to the settler in that regard.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): It is exactly the same as any other amortization scheme of that character. It is no different. There is nothing new.

Mr. STEVENS: I quite agree but I am pointing out what the result is.

Mr. GOULD: The hon. member argues that at the end of three years these conditions readily lend themselves to a man leaving the organization?

Mr. STEVENS: Certainly. I have a few more observations to make in regard to this bargain. I am trying to give to the committee the facts. What becomes of the $320 cash payment?

And this presents to my mind what is really an absurdity. The $320 goes to the Colonization Company, and not to the vendor. Here is where the vendor receives a blank cheque, as it were. The vendor who is asked in this advertisement to list his property with the government, and who must enter into an agreement for five years gets nothing at all. He cannot get anything at all for some three or four years, and then he receives at the end of the three years $40.80 out of this liability of $3,200. The first $320 cash payment goes to these high-pressure salesmen. It goes through the association to their agents. They are paying to their agents in the United States and elsewhere ten per cent, or something like that, but it all goes to the association. The vendor gets nothing at all. Does the minister think for a moment that the vendors of these properties who are expected to come under this scheme will permit a condition of that kind? According to this advertisement, there is a very clever inducement held out to vendors to list their properties, and it is this, that the Imperial government, the Canadian government, and the railway companies are behind this scheme. Now the average person with property to sell will say: They are the people to whom I should entrust my property. But they will wake up very shortly to the fact that they are getting little or nothing out of their property. The association deducts one per cent of the six per cent interest in addition to the $320, and that lasts for eight

years. That is another very extraordinary charge. Then we go further. The Dominion government have certain responsibilities.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Is not that one per cent for the purpose of acting as agent for the vendor, if they so act?

Mr. STEVENS: Quite so, but what I am getting at is the unsatisfactory nature of this so-called agreement. The association get one per cent of the interest, leaving five per cent to the vendor.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): In the event of their continuing to act as agents. If they do not they get nothing.

Mr. STEVENS: Oh, certainly, but the object of my hon. friend's bargain and the expenditure of public money is that the thing is going to be a success.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I will discuss that later. What I want my hon. friend to point out to the committee, if he will do it—and I am quite certain he wants to make a fair presentation—is this, that if they act as agents for the vendor for whom they have sold the land, for that service they will get one per cent.

Mr. BOYS: Of the money they collect?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Mr. STEVENS: No, one per cent of the six per cent interest. That is where the purchaser pays six per cent per annum, the association acting as agent for eight years, following the three years where no payment is made, and it is allowed to take one of the six per cent paid in interest. That is its charge for acting as agent. I want to say to the minister that that arrangement will fail, and I think it will fail in two ways. First, I think it is simply inviting trouble and disappointment for those who purchase under this scheme, and secondly, I am certain that once the vendors realize—what shall I say?—the shabbiness of it, and I do not use the word offensively, as far as their interests are concerned, they will withdraw their property unless they become involved for five years before they properly understand the conditions. I think my hon. friend is simply laying up a peck of trouble, if I might use that expression.

Now then, what about the government? The government are asked not only to assume a vast responsibility as to this association's activities, but they must extend and maintain agencies in all countries of the world, or virtually so,—that is to maintain and extend agencies in the United States, in Europe, and in Great Britain at the expense of this country, and for which we are being asked to-day to vote some million-odd dollars. In addition to that the government, not only gives to this association these enormous and valuable privileges and its whole moral support—and I believe actual responsibility—must pay for the advertising, must carry on an effective advertising campaign. I would think that out of the ten per cent or twenty per cent that this concern get they might at least pay for the expense of maintaining agencies and the expense of advertising and publicity. But no: the government pay that in addition to its grants and its gifts to this association.

Now, I want to read to the committee what appears to me to give a fair interpretation of the meaning of this whole scheme. At the bottom of this full-page ad of the association are these words in leaded type:

> Owners of vacant agricultural land within 15 miles of railways in the western provinces are requested to list their properties immediately with the Canada Colonization Association, Bank of Hamilton Building, Winnipeg.

That seems to be really what is at the bottom of the whole business. Here is a magnificient opportunity for this Canada Colonization Company to induce people to list their property with them, and, if they did list, they would be bound for five years; their property would be listed with the company for that period of time. Is it fair—I put it to the minister very frankly—to use the name of the Imperial government, associated with the Dominion government and the big railway companies of Canada to induce property holders to list their property with these agents? I do not think it is. Because, after all, these people—I care not how estimable they may be as citizens—are nothing more or less than a real estate association. You cannot escape that point, there is no escape from it. Their whole activity is based upon the very revenue that they expect to derive from the sale of lands; —it is on a commission basis, they pay their agents on a commission basis just the same as any land company does. My hon. friend referred to the general manager in quite glowing terms and his qualification, quoted by the minister was that he was the successful manager of the Luseland Company. Now, this is the point I want to warn the government and the House against. Not that these people are not honest or honourable, not at all, but that the whole proposition is largely a real estate listing and sale proposition, and the government is entering into that rather

than into an immigration policy. That is what I want to warn the government against.

Now, to summarize the situation very briefly, we have these facts: The government subsidizes this company to the extent of $100,000 annually; the government is to maintain its offices all over the world at the cost of the public treasury of Canada; the government is to pay for the advertising, or to maintain the advertising; and must turn over all their emigration machinery to the use of this association; every move made by the association, in so far as this scheme is concerned, must be supplemented by the organization of the Immigration department. And the association is to get ten per cent on the sale price, plus the one per cent interest for ten years. The association employs the agents, the government does not employ them; and the association alone controls the agents, the government does not control them. I doubt if the minister has any idea of the extent of the provision with respect to these agents. I feel very much alarmed about this point in particular: the turning loose of agents in all quarters of the world. And with what guarantee? Simply this: Go out and sell Canadian western lands: the Dominion government is behind you: this association—with the backing of the Dominion and the Imperial governments—is behind you; and you will get ten per cent in respect of any lands you sell upon which immigrants enter. That means, the agents will be telling pretty roseate stories. My hon. friends to my left have been telling us some very doleful stories. I am not altogether agreeing with them, although there is much in what they have said; but it would be the height of folly for this government to associate themselves with the high-pressure salesman's story as to the conditions that obtain in the Canadian West. Most of them—certainly ninety per cent of them—have never seen the Canadian West I venture to say.

I now wish to reiterate what I said a moment ago. In fact, my purpose in rising to-day is to press home upon the government that they must be prepared to accept full responsibility for whatever results may come from this campaign.

Let me say just a few words more before I take my seat. It is not to my mind so much a question of immigration; the problem is one of emigration. That is not a new statement, I merely reiterate what others have said. I think my hon. friend the minister would be well advised to turn to his colleagues and put some very pertinent questions to them. My hon. friend is the Acting Minister of Immigration and Colonization. It appears, to me at least, that he has separated himself and his department from the government. He is going out with this colonization scheme, and other measures, to carry on an immigration policy and he has ignored the fact, apparently, that there are some sound reasons for the emigration from Canada of so many people during this past year or two. Why does he not tell the Minister of Finance that one of the reasons why people are leaving Canada, one of the reasons why there is such hard times in the industrial world, is because of heavy taxation? and in some regards, as I have stated before to the House this session, unfair taxation. This is not an attack I am making upon the Minister of Finance, I am simply stating what I think to be a problem—a problem that ought to be faced before we enter into any extensive scheme of immigration. Stop this emigration before dealing with this problem. I invite him, therefore, to bring to the attention of the Minister of Finance, who ought to co-operate with him in this matter, the necessity of meeting this problem of taxation, solving it—simplifying it if you like to use that term—so as to promote industrial activity and more contentment in the country.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Does my hon. friend include customs duties in that "heavy taxation?"

Mr. STEVENS: I felt sure that question would be put, but I hardly expected the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe) to ask it; I really expected it to come from hon. gentlemen to my left. I do not wish, nor do I purpose, being side-tracked into a discussion of the tariff policy. My opinions on the tariff question are well known. The problem that I am propounding—namely dealing with the financial situation as regards industry and agriculture—is the responsibility of the Minister of Finance and not mine. I am prepared at the proper time—and when it comes in a few weeks I shall avail myself of the opportunity—to state my opinions very clearly and I shall have no hesitancy in doing so. But I say that is the problem to be dealt with; and the minister, before entering into this scheme, ought to have addressed himself to the Minister of Finance, in regard to it. He should also have addressed himself to the Minister of Trade and Commerce and asked him to co-operate in the promotion of trade. I know he has done something, I know he wants to do something; but it is only by the co-ordinated activity of the government that these things can be done, and not by one minister framing a policy for his department alone.

It would appear to me as if the ministry were all at sixes and sevens, and not co-operating at all. Referring to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell), upon his shoulders, as the head of the Agricultural department of Canada, rests the responsibility of solving or leading in the solution, of the problem of why agriculture is not successful to-day. I do not say he is responsible for the problem, but I say he is responsible for its solution, or for the lead in attempted solution. My hon. friend (Mr. Stewart, Argenteuil) should have addressed himself to the Minister of Agriculture before he propounded this policy, which, I am certain in my mind, will bring nothing but pain, suffering, disappointment and discord. My hon. friend has the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) to fall back upon. It is true that he stated the other day that the Prime Minister was consulted in the matter. To my mind at least, there is little evidence that this scheme were properly considered by the government as a whole. It might have been, but if it was, then it reflects but little credit on the government. My hon. friend for Fort William (Mr. Manion) the other day made a very excellent suggestion to this House. He made an excellent speech, and he made a reference that merits the closest consideration of the government, and I hope it will receive such consideration. One of the great difficulties in Canada is a thousand-mile gap between eastern and western Canada. It is a geographical difficulty, but the fact is that a barren, almost depopulated, or unpopulated, area exists and while it may not be caused by the government, yet I believe the first responsibility of a settlement scheme in Canada should be towards bringing the eastern part of Canada together with the west. There you have a wide barren territory, with no traffic developing or little traffic, very little settlement, and with a lot of splendid land, and it would behoove the minister, I think, in co-operation with the Ontario government, to study how he could populate that hinterland of Ontario, or that gap between the East and the West. The speech of the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Hoey) the other day was one of the best expositions of this problem given in the House this session. He referred in a different way altogether to this same problem which my hon. friend for Fort William mentioned. Here you have an hon. member from Ontario and an hon. member from Manitoba, both recognizing that the difficulty was to bring the population in their respective districts, bordering on this gap to which I have referred, to a level commensurate with means that exist there to sustain a large population. Therefore, I say to the minister if he wants to inaugurate a first-rate, a fundamentally sound, scheme of immigration, there is where he can find scope for his activities. Why should he at this moment seek to force, through high-pressure land salesmen—I want the minister to get that—upon the three prairie provinces, whose representatives in this House tell us there is no use putting more settlers there at the present time because of the difficulties they are placed in—why should he force this immigration? Why should he, through the high-pressure salesman and through this scheme, force immigration into the provinces, when we know perfectly well that in northern Ontario there is just as fine opportunity for a different type of agriculture, but for agriculture waiting for assistance? I would certainly be more than willing to vote money direct to assistance of settlers in that area, rather than to vote money to be expended in connection with this enormous, and, I think, highly painted visionary scheme, presented to the minister by the Canada Colonization Association, and accepted by him.

I rose for the purpose of impressing, if I could, upon the minister and the government, the dangers that confront them and the government, the parliament and the country in the acceptance of this contract. I fear the minister has made a serious mistake, and I do not think it is too late now to retreat from the position in which he finds himself. It is true that this project was precipitated some time last fall, and there may have been negotiations carried on some time since, but parliament has not yet approved of it. I would not want to be one who would say to the government "we must resist absolutely your policy in immigration". I have grave doubts about it and serious apprehensions as to its effect, and I want the minister, if he persists in going on, to realize that these dangerous waters lie ahead of him and what the results may be; so that he cannot come back to parliament next year and say that parliament as a whole participated in the scheme.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I think it appropriate that at this moment I should give the committee some information with respect to the organization in regard to which my hon. friend for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) has just offered his criticisms. The Canada Colonization Association is not a new organization and was not a new organization when this government took office. It had the endorsation of the government which preceded this government through their Minis-

ter of Agriculture. It has been in existence for some two or three years to my certain knowledge. I do not desire to cover that ground, but I want to point out to the committee that in the very difficult situation in which I found myself with respect to this question of immigration, I felt that this organization, patriotic as they called themselves, which my hon. friend denies this afternoon—

Mr. STEVENS: I do not deny it.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): If the hon. member does not deny it directly he denies it by implication.

Mr. STEVENS: I made no such statement. I said I did not question the bona fides of the association, I am not in a position to do so. Next year we may be in that position.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Nor is it my intention to give a certificate of character to these men, but simply, if I can, to place my position before this committee.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. minister referred to the former government having approved of the organization—I think he used the word "approved." I hope he does not mean to imply that the former government in any way approved of any plan by which this organization would get any advantages or any special assistance from the government.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I was not inferring that a letter had been given them by the Minister of Immigration, and in fairness to him I need not deal with some changes that have transpired since the occasion of that letter. This organization was started some three years ago. I well remember the propaganda carried on throughout Canada. It was heralded as a patriotic endeavour on the part of the citizens to settle privately-owned lands along our existing railways. I mentioned the other day they had difficulty about their land listing proposition, inasmuch as they were asking for legislation to validate listing over a period of two years, if I remember the circumstances properly. At that time, as Premier of the province of Alberta, I refused that, and I have had some personal experience in land selling and the dealing in land, and one of the very practical difficulties that a Minister of Immigration or any government is faced with in connection with immigration to-day is that we have no longer available, within reasonable distance of our railways, land that we can offer freely to attract settlement to Canada. That was the great lure in the past; but although there are millions of acres of land still available, we cannot advise people to go into outlying areas and to take up land for themselves, as they did formerly when coming to Canada.

Mr. GOOD: May I ask the minister a question?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): If my hon. friend will let me make my statement this afternoon, I shall be glad to answer all questions that anyone may wish to ask at a later date.

That is the situation we have to face. I said the other day, and I repeat, that we must have our propaganda, our advertising and our discussion confined very largely to encouraging incoming settlement amongst agricultural classes. There can be no doubt about that. There is at the moment undoubtedly a place for people in Canada within the boundaries of our urban centres, and that is becoming more apparent every day. The organization we have at the moment throughout Canada would indicate that there will be a fairly lively demand for mechanics to engage in the building trades in the various cities of Canada, and we are ready, willing and glad to make that known in countries from which we hope to attract settlers. But when I mention the great railway problem and the difficulty that has been mentioned by my hon. friend, namely, the burden of taxation that is bearing down upon the shoulders of the people of Canada, one way in which this can be relieved is by getting additional people into this country. That is not the only way, it is true, but that is one of the ways. The hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Garland) stated the other day that one of the lures we were offering to people to come to Canada was to come and assist us with our very heavy burden. Let me answer my hon. friend in two ways. We are not overpersuading people in the countries from which we hope to attract settlers, and there is no difficulty about convincing them that their opportunity in Canada is better than in the country in which they are living to-day. I am speaking of people engaged in agriculture in those countries, and I speak of Great Britain, Scandinavia, the European continent and the United States. Therefore, I think we can say with caution and safety, that we are offering a better opportunity, if we confine that settlement within reasonable distance of railway facilities. Thus, we are not asking them to come to Canada, primarily to assist us in carrying our burden. If I thought we were doing that, I would be the last one to advo-

cate that our agents scattered throughout the various countries I have mentioned, should offer the advantages of Canada to incoming settlers. Moreover, I have been very careful, in discussion with agents at Chicago, with Colonel Smith, who is in charge of twelve agencies in Great Britain, and with Mr. Willans, who has recently gone to the Continent, to ask them to be sure not to over-advertise, and not to overpersuade—if that is the proper way to put the matter—people to come to this country, but to offer the advantages that Canada is ready to offer, to all who intend leaving countries in which we are engaged in settlement work to-day. I hope that answers some of the questions raised by some hon. members with respect to the propaganda that we are carrying on. First, it is to the advantage of these people to come, because I believe they can better their condition. Second, they can undoubtedly—no one will deny the fact—be of a great deal of assistance to the people of Canada.

As regards migration, as near as I can discover, that has been going on since 1885 in greater or less degree. That it has gone on during the last year, no one will deny, and probably to a somewhat greater degree than on former occasions; but the unprecedented prosperity in urban centres of the United States has been the attraction. Whether that will continue is problematical; but at all events, I am getting assurances from the agencies of the United States that a very considerable movement will come to Canada this year.

As regards the Canada Colonization Association when they first approached me, they were endorsed by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, by the Canadian National Railway Company, by the banking institutions of Canada, and by boards of trade from one end of the country to the other. And let me say to the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) that those institutions, those boards of trade and those individuals who lent their endorsation to this scheme, did so on the scheme outlined by my hon. friend this afternoon. That was the scheme that was endorsed almost universally, as I stated the other day, from Montreal to the Pacific coast.

Mr. STEVENS: Do these railway companies, boards of trade and banking institutions accept any responsibility for the results of the activities of this company?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): That is another question. I will come to that later on. I simply want to state this afternoon that, as Minister of Immigration, I felt that this organization had the backing of the people of Canada who were anxious about land settlement. I do not propose to discuss at any length this afternoon the question of the basis of settlement, or the scheme outlined so well by my hon. friend. Responsible organizations in Canada have stated both publicly and privately that immigration is the great question in this country. I say that it is one of them, and I have repeatedly said that, it is, perhaps, not the greatest one, because some of my hon. friends who are sitting across the floor of this House and many on this side will, I am sure, agree with me, that many other things could be done that would, perhaps assist the situation. I have great respect for the opinion of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding). I think, perhaps, something might be done by way of tariff reduction that would help the situation materially. But, while I say that, let me say that I cannot forget that there is upon the shoulders of this government the responsibility of raising a tremendous sum of money annually, and the thing that the Immigration department could best advertise would be the fact that we have at last reached a point where our revenue covers our expenditure. I am not unmindful of these facts. As I say, I have a great deal of respect for my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) who has to deal with matters of this kind, and I am prepared to support him when he has to take into consideration the situation as it exists throughout Canada. My hon. friend for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) had a different idea from mine altogether; and throughout Canada different views are held. But I say that the one paramount thing we must consider, the one question we have to face at all times, is how we shall raise the revenue. My hon. friend (Mr. Stevens) said—and I am not going to say anything on that point—that it was the method of raising this revenue that he objected to. Undoubtedly, his view in regard to this matter is different from mine. Now, I do not believe that it is within the province of a government to go into the real estate business; and I want to keep as far away from it as does my hon. friend for Vancouver Centre. I do not want to see the government of Canada implicated in any scheme in which it has to act as agent between the vendor and the purchaser of land. Indeed, I do not believe that the government could ever occupy that position, either through the agency of the Soldier Settlement Board or of any other organization that might be in its direct pay. My hon. friend

may say that because we are offering to assist this organization, which is backed by the money of private interests and private individuals throughout Canada and which has the endorsation of all the people and all the responsible bodies I have mentioned, that we are nevertheless making a serious mistake. Well, I think that you, Mr. Chairman, as well as other members of this committee, so far as this debate has progressed, will agree with me that the man who could evolve an immigration policy that would satisfy all the members of this House would be a second Moses.

An hon. MEMBER: Greater than Moses.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Possibly. That, at any rate, is my opinion, and I form that opinion after listening to the speeches of hon. gentlemen on all sides of this House. It is a fair assumption, I think, that the members of parliament are representative of the feelings of the people throughout Canada. And whatever our views may be, I think there is one thing about which we are all agreed, and that is that we must get people into Canada. I say, therefore, let us bring into the country people who have a fair chance of making a success. My hon. friend says that we should have a well rounded out policy and should beware of the difficulties that beset us. I said the other day that I was aware of the conflicting opinions throughout Canada; which I had heard from all quarters; and I am well aware also of the difficulties under which the agricultural population of Canada is labouring. But I still think that there is an opportunity for saving the situation and giving a decent chance to the people who come amongst us. Let me repeat again, most emphatically, that if I did not feel that way I should not be advocating immigration to this country.

My hon. friend makes the statement that this organization may get the government of Canada into difficulties. Now, I said the other day, and I want in all fairness to repeat, that from what I know about the organization it has not the entire approval of all the people who have subscribed their money to it; that is, I mean, the scheme under which this organization is operating at the present moment. And when I make that statement I want to deal with the objection that has been voiced in reference to this matter. I stated that the Canadian Pacific Railway lent their endorsation to the scheme, and when I spoke of the scheme I meant the 32-year plan of land selling. Colonel J. S. Dennis, who is a strong advocate of the scheme which my hon. friend has criticized, as it affects the vendor and the purchaser, does however object—and in fairness to him I make the statement—to the taking of the ten per cent commission by the organization; and that is one of the reasons why he to-day is not an advocate of this particular scheme. He does not approve of the taking of that commission. But let me explain.

Mr. BOYS: I understood the minister to say that the scheme had the approval of the late government and also of the various institutions to which he has referred; and his latest interjection raises that very question. What scheme was it that had their approval? Was it the scheme now before the people, or some previous scheme? I hold in my hand an early prospectus of the company, and there have been no fewer than three variations in it since last September. One important variation, and one that has prompted me to rise now and interrupt the minister, is the very point of commission. The prospectus I have in my hand, and which I am given to understand was issued about September last, with two variations since, provides a commission of fifty cents an acre on the land actually sold. Taking the illustration which appears in this flaring advertisement referred to by my hon. friend for Vancouver Centre, we find that 160 acres rated at $20 per acre produce a commission, not of $80 as would be the case on a fifty-cent basis, but of $320. And the same thing would apply to the sale
5 p.m. of the whole 900,000 acres if the same basis were adopted. What I want to ask the minister is this: Is he in a position to say that the gentleman he has referred to as the late president—in fact, he was the only president—Sir John Willison, who presided for a period of three months, did approve of the fifty cents an acre commission or the ten per cent commission, which is very much larger? There are many other features on which I should like information from the minister, but for the moment I will confine my question to this point.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Sir John Willison did approve of the scheme. He toured the western provinces and spoke to the boards of trade. I may say that he also addressed the Board of Trade in Toronto and outlined the very scheme my hon. friend has discussed this afternoon.

Mr. BOYS: The ten per cent commission?

Mr. STEVENS: What scheme?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The scheme you outlined this afternoon.

Mr. STEVENS: The ten per cent. commission?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes, the scheme as it is outlined in the advertisement referred to by my hon. friend.

Mr. BOYS: There are three variations in it.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Well, let us deal with the last one, because we shall only become entangled if we try to consider them all simultaneously. I will confine my remarks to the last scheme and try to give the committee a fair statement of the facts as they exist in connection with this matter. Colonel J. S. Dennis makes the statement that this organization was to be patriotic, to be supported entirely by private subscription. It was not to take any commission but was to be supported and paid altogether out of the moneys to be raised by the various subscribers to the organization. Now, I want to be perfectly fair and to make myself clear on the matter.

Mr. BOYS: Was not that the proposition that Sir John Willison lent himself to? In other words, did he not advocate a scheme that was to be patriotic, a philanthropic proposition. I am told that these gentlemen did subscribe $1,000,000, but that there was no real estate proposition for commission at all. They were to devote the money for a period of probably three years to the encouragement of the work of settlement, and when that was done, it was supposed that the company would carry itself.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): With the single exception of Colonel J. S. Dennis I do not know of, nor has there come to my knowledge, any other objector. And I presume that Colonel J. S. Dennis was speaking on behalf of the Canadian Pacific Railway. In fairness to Mr. Beatty I may say that several conversations took place between him and myself with respect to this matter prior to the visit to Great Britain of Mr. Brown and his associates to interest the overseas government. I had been pressed ever since July of last year to lend assistance to this organization on the ground that it would be in the best interests of the settlement of these privately-owned lands—in other words, the getting of these lands out of the hands of owners who could not utilize them and were not cultivating them.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Does the minister know why General McRae left this organization?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes,—well, perhaps I should not say that. I do not know why he left, but I do know that his scheme was not acceptable to the board of directors.

[Mr. Chas. Stewart.]

Mr. BOYS: Was his salary not fixed at $25,000 a year?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I have no knowledge of that.

Mr. BOYS: I am informed on an authority which I do not dispute for a moment that for acting as president he was to receive $25,000 —and that in connection with a scheme which had been started for patriotic and philanthropic purposes. I understand that that was a source of dissatisfaction.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The only knowledge I have of the organization during the presidency of General McRae was when he asked me for legislation in Alberta to make compulsory the listing of privately owned lands. I do not know what salary he was paid or how long he was employed by this organization.

Mr. BOYS: I am not saying he was paid that, but I know that amount was fixed, and I am given to understand there was trouble over it. One does not wonder that there was.

Mr. STEVENS: The minister refers to Colonel Dennis, of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Do the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Canadian National Railways officially endorse this scheme?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Let me make a differentiation to my hon. friend. So far as the 32-year plan of land settlement is concerned, yes—all of them agree.

Mr. STEVENS: And the ten per cent to the company?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No. I have tried to point out that Colonel Dennis objected to that provision for the ten per cent to go to the company. An organization of this kind appeals to the Canadian Pacific Railway; they think it is in the best interests of Canada and that it ought to be supported by the government; and they are a unit in expressing approval. Now, have I made that plain to my hon. friend? So far as the purpose of this organization is to settle these lands, it has received entire approval. The one difficulty is the objection to the ten per cent taken by the company.

I have stated that pressure was being exerted from all quarters in this matter, and that criticism was being made of the government and of the Immigration department in that they were not participating in the overseas scheme. It has been stated that we are urged largely by the transportation companies to bring settlers into Canada. That is

not the case; I will deal with that in a moment or two, in connection with our propaganda for getting settlement. But I yielded to the extent of assisting this organization as we did last fall. They went forward; they listed in the neighbourhood of half a million acres of land. I cannot of course, take an affidavit on this floor that the vendor of these lands knows all about the provisions of the listing; I assume he does. I have heard those who own land privately, private individuals as well as corporations, maligned because of the very fact that they were holding it. As one who had something to do with taxation I endeavoured in the province from which I come to make it unprofitable for the absentee landholder or the owner of land out of use to continue to hold that land. We imposed an unearned increment tax and we gave to those who improved their land a reduction of 25 per cent from the rate applying to unimproved areas so far as local taxation went. There is no property tax in that province, so that the man who holds unimproved land is more than willing to sell it. The greatest criticism I received from our agents was that there was no responsible organization to which we could send prospective settlers to purchase land. I have pointed out that I did not think it was good business for the government to go into a land selling scheme. For these reasons I thought it wise to utilize this organization to a certain extent in our scheme of settling those lands. I hold in my hand a telegram from Sir John Willison sent to me on September 30. It is to this effect:

> Have just completed tour of West. Have had conferences with four western governments and with grain growers and held many public meetings. Interviews with all governments most satisfactory.

He interviewed the western governments and placed this scheme before them. The telegram continues:

> All meetings warmly sympathetic. At Winnipeg meeting five hundred representative citizens called by James Stewart adopted with enthusiasm resolution offering plan Canada Colonization Association. Everywhere we emphasized action government in uniting all forces for immigration and settlement. Beatty has appointed Col Dennis to represent Canadian Pacific on operating committee association, and Chipman of Grain Growers Guide with approval Crerar has agreed represent western farmers.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): May I ask whether any farmer's organizations in any part of Canada have endorsed this scheme?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Not to my knowledge, except that there is on record a letter from the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) endorsing it. In fairness to him I may say that except so far as this telegram goes I did not know what connection we had with the organization at that time. But that propaganda, if you call it such, that settlement outlined by my hon. friend, was then in existence and it was on that basis that this enthusiastic reception was extended. That is what I want to convey to my hon. friend, because I am being severely criticized in connection with this matter.

I sometimes wonder, Mr. Chairman, whether if I had turned this thing down I would not have been criticized just as severely by some hon. gentlemen of this House for refusing assistance to this organization. I realize full well the difficulties of a position of this character. I want to do the best I can for the people of this country. My business is to get people into this country, and to bring them honestly and legitimately if it is humanly possible so to do, to bring in citizens who will assimilate with the life of this country and assist in nation-building here, no matter whether I am here as minister or whether this government or some other government is in existence. I have endeavoured to do this in a careful, conscientious way.

As I stated the other day, one other factor in inducing me to listen to the proposal of this organization was the fact that I knew of the activities of Mr. Howard Everett. I have known of his activities for years. Does anyone in this House, does anyone in this parliament think that the activities of governmental agencies alone in Canada have brought all the settlers in this country? Let me ask my hon. friends who have lived in western Canada, some of them longer than I have, do they not think that in a very large way the settlement that is in western Canada to-day was brought in by men who came in and purchased cheap land, and then went out and spent money and sold it and placed settlers on those lands? I frankly admit that some of them did not always tell the truth, that they over-coloured the picture, because as my hon. friend has rightly said, there is always an inducement to do that kind of thing. But here is one organization, and I would ask any hon. gentleman representing the areas that this company operated in for twenty years in Saskatchewan and central Alberta, have they heard any complaints about it? So far, as I am concerned, I have never heard that Howard Everett or his company misrepresented land to any individual whom they settled, but I have heard this, that where dissatisfaction existed they made it their business to change the individual to more congenial surroundings, and perhaps to better land, believing, and I think it is good business, that

to have a satisfied settler was a better advertisement for them than to make the small sum of money that might accrue from refusing to make that exchange.

Mr. Chairman, I am not unmindful of the difficulties that surround a situation such as this, but I have felt that as one of the agencies for settlement we might give this organization a trial, and I have recommended it to the government. My hon. friend has said that there is a signed agreement in existence—perhaps I should qualify that statement that there would be a signed agreement in existence. There is not. We have discussed this matter from time to time, and undoubtedly this organization have certain promises of mine that I hold more or less in respect. I believe from the experience that I have had in connection with western Canada that this organization can be a real factor in settling western Canada, and that is the reason I am asking for the consideration of this committee.

My hon. friend made one other statement, that the agents of the government are to act with this company's agents. That is not the case. Rather is it the reverse. They are to carry on their own work. True, if you pick up an advertisement of our government in the United States you will find reference in one particular to this organization, namely, that they are in Canada and that we think it is an organization upon which the intending settler can depend for information of a reliable character, but he is under no obligation to purchase from the company. Furthermore, they have not gone into Great Britain. They will confine their operations entirely to the United States. They will not even be in the eastern states. Their business, so far as this year at all events is concerned, will be bringing settlers from the western states to settle in western Canada, and I think that that is a task for which Mr. Everett is eminently fitted.

Our own immigration agents in the United States are working along the very same lines on which they have always worked. They are advertising Canada to the man who is intending to leave the United States and come here and settle, and I take it that there is no criticism of that. What I want to emphasize here and now is that the statement made the other day that we are endeavouring to bring people to Canada by false representation has not one tittle of foundation in fact. That is not true of our efforts in any country in the world, none excepted. We are endeavouring to advertise Canada as Canada exists, and the opportunities that are in this country for those who are desirous to come here.

Let me follow that one step further and say this: We do not approach any individual until he has first made application to the agent. In the United States, for example, where advertisements are carried in the newspapers, when we get an application for information from some individual a card is sent out asking him for certain information, which is filed when it comes back. A mark is made upon the map indicating where this individual lives, and he is invited to meet on a certain day one of our agents who will be at some convenient point to which he can drive in. He then interviews the agent and the advantages of Canada are placed before him, the conditions are depicted just as they exist. If he is interested, we hope to get him to come up to Canada. That is true of the American field, and true also of the English field except that we go into it a little more intensively over there. I had hoped this year to have a number of motor cars in Great Britain. We have one in the British field at the moment, and we hope to have two or three carrying advertisements and showing motion pictures and giving lectures on the advantages of this country. We have very strong competitors in the Old Land. The Australian government and the South African government are all in the field in the Old Land for immigration. One of the principal difficulties in connection with moving people from the Old Land to Canada is that a great many of those who are willing to come and would make very desirable settlers are financially unable to make the move; but I do not want to be led away into a discussion of that phase at the moment.

I welcome criticism from any hon. member of this House. I am not averse to it at all. My object is to recommend to the government, in the light of this discussion and the various suggestions that are offered by members of this House, what is the best thing to do under the circumstances, what will be in the best interests of the country in connection with immigration.

One hon. member the other day asked me to give him the personnel of this organization. I have the names here, but before giving them I had perhaps better say a word or two about Sir John Willison. Sir John Willison was in charge of this organization for a short space of time. I have said that he endorsed the scheme that has been presented to the committee by my hon. friend this afternoon, that he has retired, and that the reason for his retirement was a difference of opinion that

apparently existed between some supporters of the organization here in the East and its vice president. In addition he pointed out to me that he does not feel that he understands all the ramifications of an organization of this kind; he feels that he cannot give his time to it, and that he is not warranted in taking a salary for devoting attention to an organization whose work he does not thoroughly understand. That is the purport of his statement with respect to this matter. I have said to the committee that I believe the success of this organization depends upon Mr. Howard Everett. I do not believe it depends upon Mr. Brown because Mr. Brown, with all due respect to him, has had little or no experience in the actual selling or disposing of lands. He has, no doubt, been valuable in stirring up public opinion and getting the subscriptions of those organizations that have backed this institution so far—and many of them are backing it to-day.

Let me read to you the names of the gentlemen who are in control of this association, although I think I shall have to make an exception in the case of my hon. friend the leader of the Progressives (Mr. Forke) whose name appears here. My hon. friend, however, made an explanation the other day with respect to his connection with the association, and I do not know that there is anything I can add to his statement.

Mr. FORKE: I am not at all ashamed to be in the association.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No. I want to give the committee all the information with respect to this matter that I am in possession of, and to be fair to all parties concerned. The officers and directors of the company are:

Vice-President, M. A. Brown.
General Manager, Howard Everett.
Secretary-Treasurer, F. D. L. Smith.
Directors:—
M. A. Brown, Winnipeg.
W. W. Evans, Winnipeg.
Robert Forke, Pipestone, Man.
Col. F. J. James, Regina, Sask.
S. W. Johns, Saskatoon, Sask.
J. F. Cairns, Saskatoon, Sask.
J. K. R. Williams, Regina, Sask.
Sam McLeod, Prince Albert, Sask.
Chas. McDonald, M.L.A., Prince Albert, Sask.
Hon. R. G. Brett, (Governor of Alberta), Edmonton.
Pat. Burns, Calgary, Alberta.
C. S. Noble, Nobleford, Alberta.
Brig. Gen. H. F. McDonald, Vancouver, B.C.
Col. Nelson Spencer, Vancouver, B.C.
Eastern Advisory Board:—
A. M. MacQueen, Toronto, Ont.
Robert Hobson, Hamilton, Ont.
Frank Cockshutt, Brantford, Ont.
Lt. Col. R. W. Leonard, St. Catherines, Ont.
F. D. L. Smith, Toronto, Ont.

That is the statement I have to make with respect to this matter. I think I have covered the field very well except to say this: I stated the other day that the association had half a million acres of land listed at the present moment, and that land is all listed within reasonable distance of the existing railways largely our own national railways. They are making some progress. The latest reports I have from them—and these reports are to be furnished monthly—denote that they have 200 intending settlers ready to bring to western Canada to examine the lands that have been listed. They have agents in the United States, a very large number of agents, and undoubtedly these men will be under the control of the manager, Mr. Everett. If there is an element of danger to this government in trying to utilize and use the services of an organization of this kind—as my hon. friend (Mr. Stevens) pointed out—backed by the people I have mentioned so far as I know—because I have had no contradiction of this telegram of Sir John Willison's of the 30th September that there was full knowledge of the scheme that is now before the House—I have had no communication or no objection with the single exception of the one gentleman I have mentioned, Colonel John S. Dennis. I still believe that a great many people in Canada think this is the proper method to handle privately owned land, along the existing lines of railway, which it is so desirable to bring under cultivation and have settled.

My hon. friend (Mr. Stevens) has suggested that we are not co-operating with the provincial governments. I think I told my hon. friend the other day that not only was I trying to co-operate with them, but that I visited them last summer and placed before them the very serious situation, in my opinion, that existed in Canada for the lack of an adequate population. I went to the province from which my hon. friend himself comes—I went as far west as British Columbia. I met the government in the Vancouver Hotel and discussed this matter with them. They are vitally interested, they are willing to co-operate; but they feel, perhaps, that it is a duty of the federal government to assume, in a large way, the financial responsibility of this work. With respect to the prairie provinces I did the same thing. Not only that but I called a conference last fall and asked representatives from every province in Canada to come here and discuss this very vital question in all its aspects; and these governments, so far as I know—I have had no intimation to the contrary—have endorsed this scheme outlined by my hon. friend. My hon. friend

asked me why I recommend a scheme of this kind to the government? I felt, Mr. Chairman, that I had the backing, and that this government would have the backing, of the provincial governments; that we would also have the backing of these organizations that I have mentioned in a scheme of this kind when it had been so fully and clearly explained to them—as I was ready to believe had been done by this association and by so responsible a gentleman as Sir John Willison; because I think we can say with full assurance that Sir John Willison would make a fair presentation of the facts in a case of this kind. I felt too, and I think my hon. friends from western Canada will agree with me, that when a scheme of the kind was presented to westerners, who knew every phase of an enterprise of this character, they would be critical and examine the situation very carefully before lending support—such support as I have mentioned by way of resolutions passed by certain bodies—to an undertaking of this nature. Therefore, if I have made a mistake, if I have gone astray in making this recommendation, all I have to say is that I am in mighty good company.

Mr. SPENCER: Did the Alberta government fully endorse the proposition?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I know that the Alberta government was visited by these gentlemen and I know that previously they endorsed this scheme. I cannot say that I have in my possession letters from the Alberta government, since September 30, endorsing it.

Mr. STEVENS: Will the minister permit me one more question and I will not bother him any more. Has he official endorsation of this scheme, as set forth in their propaganda, from the Imperial government, the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Canadian National Railways, the provincial governments of Canada, and the banking institutions to which he has referred? If he has will he lay those endorsations on the table?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I have not endorsations from those organizations in writing. I have an endorsation from Colonel Amery, who was in charge of the Empire Settlement scheme, after Mr. M. A. Brown and Mr. Smith had laid this matter before him. However, let me in fairness, say this: Colonel Amery pointed out quite properly that before they would be prepared to lend full support to the scheme it would have to be endorsed by the government of Canada. Have I made myself clear?

[Mr. Chas. Stewart.]

Mr. STEVENS: Not at all. My hon. friend has made himself clear to this extent—he will correct me if I am wrong—that he has no official endorsation at all from any of these institutions to which he has referred and to which the association's advertisement applies.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I followed very closely the press despatches at the time this visit was made to western Canada. I saw no statement in the western newspapers that what was contained in the telegram from Sir John Willison was not true. I have no direct communications from the boards of trade or these various institutions I have mentioned.

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend does not catch my question. I asked him if he had the endorsation, as referred to in this propaganda, of the Imperial government, the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Canadian National Railways and the Canadian government—never mind the telegram at all or the board of trade—these important official bodies upon which my hon. friend places so much importance and which he introduces in justification of his scheme.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I have not the direct written endorsation of those individuals. I did not think it was necessary. Surely my hon. friend did not expect that, before an organization of this sort was started by private individuals, with the names of the gentlemen that I have mentioned as sponsors for it, they would require the written endorsation of every organization to which they gave an explanation of their scheme.

Mr. STEVENS: The hon. minister will persist in bringing in every organization. I limited my question to the official bodies and I will repeat them—the Imperial government, the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Canadian National Railways, and the provincial governments. My hon. friend says he has no endorsations from these bodies.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I will say, dealing with the Imperial government particularly, that they have written saying that the scheme as outlined appealed to them, but of course they did not deal directly with private organizations, and before accepting and supporting fully a scheme of this character it would require to be endorsed by the federal government.

Mr. STEVENS: Permit me to read to my hon. friend a portion of this propaganda. In the official statement of this association I find the following.

The Imperial government will assume a legal share of the cost of the welfare work.

And so on; inferring in this propaganda that the Imperial government, as my hon. friend's suggestion would infer, the Canadian Pacific and the other organizations, would assume part of the financial responsibility. Now apparently there is no such responsibility assumed by these bodies at all.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I am not sure whether the report brought back by Mr. Brown was confirmed by letter or not. However, one should speak carefully about matters of this kind. I am not sure whether the amount of $100,000, which was mentioned as a contribution for the purpose of welfare work to be carried on amongst settlers who have come from the Old Country, was mentioned in the letter or not. All I am sure is that we have a letter of the character I have mentioned from Colonel Amery, then head of the Overseas Settlement Board, saying that the scheme appealed to them, but of course it would require to have the endorsation of the federal government. With that, I will leave it. I will be very glad to examine my correspondence, to see just exactly what was said about that matter. Of course I am not responsible in every particular for all that may have appeared in that advertisement, nor do I wish to be held responsible. In the main, I think, perhaps, it is correct. I have tried to make myself clear with respect to the railways and with respect to the other individuals who were backing a scheme of this character.

I believe that my hon. friend asked the amount of money subscribed and paid up. I think practically one million and a quarter were subscribed, and so far, $150,000 of that amount has been paid up and used by this corporation, and that they will continue to subscribe, and that they are continuing to receive subscriptions, I am assured.

Mr. BOYS: How much was paid up?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): One hundred and fifty thousand dollars is the amount mentioned in the report I got from this association. So far as I am concerned, I will try to throw around the attempt, at all events, to settle the land and settle it successfully, carefully and economically, all the safeguards that are humanly possible to be placed around it. For years the organization known as the Salvation Army have been given a grant as my hon. friend well knows, of $25,000. No investigation has been held into the affairs of the army. I was one of the members of this House who voted that sum of money last year, but I would be unable to say just how that money is used. I believe it is used well. I believe they can make good use of that $25,000. They do a splendid work, and I am again recommending that $25,000 be given to them. I have heard repeatedly commendation of the giving of this sum of money to this organization to engage in immigration work. So that the giving of a grant to the organization is not a new thing for the government which preceded us, nor for this government. This is in a somewhat larger way, and I say that I have not heard criticism of the grant to that organization. True they are religious. They are engaged to some extent in the land settlement scheme.

Mr. STEVENS: They are not getting a ten per cent commission.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No, they are not getting a commission; that is true and that is the reason of all my hon. friend's criticisms.

Mr. STEVENS: No, not all.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): And full assurance is given that this money will not be taken in the way of profit. Let me say that if an arrangement is made with the association, an accounting of the disposition of funds will be made monthly. My hon. friend will say that is no particular protection, but I wish to impress upon the committee that every means of protection humanly possible will be adopted to prevent people being mulcted of their funds, or cheated in their settlement, and I hope that nothing of that kind will happen. My hon. friend will say that that is a pious hope and will not materialize.

Mr. STEVENS: Hear, hear.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): So far as I can see, I think this scheme has many advantages. It will help to settle a very difficult problem, because without it I fear we will have the same disjointed policy with respect to settling these lands and the same disappointment that we have had in the past. I have endeavoured to enlist every organization in immigration that was possible for me to enlist, hoping by the co-operation of all the people who are interested in this problem in Canada to work out a scheme of co-operation and co-ordination the effect of which would be advantageous to the people and government of that country. I stated the other day that any wide scheme of settlement involving huge expenditures of money would not be warranted at this time, and I am of the same opinion today. In the light of the discussion we have had, I sometimes wonder whether it would not have been well to have gone very slow. It would have been a great disappointment to certain people in Canada had we done so.

We have gone moderately with this thing; we have endeavoured to evolve a scheme that will embrace every phase of settlement, bringing in people where they are required in urban centres, where a demand appears to exist for them and endeavouring to prevent unemployment during the long winter months, because we have to face in Canada the problem of seasonal employment with those six months of winter. I have sought to avoid the pitfalls of the past, first, by careful selection, second, by careful placing, in order to give those whom we bring into this country an opportunity to succeed.

As regards emigration, so far as we are able to get substantial returns, these would indicate that it is not so much the people who come to this country who are leaving it—and people are not leaving the country in such large numbers from western Canada as from eastern Canada—but rather our own sons and daughters, born and reared in Canada, who are going to the United States. Therefore, it behooves us that we be more careful than ever; that we exercise due care in selecting those whom we bring amongst us, because I do not see that we can entirely stop that flow to the United States, much as we would do so.

In conclusion, so far as possible in carrying out this scheme of immigration, every aspect of it, I will endeavour to exercise due care, first, in selection and, second, in placing, in order that we may have a well-balanced colonization scheme for the whole of Canada, including the area in northern Ontario about which my hon. friend has complained. We stand ready at any moment to co-operate with any provincial government on any scheme that will appeal to the federal authorities for the settlement of any area in any province, more particularly along the area served by the Grand Trunk Pacific railway through the older provinces of Quebec and Ontario. We welcome co-operation, and we will co-operate and work hand in hand in any scheme. In saying this, I am speaking largely on behalf of myself, but that would be my recommendation to the government.

I think I have covered all the phases in connection with this matter as regards the Canada Colonization Association. I shall be glad to have further light on immigration matters, and if possible so to adjust them as to meet with the approval of all hon. members.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I had not intended to take any part in this debate; but the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) brought my name into the discussion, and he rather intimated that the Acting Minister of Immigration (Mr. Stewart) had taken upon himself to settle the entire question of the government's relation to the Canada Colonization Association, and that the matter had not been carefully considered by the government as a whole. I just want to assure the House that co-operation in this matter was not lightly undertaken by the government but that it did receive the most careful consideration in Cabinet Council, before the minister finally decided to give the approval which he gave as to a limited measure of governmental assistance towards this Canada Colonization scheme.

I should like to draw the attention of hon. members to the responsibility which the government had in this matter. A government has to accept responsibility, not only for what it does, but for what it refuses or fails to do. In the matter of immigration, as members of the House well know, there is nothing that, perhaps, counts for so much as an effective organization, an organization that will bring together large bodies of influence that may have means and methods which even a government itself could not possibly have of helping to bring about the result desired. When we came into office, we found that our predecessors had done little or nothing with respect to immigration, in the months immediately preceding their going out of office. As a matter of fact, the whole immigration work of the government had been practically stopped. There was a demand, very naturally and properly, from all parts of Canada, that efforts should be made to stimulate immigration; that advantage should be taken of every possible agency towards that end. We found an organization which was already in existence, an organization, let me say at once, not composed of friends of the government. I think almost every name identified with it was that of a gentleman who had not been associated, so far as I am aware, with the administration; but the names were for the most part those of men who rank high in public confidence in this country. We found that organization in existence, and it was represented to us that it had been able to bring together certain of the large financial interests, the large transportation companies, and to a considerable extent the entire press of the country, as a combined agency to help to further it in its purpose, which was asserted to be the patriotic one of assisting in getting settlers for the vacant lands of this country.

I ask hon. members: With an association of that kind in existence, representing to the

government that our co-operation was required in order that they might get assistance from Great Britain under the British Empire settlement scheme, what position would the government have been in had it refused to countenance, in the slight degree in which we have countenanced it, this organization, and refused to agree to assist it in its welfare work?

I venture to say that hon. gentlemen who are condemning us to-day for some of the features of this organization which do not appeal to them, would have been the first and loudest in their denunciation of the government, had we at that time said: "We will not have anything to do with this particular organization." And what would have been said? The reason would have been very speedily alleged or the motive asserted that the government had declined its co-operation because the gentlemen who for the most part composed the company, were not of the same political persuasion as members of the administration.

I confess that when the whole plan was put before the government, I felt it was a serious matter for the government to lend assistance to an association as vast as this. On the other hand, considering the responsibility of refusing, and what a refusal might involve, namely, a possible complete crippling of the organization, and the destroying of the possibility of its securing assistance from the British government in connection with its work, I felt, on examining the personnel and above all having regard for the then president of the association, that the government was justified in lending the countenance it did to the association. I had interviews with Sir John Willison. The minister and myself met Sir John Willison and other members of the board at Toronto, and they outlined their plans very fully to us. The matter was thoroughly discussed in Council, and such assistance as we were giving, was given on the same basis as the British Empire Association was to give its assistance, and on a parity with what the organisation itself was also to give for its welfare work.

Let me again read this communication, because in a way it sums up the endorsation which the government felt it had from the different parties concerned. The minister has read it, but I shall refer to it again. The telegram was sent to me by Sir John Willison from Winnipeg after conversations we had had together on the subject, and after I had intimated in the clearest possible way to Sir John Willison that unless the government had the assurance that this scheme was one which appealed to the western governments, and that it was a plan which was likely to meet with the general approval of parliament, irrespective altogether of the groups of which it was composed, we could not undertake to lend our co-operation to what it was proposing to do. On September 30th Sir John Willison sent me this telegram:

> Have just completed tour of West. Have had conferences with four western governments and with grain growers and held many public meetings. Interviews with all governments most satisfactory and all meetings warmly sympathetic.

Now, I submit that no one who knows Sir John Willison and is aware of his standing, not only in this country, but throughout the British Empire, would suggest that a statement of that kind from him to the government of Canada was not equivalent to an endorsation of this plan on the part of the western governments and the people of the West generally. The telegram continues:

> At Winnipeg meeting five hundred representative citizens called by James Stewart adopted with enthusiasm resolution offering plan Canada Colonization Association. Everywhere we emphasized action government in uniting all forces for immigration and settlement.

That was the strong point urged upon us by this association. It was pointed out by Sir John Willison and his associates that they had succeeded in bringing together into one organization agencies which were prepared to co-operate and which were so essential to bring immigrants to Canada, namely, the transportation agencies, the financial backing that was necessary, and the press of the country—three powerful and mighty influences, all ready to work together for the settlement of the unsettled areas. That was the note which Sir John Willison sounded, not only in conversation with the government, but publicly wherever he spoke on the subject.

> Beatty has appointed Col. Dennis to represent Canadian Pacific on operating committee association,—

My hon. friend asks whether we have the endorsation of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I ask, in reply, what better form of endorsation could be given by this corporation than that which is implied in this statement, that its president had appointed Colonel Dennis to represent the Canadian Pacific Railway on the operating committee of the association. Then my hon. friend asks, have we any endorsation from any other source. What is the next statement in the telegram:

> —and Chipman of Grain Growers Guide with approval Crerar has agreed represent western farmers.

These are all names that are held in respect in this House and that carry weight with the government and with the country. I submit

that with the class of representations that are contained in that telegram which were made to the government in regard to this association, had we refused to have anything to do with the organization, or to assist it to the small extent that we are—because in view of the fact that the organization has a subscribed capital of over a million dollars, $100,000 is relatively small when it covers everything for which we are obligated and which we have conditionally promised—our responsibility, in refusing to have anything to do with the organization would have been infinitely greater than the obligation which we have assumed in endeavouring to give the organization a start on its way, and to help it successfully carry out the large purposes for which it is intended.

At six o'clock the Speaker resumed the chair and the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 76 (from the Senate), for the relief of Ernest Warren Porter.—Mr. Ross (Kingston).

Bill No. 77 (from the Senate), for the relief of May Elizabeth Meng.—Mr. Hunt.

Bill No. 78 (from the Senate), for the relief of Maud Vera Butler.—Mr. Ladner.

Bill No. 79 (from the Senate), for the relief of Lillian Black.—Mr. Hocken.

Bill No. 80 (from the Senate), for the relief of Florence Elizabeth McDonald.—Mr. Church.

Bill No. 81 (from the Senate), for the relief of Gretta Melville.—Mr. Ryckman.

SUPPLY

IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION

The House again in Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

Immigration—outside service—salaries, $700,000.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: When the committee rose at six o'clock I had been speaking of the responsibility of the government in the matter of lending the assistance which it promised to the Western Canada Colonization Association, and the still greater responsibility we would have assumed had we refused to have anything to do with that organization. I hope I made it plain that in promising a limited measure of assistance for the welfare work of the Association, the government was influenced by the importance of the work, the personnel of the association, and the large and responsible interests represented by those gentlemen in this country.

I would like to say quite frankly that among the names that helped to inspire confidence so far as I personally was concerned was that of Sir John Willison, as president of the organization. I felt that Sir John Willison would not have associated himself as president with the Western Canada Colonization Association if its purpose was, as has been suggested in this debate that of some realty scheme, a land profits scheme of some kind or another, an agency other than of a patriotic and public-spirited character. Believing that the purpose of the organization was of a patriotic and public-spirited character, the government felt that it would justly incur a measure of disapproval, if it failed to encourage to the extent it did, an undertaking as vast as this, and which gave promise of such profitable results, possibly not all in a day, but in the course of time, by way of settling people on large tracts of land in this country.

When Sir John Willison retired from the presidency of the company, I confess that the members of the government felt a moment of concern with respect to the assistance that should be continued towards the organization, and we hesitated somewhat in our further relations with it. I remember particularly in the interviews I had with one or two members of the organization mentioning that we had gone into this matter to the extent we had, from purely public reasons, that if we had been governed by party considerations in any way, we would probably, as I indicated before recess, have had nothing whatever to do with the organization, as most of its personnel were gentlemen who were known to be opposed to the government. I stated that we had sought to take what we believed to be a broad patriotic stand and on this basis had recognized the association which our predecessors in office had been prepared to have dealings with. I pointed out that with the change that had come about as a consequence of Sir John Willison's resignation, it would be necessary for the company to give the government some further assurance of the confidence which it held in the minds of the people of the country. I spoke particularly of the complexion of the House of Commons and of the necessity in any great undertaking of this kind, of the government having the co-operation of the groups which were opposed to it. I pointed out that we had no desire whatever to deal with the immigration question on party lines; that we wished to have a policy broader than that of party and that we hoped and believed

we could count upon the co-operation of hon. members in this House, in an endeavour to deal with this all important question, probably the most important we have, in a statesmanlike way. I received the assurance of the officers of the company that they had been in conference with the leaders of the groups opposite, and that the leaders were of the opinion that the government should give their support to the organization notwithstanding the change which had taken place in the presidency. I said that I would like to have some substantial evidence of that, and in the course of a short time I was presented with one or two letters which I shall read to the House, and I shall ask hon. members to consider from a reading of them whether the government was not right in believing that it was justified in continuing the co-operation which it had promised.

The first is a letter from the Right hon. the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen), dated at Ottawa, Ontario, as recently as February 5, 1923. It is addressed to Mr. M. A. Brown, Vice-President of the Western Canada Colonization Association, Ottawa, Ontario. It was given to me by Mr. Brown with the statement that he had the permission of the right hon. leader of the Opposition to give this letter to the government. It reads as follows:

Dear Mr. BROWN,

Western Canada Colonization Association

You have asked me to give you my view as to the above Association.

When your organization was under way, the Honourable Mr. J. A. Calder, who was at that time Minister of Immigration and Colonization, looked with favour upon the establishment of a voluntary non-profit sharing company designed to serve as a colonizing agency of western farm lands, and as such to help to place and take care of immigrants who were to be intending settlers upon such lands.

Mr. Calder's attitude in this regard, which I believe was put in the form of a letter to the Association, was in harmony with the attitude of the government of the time.

I regarded such an Association as having a useful purpose to serve and could see then as I see now, no reason why it should not succeed.

Yours very truly,

ARTHUR MEIGHEN.

At the same time I was handed by Mr. Brown a letter from my hon. friend the member for Brandon (Mr. Forke), and I may say that I had the same assurance from Mr. Brown at the time this letter was received by me, that it had been written with the expectation that the government would not hesitate to use it, if circumstances seemed to warrant its introduction into any of the debates. It reads as follows:

OTTAWA, February 3, 1923.

Dear Mr. BROWN,

Having taken into consideration the policy of the Canada Colonization Association, which is planned to effect the settlement of the vacant lands of the railway lines in Canada, I have no hesitation in endorsing the scheme so well suited to the requirements of the country. The need of new immigrants to settle our vacant lands is great and would tend to solve some of the problems that are now before us.

I am therefore of opinion that the government should do all in its power to assist the Association in this important enterprise.

Yours very sincerely,

ROBERT FORKE.

That communication is in entire accord with the speech which the hon. leader of the Progressive group made in this House a night or two ago.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that these two communications are to all intents and purposes an endorsation of the Western Canada Colonization Association, an endorsation given in the same spirit and with the same knowledge of the organization, as the government had. I think hon. gentlemen opposite who have given these communications to the Western Canada Colonization Association have done so with precisely the same motive as the government had, in giving such endorsation as it gave, in promising co-operation with the British Empire Settlement Association in its immigration scheme. May I say that I think that had all hon. members of this House the knowledge of this association, and the purpose of its work, and the information concerning what it has accomplished in bringing together the different elements whose co-operation are so essential to success in immigration, their view of its possible service would have been precisely what the view of the government has been and the view expressed also in the two communications from the respective leaders of the groups opposite., which I have read to the House.

If, as a matter of fact, it should now appear that in any particular the Western Canada Colonization Association is not fulfilling the spirit as well as the intent of the letter of the representations and the undertakings they gave to the government, that would be a good and sufficient reason for the government to consider at this time whether further assistance should be given to the organization. I submit that at the present time—

Mr. FORKE: May I interrupt for a moment? I understood just before we rose at six o'clock that there was another letter to which the Prime Minister had referred. It may not be proper to read that letter without the permission of the writer, but I understood there was another letter which the Premier would probably read to-night. If the Premier thinks it better not to read that letter I will not press the request.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I may say that I saw my hon. friend as I was going out of the House at 6 o'clock, and I mentioned to him that I intended this evening to read his communication to Mr. Brown, and that I had another communication from the leader of the Opposition. Those were the two communications which I referred to, they are the two which I have just read. Probably I read the one from the leader of the Opposition before my hon. friend came in. Is not that the communication to which he refers?

Mr. FORKE: No, that was not the one I refer to. However, I prefer to leave the matter where it is for the present. I think the Premier has another letter; he probably understands the one I mean.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No, I am not aware of any other.

Mr. STEVENS: Let us have them all.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I would be glad if my hon. friend would mention the communication to which he refers; I have no knowledge of it. The only communications I spoke of to my hon. friend were the two which I have in my hand at the moment, and possibly the telegram from Sir John Willison. I did not refer to any other.

Mr. FORKE: It is all right; I am quite satisfied.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If my hon. friend recalls the conversation I had with him, he will recollect that I simply mentioned to him that I intended to read his communication, and also a communication from the right hon. leader of the Opposition, each of which had been given to me by Mr. Brown, and given on the understanding that they were to be regarded as public communications.

Now, all that I wish to say, Mr. Chairman, is this: I submit that the government, in the action which it took at the outset, was justified in lending the co-operation it did to this organization, from the representations that were made concerning its opportunities of service, from the nature of the organization itself, and the personnel of those who were responsible for its affairs. I submit further, that such changes as have taken place since would be a reason for the government moving with increased caution in the matter of any assistance it might give the association; that having taken the precautions that the government has taken to ascertain from the leaders of the groups opposite how far they also had confidence in this organization, and having before it the communications which I have just read, the government has, in this matter, acted in a manner which is best serving the interests of the country. But if it should now appear that this organization has in any way departed from its original purpose, if in any way it is departing from the representations which it made to the government—and on the basis of which such co-operation as we have given was given—then there would be good and sufficient reason why we should consider whether that co-operation should be extended any further. I confess, having regard to all of the circumstances, to the fact that the immigration problem is par excellence the great problem concerning this country at the present time, having regard to the fact that this association has brought together the different interests that should work in a co-ordinated fashion in the matter of immigration, that there would be a very great responsibility in the government declining at this stage to have anything further to do with the organization. But if hon. members have not confidence in it, if there is any reason to mistrust the organization at this particular stage, then I would say quite frankly that the government is prepared to consider just how much further, if at all, it should extend the co-operation which it has already promised in good faith, and in what it believes to be the best interests of the country.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I had not the privilege of hearing the Prime Minister until the commencement of his reading of the letter addressed by myself to the Secretary of the Canada Colonization Association, nor had I, indeed, intimation from the Prime Minister that any letter of mine was to be read.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Let me say to my right hon. friend at once, if he will permit me that it was on the merest chance that when the House adjourned I saw the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Forke). I would have read the letter before six o'clock if there had been time. My right hon. friend was not in the House when I was speaking before dinner. Had he been I would have extended the same courtesy to him that I did to the hon. member for Brandon; I would have mentioned that I had received his letter and intended to read it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am not making the least complaint. I did not write the letter with any idea of secrecy at all, and I stand by the terms of that letter to the last period. When the late government was in office the Western Canada Colonization Association, as it was then called, was formed. It was formed on the basis of a voluntary association to assist in the settlement of near railway western

lands, supported by the voluntary contribution of those who desired those lands settled, and particularly by those who had a special interest in that settlement. The late government made no proposal, nor did it receive favourably any suggestion, looking to exerting its own immigration activities through the instrumentality of the organization. The late government merely looked with favour upon the formation of a voluntary non-profit sharing organization. That position we took then, that position I reiterated without hesitation in the letter that was read; but just as we looked with favour upon the organization of a non-profit sharing company for this work, just as we took that view of it we took, as well, the view that there should not be any system of assistance on the part of the administration, nor any system of inter-responsibility as between the Immigration department, the government of Canada and any land selling organization. That responsibility we declined to take; and my letter is not only entirely consistent with that position but emphasizes it from beginning to end. I do not favour any assistance by the government; I do not favour any inter-locking responsibility as between the government of Canada and any land organization whatsoever; I did not favour it at the time; I do not favour it now. That is the purport of the letter I wrote, and if the government feels that it can rest on any letter of mine as endorsing the policy that now is presented to this House, I am afraid it rests on a broken reed.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Might I ask my right hon. friend whether, in his mind, the circumstance that his letter is headed "Western Canada Colonization Association", underlined and dated February 5, implies that he is referring to the Western Canada Association. as it was at that date.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That association was organized as a non-profit sharing, voluntary organization. As such it was looked on with favour; but assistance, by the government, and any system of inter-locking responsibility of the government with it was refused. Presented in the character it was then, for the purposes it then had, by itself and without any responsibility on the government's part and without any assistance from the government, it was favoured. In that sense I favoured it then; I have not changed my position in regard to the matter at all. But to say that because one does look with favour on the activities of a voluntary company, resting on its own feet, not asking to be supported by the state, not asking that the state share the responsibility of its work —favouring a company on that basis is one thing, the government policy is something else altogether. There is no word in my letter binding me, or intimating in the least degree that I favoured assistance by the government of Canada or that I favoured the government of Canada entering into some arrangement with this organization whereby government officers would assume a share of the responsibility for the work of the organization in the selling of lands, or in the purchase of lands by immigrants—nothing in the world in my letter favoured any such policy. I am quite prepared, I say, to stand by what I said then, because it is no doubt what we said when we were in power. But what we did when we were in power is wholly different from this proposal; and what I said at that time is wholly different from what is said by the Prime Minister.

Now, I have not had the advantage of hearing anything else from the Prime Minister himself, but in the course of the debate I have heard it said that nothing was done by the late administration in the way of immigration, and that there were great calls for immigration activities in the time of the late administration. Well, there were calls for many things during the time of the late administration. It was a time of calls all over the Dominion, but the only thing that was not called for was immigration. I do not remember ever hearing the call from anybody for special activities in immigration at that time. Here, as in every country in the world, the volume of unemployment was great—great in almost all classes of employment—and there was considerable suffering as a result. It is true we had the least unemployment relatively of any country in the world. It is true we had less unemployment even than the great republic to the south of us though one would expect that in the reaction and the relapse from the war we would suffer more than the great republic. Up to the end of 1921 our share of unemployment was less than theirs, but that is not the case to-day. Our share of unemployment now is much more than theirs relatively to population. Still we had large numbers out of work and there was no pressure for great immigration effort.

Immigration at that time though was not dead. Immigration at that time was all it could be expected to be so soon after the war. We had some 117,000 people come to this country in the year that succeeded the war; that is to say in the first fiscal year after the war. We had some 140,000 people in the succeeding year, and last year, part of it

being in the lifetime of the present government, the number admitted to Canada was some 89,000 people. The number coming to Canada in the last full year of the late government was 148,000 odd. This country could not reasonably expect a more lively immigration. But with the advent of this government those things changed, and now the stream is almost dammed. Nothing has been done for a year and a quarter. What is proposed now is this method of using the Western Canada Colonization Company—at least that is the main feature of the present policy—but for a year and a half there has been absolutely no activity in the organization, and the drying up of the stream of immigration is at the door of this administration. It is for them to find the solution and it is for them to present the solution to parliament.

Now what they propose is before this House, but let them not try to rest their present proposals on any imprimatur of the late administration, and let them not try to account for the present dearth of immigration by any failure of the late administration. The largest immigration this country ever had was under us in the year 1913, when, I think, it was 446,000, or about that number. The year before the immigration was about the same. There could be absolutely no immigration during the war. That naturally and inevitably flows from the exigencies of war. But even during the period of the war, even during the full years of the war, when the submarines and all other war activities prevented immigration, when indeed the laws of countries prevented it, the average immigration was greater than the immigration we are getting now. These are the facts of the situation. I rose to-night only to draw attention to the actual effect of the wording and meaning of the letter which I wrote and to say that I have no objection whatever to any publicity which may be given to it. By that letter I abide, but I will not have read into that letter anything which is not there.

Mr. FORKE: I do not know whether I can make myself plain in any fewer words than the right hon. leader of the Opposition has taken to state his position. I have no apologies for anything I have done. I have not changed my mind in any particular. I wrote that letter in perfect good faith and I think I could write it with a clear conscience to-day. I had no idea at that time as to what the government was going to do, and understood nothing of the relations which existed between the government and the Western Canada Colonization Association. I do not know whether I drew my letter just as closely as the right hon. leader of the Opposition did, but I am certain the intention I had was the same as his intention. We had no difference in our idea, which was to convey to the people at large that we thought there was merit in the scheme. I think so yet. I may be wrong. I think I said when speaking in the beginning of the debate, that if the scheme could not stand criticism and investigation by all means condemn it, but what I had to find fault with, and do find fault with to-day, is that the scheme had been condemned without trial or investigation in any quarter. We know something about the scheme and understand something about its workings, and, as with every other scheme, unless the personnel of the men who are connected with it and who are carrying out its working is what it ought to be, then perhaps the scheme will fall down. I am quite prepared to stand on what I said in that letter. It had nothing to do with the arrangement proposed by the government at the present time. That will have to stand on its own merits, and in that connection it might be thought that there was something mysterious about the question I was asking the Premier about another letter. I know that Mr. Brown had two or three hundred letters from most of the prominent people in this country. It is part of the stock in trade in launching any scheme to get the endorsation of men whose opinions are worth having, and I thought perhaps the Premier would read another letter which I had in mind.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I have no other letter.

Mr. FORKE: It makes no difference. I do not think the writer would have objected to it, but I think perhaps it is better not to read it when the gentleman is not here.

I have said all I wish to say on this particular question, and I will simply repeat the words of the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) that I have nothing to be ashamed of, or to apologize for, and I have nothing to take back from what I wrote.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: The debate has centred recently around the question of the Western Canada Colonization Association. I do not desire to say very much with regard to that company, as I think there has been a great deal of criticism offered. I must protest against the government subsidizing any private company of this character. It seems to me that, with the Soldier Settlement Board in existence, with the government agents throughout this country and the United States

and Europe, we ought to have sufficient machinery to do the work that is required to be done along these lines, and we ought not to commit ourselves to any private company that undoubtedly has, in one form or another, profit and gain in view. The Acting Minister of Immigration (Mr. Stewart) referred to the fact that the Salvation Army is receiving funds for which no accounting is required. It seems to me if this is so it is rather a thing in itself to be inquired into. We do not need to condemn any organization, the Salvation Army or any other, but we say there ought to be a strict accounting for every dollar that is spent by this parliament, and we ought to know exactly the purpose to which it is being applied.

In considering this matter we shall require to go a great deal more deeply into the question than simply dealing with one particular company. I cannot agree with the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) in his statement that the drying up of the stream of immigration must be laid at the door of the present government. I take it that there are larger economic and social forces at work, and that, whatever government was in power at the present time, we would have very similar results. Personally, I am not opposed to immigration as such. The member for Springfield (Mr. Hoey) told us the other day of the very great resources we had in Winnipeg and the western country. I think we all agree on that. Any man who has lived in the West is fully cognizant of the almost unparalleled resources that exist in that western country, and I think we all recognize that with those resources we have room for millions of people in the West. No one disputes that; but that is not the point that we are arguing at the present time. The question before us is whether we should adopt an active immigration policy in face of existing conditions at home. It seems to me that the first duty of this parliament is to safeguard the interests of those already in the country. It is not that some of us are opposed to immigration that we oppose such a policy as this; but we say: "Why go on with this policy when there are other alternatives that we might adopt?" We have been told that we ought to pump immigrants in. We, who question the policy are on the ground of common sense when we say that it is more essential to stop the leaks than to keep pumping people in. It might be all very well to pump them in if we proceed at the same time to stop the leaks; but it would seem the part of good, sound common sense to stop the leaks first. It is not good policy to continue to expend large sums of money while people are leaking out faster than we can pump them in.

We might clarify our thinking if we should ask who is really to benefit by this immigration policy. The hon. member for North Waterloo (Mr. Euler)) took rather high moral grounds when he said that we have no exclusive claim to this country, and that we ought to admit people who, perhaps, are in inferior positions in other lands. I am quite willing to admit that that is true, although I notice that the hon. member for North Waterloo was rather inclined to think we white people had exclusive claims to this country. I do not know how he reconciles that with the broader idea; but I do not think we can contend that we alone have exclusive claim to the northern half of this American continent. It is, however, laid upon us who are here to see to it that large floods of immigrants are not permitted to destroy or to lower permanently the standard of living of the people in this country.

Although we protest that we are doing this for the sake of the immigrant, again and again in those self-same speeches, we come back to the point that we are doing this in order that we may get more people to carry our load. Let us be frank and say that we are asking for more immigrants in order that they may help us in this country and assist this country. I am not sure that that is not a very good reason, for the adoption of such a policy; but let us be frank and say that we are looking after ourselves in this regard. That raises a still further question whether all people or all classes of people in Canada are to be benfited by such immigration, or whether we are benefitting only certain classes. It seems rather peculiar that the great masses of the labour people of this country and of the farming people of the western part of Canada should be opposed to bringing in immigrants. Under these circumstances we should ask ourselves whether the incoming of immigrants at the present time would not tend to benefit simply a few. Undoubtedly the transportation systems would benefit very largely, and I fancy from the telegram which was read twice to-day and which was emphasized, that the transportation interests and the financial interests have been exercising a very strong pressure upon the Acting Minister of Immigration (Mr. Stewart) and upon the government in this regard. It is two or three years ago since Lord Shaughnessy first told us that we ought again to adopt a progressive immigration policy, and about two years ago now, Mr. Beatty, president of the Canadian Pacific, came out very definitely with this

policy which we are being urged to adopt. Mr. Beatty said:

> The most urgent and essential need to-day is increase in population, not only to provide traffic for the railways, but also to help pay our enormous national indebtedness.

He said further:

> In reference to the 300,000 Ukrainians in western Canada, in which it is stated that these people of sturdy farming stock from central Europe have four large educational institutes.

And so on. He claims that these are the people whom we ought to bring in—the sturdy peasants from Central Europe. Still further, not satisfied with this, Mr. Beatty urges:

> What progress can Canadian industry make if the skilled mechanic is to be practically shut out? And without Canadian industry where are we to find exports for the Canadian Merchant Marine?

I would like to ask: What attitude are these transportation interests themselves taking in this matter of retaining the people in this country and building up our Canadian industry? I have received a communication from a union of mechanics from my own city of Winnipeg, which states:

> The Manitoba Free Press of Friday the second of February carried a despatch stating that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company had let contracts in the States for the construction of sixteen locomotives, and that in the meantime their own plants were working to capacity, whilst as a matter of fact at that very time the Angus shops were closed down, and its working staff on the streets.

This organization passed the following resolution which was forwarded to the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), the Acting Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham), and the Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock):

> Whereas, continual attacks are being made upon the earnings of railway workers and,
>
> Whereas, the shopmen employed by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have been on continuous short time for the past two years, and,
>
> Whereas, the highest possible earnings of a skilled mechanic working every hour the shops were open during the last two years have averaged only $24.61 per week, and the highest possible earnings of a mechanic's helper have averaged only $16.90 per week, and,
>
> Whereas, according to published statements the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have during the last crop movement had the largest earnings in the history of the road, and notwithstanding, have kept the mechanical staff on short time and periodically closed the shops,
>
> Now, therefore, be it resolved that this mass meeting of Canadian Pacific shopmen strongly protest this action of the company, and demand that the transportation industry of the country be organized upon a basis that will ensure a decent standard of living for the permanent staff engaged in it.

If we turn from the West to the East, I have also from the International Association of Machinists in Montreal, a resolution along somewhat similar lines:

> We understand that contracts for some forty-eight lake freighters have recently been contracted for, by companies operating on our lakes and rivers, with firms outside the country and it would appear to us that such business methods are not in the best interests of the citizens of this country. The shipyard workers of this country have demonstrated their ability to build good ships and the boats they produced are, in their particular class, amongst the finest, in point of workmanship, to be found on the waters of the globe. Thousands of these workmen have been thrown out of employment, or have been forced to accept temporary work in other lines, through the closing down of our shipyards and this condition obtains, to a great extent, because of the failure on the part of shipping companies, operating in Canada, to patronize Canadian shipyards. It is also a fact that many of our best shipyard mechanics have left the country in search of employment in that line and, undoubtedly, many others will be compelled to do likewise, unless some action is taken to prevent it.

Mr. MURDOCK: What is the date of that letter?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: January 30, 1923. That was sent to me with a request that the matter be brought before parliament at the first opportunity. Now, when we have men in the employ of these transportation companies, both in the East and in the West, bringing in resolutions along this line, outlining facts that show a condition of affairs in which large numbers of our own Canadian citizens find it impossible to obtain a decent living in this country, it seems to me that there is something to be attended to before there is adopted any policy looking to the bringing in of more people. In my constituency of Centre Winnipeg, I think there have been thousands of people during the past year who have been forced to go south of the line in order to get work. Among these people there were the very best mechanics to be found in this country, and to such an extent has this emigration taken place that we are now told there may be a shortage. There is not yet, however, any shortage in Canada in this direction.

I might refer to the different classes of immigrants that we have had brought into Canada in the past. Roughly speaking, during the fifteen years in which our immigration was at full tide, one-third of the immigrants came from the United States, one-third from Great Britain, and one-third from the various countries of Europe. Undoubtedly those who have come to us from the western states have been amongst our very best citizens, from the standpoint of the farming industry. A very considerable number of them sold out their holdings in the United States at high prices and invested in our Canadian lands, which they were able to purchase comparatively cheap. A good many of them brought considerable equipment with them, and from

the material point of view at least their incoming meant a great deal, especially to the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta. Those, however, who know these provinces and have experience of them in more recent years, know that very many of these American citizens are already travelling back over the boundary. Some of them are selling out their lands in this country because they want to get back to the homeland south of the line. A good many, of course, are remaining. But it would seem as though there are a sufficient number of people in the leading western states who now know of the opportunities offered by western Canada that, if our taxation could be brought down and implements could be put within reach of the farmers at reasonable prices, there would not be the slightest doubt that we should gain steadily a stream of immigration from the western states.

The second group of people to whom I referred came from Great Britain. These were of two classes: first of all, those who came from the rural districts. And we have never had a very large immigration from rural England; a larger number have come from rural Scotland. But I would suggest that those who come from rural England, if we can get any, are not going to solve our problems in western Canada; for I would remind my Progressive friends here that a good many of these people are accustomed to standards of living much superior to those which a large percentage of our farmers can afford to give them in this country. I would remind my hon. friends that these people, too, are accustomed to membership in unions of agricultural labourers, that they have worked much shorter hours than they would be required to work in this country, and have been used to very much better accommodation than can be found on a great many of our western farms. And I know that a good many of my farmer friends in the West feel that agricultural workers from England are rather a difficult class to handle to-day under present conditions.

Mr. GAUVREAU: What about their Scotch whiskey?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Well, in the dry territories that may be a very serious matter, too. There is another thing which I think a good many of our farmers are realizing more and more clearly. In the older days when immigration was flowing freely to this country and when there was a steady movement from eastern Canada to the West, it was comparatively easy for the western farmer to secure hired men for a short period. Young fellows without the encumbrances of a family were eager to get a start in the new land and were willing to be hired for a few months at a time; then if they so desired they could take up homesteads for themselves. To-day the farmers on the prairies are having to compete more and more with the manufacturers in the city for hired labour; and the labour men in the cities are accustomed to shorter hours than those customary on the farm. A good many of them have families and expect that provision shall be made for themselves and their families where they are expected to reside. In this way, we shall have to recognize that the problem of agricultural labour in western Canada is bound to be a very serious one in the days to come. We cannot depend upon a steady supply of transient labour which we can use for a few months and then get rid of. In the older countries farming has become fully self-supporting; it should be in no sense parasitic.

9 p.m.

Now, although in my judgment at least the manufacturers and the transportation companies of this country have exploited the farmer, at the same time I think that in a great many ways our farmers have existed at all only by exploiting their hired help and their own wives and children. If I understand the temper of these western farmers, they are beginning to take the stand that they are not going indefinitely to exploit their wives and children. A great many of the farm labourers, too, are beginning to realize that they have a right to expect that if they are going to work on farms they must have the assurance that they shall work for twelve months in the year and, as my hon. friend (Mr. Hoey) implied, that some arrangement must be made to provide them with permanent homes. In some way we shall have to overcome the difficulty in connection with seasonal labour.

Anyone who has come into close contact with the immigration from the Old Land recognizes that a large proportion of our English immigration has come to us from the cities. It is quite true that a certain number of these immigrants declared that they were going to work on the farms; but again and again they have drifted back into the cities. The mere fact that they declare their destination to be the farm does not in any way bind them to stay there. Some of us who have lived in the cities for years, and who have had to do with the welfare work in those centres of our population, know perfectly well that a large proportion of the people with whom we have to deal are Old Country im-

migrants who came expecting to work on farms but who finally became dependent on relief in the cities. One scene particularly is fresh in my memory. There was a great gathering of several thousands of unemployed workers on the Cambie street grounds in the city of Vancouver two or three years ago. Word was brought that a large number of British immigrants were expected. Here were two thousand people, without work. Leaders of the unemployed drafted a resolution which they presented to the crowd, embodying a protest against the bringing in of more people while those at present unemployed were not looked after. Curiously enough, the crowd refused to pass that resolution. They said, practically in desperation; "No, the more the merrier; let them come in, and after we have enough Old Country workers here we shall be able to take things into our own hands." I would suggest, if I believed in that philosophy of despair, that the more you bring into this country from England the better. Expecting higher standards of living, they will force radical changes; unfortunately that might involve a considerable amount of trouble and even chaos in Canada.

I would like to speak for a few minutes about our third group, those from various European countries. The Minister of Immigration rather emphasized the importance of northern immigrants, suggesting that the government would seek to get a great many people from northern Europe. I have no doubt we would all like to get northern Europeans. They are much the same stock as we are—Scandinavians, French, Germans. They are hardy settlers and would do well in Canada. But unfortunately, for the past twenty-five years the stream of immigration has come to North American shores not so much from northern Europe as from southeastern Europe. That is true of immigration both to the United States and to Canada. We may get a few Belgians, Hollanders, and so on, who may help us in our dairy farming or truck farming, but we shall not get anything like the numbers from northern Europe that we might get or that we have got from southeastern Europe. A good many of the people coming to us from southeastern Europe belong to the trading classes. Hebrews, Greeks, and people of that character are coming in considerable numbers, but they are not the agriculturists about which a good many people tell us; they almost invariably go to the cities. I know a few farming colonies of Hebrews in western Canada, and some of them are doing very well. But on the whole they are city dwellers and they add to our commercial and financial classes. By the way, let me refer to the propaganda that is being carried on by the transportation companies with regard to immigrants to this country. I have in my hand a folder issued by Canadian Pacific Steamships, which reads:

> Prepaid passengers to Canada from Russia are coming forward on every sailing. Soviet Russia prepaids. Canadian Pacific steamships was the first transatlantic steamship company to open its own office in Russia. Canadian Pacific steamships was the first to be authorized by the Soviet government to book passengers from Russia to Canada.

Just why we cannot recognize Soviet Russia when the Canadian Pacific is already bringing over large numbers of immigrants from there is beyond my comprehension. A large number of people have come to us in the past from those eastern countries. We had from Russia itself, a good many of you may remember, a large number of Doukhobors—people who did well in Saskatchewan, but who unfortunately were driven from their lands by somebody who did not understand their peculiar religious beliefs and their ideals. A good many of them went to British Columbia, where they have done remarkable work—

Mr. SALES: Will the hon. member explain how they were "driven" from the lands?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I shall be very glad to do so. They were brought here on the express understanding that they should be allowed certain privileges, should be given the right to practise their own religious beliefs and to live in communities. It was against their religion to take the oath of allegiance; they were what might be called Eastern Quakers. For a time they lived in Saskatchewan, building up considerable communities there. Then there came into office another Minister of the Interior who insisted that they should register, each man for his own property, and should take the oath of allegiance. This was opposed to their ideals and to the understanding that they had with the government when they come to this country. The great majority of them, rather than give up their religious beliefs and their peculiar ideals, gave up their lands, valued, I think, at some $10,000,000, and, for the most part, went further west and purchased lands at the junction of the Columbia and Kootenay rivers. In this connection I want to suggest to the committee that certain problems were introduced into the country by the emigration of these peculiar peoples from other lands. We still have the Doukhobors in British Columbia, and we still have their peculiar religious and moral ideas to deal with. By importing large numbers of these sectaries and

others we may increase our exports for the time being, but sooner or later we shall have to face the problem of absorbing them into our Canadian citizenship.

Take another group, also a peculiar people, the Mennonites. Of Holland or German extraction, these people had lived for a good many years in Russia. About forty years ago they came to this country and settled in southern Manitoba. They were among our very best settlers. From Manitoba they colonized certain sections of Saskatchewan. Then there came the question of the public schools, which became acute at the time of the war; and the action of the Manitoba and Saskatchewan governments on that question has driven thousands of these people away down into Mexico where they are seeking freedom in the exercise of their religious beliefs. Very recently the business men of Winnipeg, realizing the financial loss involved, got together in an effort to induce the government to change its policy so that these Mennonite colonies might be retained in Manitoba. I am not sure that we can gain a great deal by allowing tens of thousands of Mennonites who have been here for forty years to go to another country and then bring in fresh streams of Poles from another country. It may be quite true that Mennonites are a brand of Protestant while Poles are a brand of Roman Catholic. In other words, we have a change of religious belief, but we have the same European peasant to deal with; and that is a difficulty that we face throughout western Canada.

Take the Ukrainians, the largest group we have. I am not one who thinks that the Ukrainian people are undesirable settlers. There are some 300,000 of them in the West, and they have on the whole made good, especially when they were settled on anything like decent land. There are some of them in Manitoba on poor lands, but on the whole they came in with very little capital; they worked hard and now most of them have their lands with very little debt. They had low standards of living, but they persisted and a great many of them to-day own their own homes. During the war it began to dawn upon us in Canada, as it did in the United States, that this talk about all these people going into the melting pot was a lot of nonsense. As they said in the States, they may be put into the melting pot, but they refuse to melt; and unless we are careful in this country we shall have a Balkanized Canada. Down in eastern Canada you have had some trouble in the past, I understand, as between French-speaking and English-speaking people.

Mr. MARLER: When did we have any trouble between the English-speaking and the French-speaking people in the province of Quebec?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I speak largely from hearsay, but I live in the West and there has never been an election when I have not heard of considerable strain and stress between the English-speaking and the French-speaking people of eastern Canada.

Mr. MARLER: If the hon. member is referring to the province of Quebec, I absolutely deny any such charge. There is the best of feeling between the French and English in the province of Quebec.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I think the hon. member has misunderstood me. I am not speaking of the province of Quebec. I spoke of eastern Canada.

An hon. MEMBER: You said Quebec.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: If I did, then I withdraw. I had not thought of the province of Quebec. I was thinking of eastern Canada when I spoke.

Mr. MARTELL: Is the hon. member referring to Nova Scotia? If he can point to any trouble that has occurred between the French and the English in the province of Nova Scotia, it is more than I can.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I am not speaking of the province of Nova Scotia.

Mr. MARLER: What province is the hon. member speaking of? Let us know exactly where we are.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I was speaking of eastern Canada.

Mr. LEGER: There has never been any trouble between the French and English in the province of New Brunswick.

Mr. MacLEAN (Prince, P.E.I.): I hope the hon. member is not referring to Prince Edward Island?

Mr. BUREAU: You must have a bad press out West.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I think anyone who understands anything of the problems of Canada will recognize that sometimes at least in this country there has been in eastern Canada—I am thinking of central, eastern Canada—considerable strain between the French-speaking people and the English-speaking people.

Mr. BUREAU: In what province?

Mr. JACOBS: That was in the days of Wolfe and Montcalm.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I for one am glad to think that we have had a decided effort to promote something of a better feeling—and I think the effort has been very largely successful—between these two great races in Canada, so that we may sit here to-day in absolute friendship. But I would like to suggest that there are problems—religious, racial, and linguistic—that we must have in the West if we continue to import large numbers of people from all the countries of Europe. That is the point I wish to make, and we have to be careful on that particular score.

There is another matter to which reference should be made, and that is the relationship which exists between the people in the city and the people in the country. Here in eastern Canada—I hope I will not have to say whether it is in Ontario or Quebec—but generally speaking in eastern Canada, the farmers have stayed more largely on the farms than they have on the prairies. Out in the West there is a continual drifting backward and forward between the cities and the country. A very considerable number of people who have tried to homestead in western Canada have drifted back into our cities. I was in a little town in northern Manitoba a few years ago and discovered that no less than seventy Ukrainian farmers were living in that little town, bankrupt. They had gone out on a homestead, had tried to make a living, had failed, and had drifted back into this little town.

A few years ago in the city of Winnipeg we had a very careful investigation with regard to some hundreds of foreigners who were being more or less kept by the city. If my memory serves me, no less than ninety-four per cent of these foreigners had come to this country with the full intention of farming but had stayed for a little while in the city in order to get together a little ready cash. They had been induced to purchase homes in the city, to invest in real estate and that kind of thing, and had been diverted from their original purpose. Now it is all very well to suggest that it is comparatively easy for a man to start without capital on the western prairies. I know some of the pioneers have done that. I know some of them endured great hardships, and that some of them are to-day fairly well to do, and some people are inclined to say: What I did, others may do. But there are not nearly such good opportunities to-day in western Canada for starting to farm without capital as there were thirty or forty years ago. In the first place,at that time land could be got absolutely free or very cheap. I remember when you could buy land for three or four or five dollars an acre. That land to-day costs from $15 to $25 an acre. In the old days there was more or less of a local market, but to-day buying and selling has been so thoroughly organized into a great commercial machine that as soon as a man steps off his own farm he comes into the grip of that great machine, and it is not easy for him to make his own way independently. Further than that, in the old days it was comparatively easy for a man to work at something else until he could get a start on his farm. Many worked as section men and many worked as hired men for a few years. That work is becoming more and more difficult to get, and so it is not easy for a man to go out at the present time and make a start with a small capital. The Acting Minister of Immigration has suggested that the men with $1,500 or $2,000 might make a start. I may say that a committee that looked into this thing from a very practical standpoint in Winnipeg a few years ago came to the conclusion that a man could not make a start in this country on less than $5,000 or thereabouts, and maintain a decent standard of living, and keep clear of debt. A man must have his living for a year or two before his farm will begin to produce. We have heard some glowing words from the province of Manitoba. I have here a paper which came to my hand the other day. It is the votes and proceedings of the legislative assembly of Manitoba, and in a resolution on the order paper I notice this statement:

> And whereas owing to financial conditions existing in this province, more than one hundred and fifty of our elementary schools are closed at the present time. and children deprived of elementary education—

It is quite true, as the hon. member for Springfield said, that we have a magnificent parliament building in the city of Winnipeg, but we have also one hundred and fifty schools in the province closed, for lack of financial support. This is a serious thing when you consider the welfare of the next generation of Canadians.

Here is an extract from a letter which came to me the other day from one of the best informed social workers in the city of Montreal. He says:

> Why is it said to be so easy to find suitable foster homes for children imported from England, when every day of every year children already in Canada, many of them born Canadians, are being huddled like so many chickens into human chicken houses.
>
> I have been studying the history of the English poor law very closely this term, and I have become quite convinced that for both economic and social reasons the Dominion government will sooner or later have to establish a statistical department to collect information as to the extent and the nature of public and private assistance being given throughout the

Dominion. If it is not done we are going to wake up some day and find that a very considerable portion of our population is always dependent, and then we shall wonder how and why it all happened.

I have a resolution here from an organization of the workers, also in the city of Montreal, which reads:

Be it resolved that we condemn the policy of inducing people to immigrate to this country whilst thousands of our citizens are unable to secure employment and are receiving no assistance from the governments, and that we take steps to notify the workers of Great Britain and Europe of the conditions they will be faced with if they come to Canada at this time.

I may say that I also have similar resolutions from the West, and I would like to inform the Acting Minister of Immigration and Colonization that there is to-day an active propaganda being carried on in the newspapers in the Old Country by the working people of this country to offset the proposed immigration policy of Canada. Further than that, I may say that on the floor of the House of Commons in Great Britain the opposition, which as you all know is the Labour party, is definitely opposed to this policy of overseas settlements and in particular to the scheme of taking Old Country children and shipping them out to the dominions.

Now, what are the prospects of the future. A good deal has been said about this policy being fostered by the financial interests and by the transportation companies. As to that I should like to quote a few lines from a statement by Sir Edmund Walker in the Financial Post of February 9.

We both wish to discriminate as to the class of immigrants we permit to land on our shores, and we surely should do so but our salvation throughout all North America depends upon a reasonably free supply of unskilled labour.

We must produce cheaper and we must produce more.

Again:

We cannot pretend that we did not know that because of war debts we must for a generation or more work harder for longer hours, and with more intense application not only because of the vast debt but because we have lost the labour of those who fell in order that we should live.

And again:

We are lucky among the nations who created war debts in owing ours mostly to ourselves.

And perhaps it is quite in line with that last statement when Sir Edmund Walker states in the annual report of the Bank of Commerce:

A domestic debt merely means the transfer by a tax of so-called money from one citizen to another.

Which is, as I understand it, that we must allow immigrants to come in here to help us to pay our debts. But we pay them to ourselves—one set of people, through the medium of money, pay to another set of people here in Canada. We have been told again and again that prosperity is just round the corner. We have been told that ever since the war stopped, and yet there are very few gentlemen who have come forward to tell us how that prosperity is going to come about, or what the basis is on which they found their predictions. It is said that in order to secure prosperity we must have larger markets. But where are those markets? It is said that we must be willing to compete. I would like to suggest to the farmers here that they may find it extremely difficult to compete with the Argentine, and with Russia and Roumania when those countries have begun to produce again. In order to compete we must rid ourselves of the loads with which we are now burdened.

The fact is that the time demands constructive measures, the time demands radical changes in our whole system, and the difficulty is that our government, and our governing classes, are, as the Americans say "standing pat," or they are trying to encourage us with the old slogans. Twenty years ago we were told that immigration was going to solve our problems, and it did to a very considerable extent help in opening up this country. But my question is: Are we going to be able to repeat what took place twenty years ago? The conditions are altogether different to-day. At that time we had a country largely undeveloped; at that time we were drawing our funds from Europe in order to build our railroads; at that time we were building every little village into a town, and every town into a city—there were all sorts of opportunities. To-day our railways are built; we have more mileage by many thousands of miles than we need. To-day our factories are built and many of them are standing idle. To-day our cities are built up; we say that we have altogether too large an urban population. It was because of this incoming of large financial resources, as well as of the incoming of large numbers of people, that at that time we had a chance to make such rapid development. But the whole world situation is changed. At that time we had markets which are absolutely closed to us at the present day. At that time we had a comparatively light load to carry; to-day we are overburdened with debt. Again I should like to ask, if in the West our very best English speaking people—many of them Canadians with farm training,—are not able to make things go, how in the name of common sense can we expect untrained Britishers to come over here without capital and make things go where the Canadian born have to a large extent failed.

Some of us—and I think I may say that in this regard I represent a very considerable section of workers across the country—suggest that there are other alternatives than those proposed by the government. The Acting Minister of Immigration and Colonization says that we have to back up a colonization company in order to get rid of our unsold and unused lands. I would like to suggest that there is another policy altogether. The fact is that our land policy in this country has been largely a failure. Those who first outlined that policy had the hope that in Canada we would have large numbers of people, each man living on his own land. That was the idea of the homestead—each man would be a freeholder. What is the situation to-day? A very considerable percentage of the farms are mortgaged; our farmers are not freeholders. The dream of those who founded these regulations has not been realized and worse than that—to those who would to-day come into this country we cannot offer the free lands that were offered years ago. I would like to ask, Mr. Chairman, whether we should not say that these great areas of agricultural land should be for the people who are actually going to live on them and proceed to do one of two things—either expropriate them, or else tax them so heavily that they would be forced into use. It is because we have been looking at this thing from the standpoint of the investor rather than from the standpoint of the settler that we have not achieved the success we should have achieved. I remember going a few years ago—it must be ten years now—to the then Premier of one of the western provinces and talking with him over a scheme for bringing settlement a little bit closer, and placing certain social opportunities within the reach of the settlers in the various districts. "Yes," he said. "this is very desirable. It would mean that the children would all get an education. It would mean that the women would have opportunity of having a doctor when they were ill. It would mean they would have some neighbours near them, and it would mean a great deal more production in the country." But he asked "How are you going to finance it?" I suggested that a few cents more per acre added to the wild lands tax would finance the whole proposition. Throwing up his hands he said, "You could never do that, the American investors are already protesting against the wild lands tax."

Mr. FORKE: Surely the hon. member is aware of the situation around Winnipeg, where no man will hold land to-day and pay taxes very long, if he can get rid of it. The hon. member knows that very well.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I know there are tens of thousands of acres being held to-day all over western Canada by men who are not using these lands, and if they were taxed heavily enough those people would be forced to get rid of them, and I would say that the duty of any government that is attempting to solve this problem—

Mr. MARLER: The hon. member says that if those lands were taxed heavily enough, you would get rid of them.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Yes.

Mr. MARLER: I would like to know who would be found to buy them.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: The whole scheme of the Western Canada Colonization Association is to get rid of lands which are privately held. I would say that if settlers could secure those lands free or at a nominal price, there would be a great deal more inducement to go on them. We must recognize to-day that men have no inherent right to hold lands that they cannot use. This is the very point I would like to emphasize; that we have been insisting everywhere on dividends, we have been insisting on certain returns on investments, and that we are not going to solve our problem until we make radical changes in our ideals along that line. I am not going into the details with regard to various changes which would need to be made in order to bring that about. We have had a good deal of discussion in regard to our coal in this country. The fact is we have to pay an enormous sum for our coal, and get it in a very unsatisfactory state, and yet there are undoubtedly large coal areas in this country of ours. We shall sooner or later have to face the fact that the people of the country really own these coal mines, and that they should be used in the interests of the people and not for the profit of those who at the present time claim to own them. This may be considered very radical, yet I would like to quote a paragraph or two from the Montreal Star of March 7, and this a leading editorial. It is headed, "Isn't it time to wake up," and reads:

> If the King government and the House of Commons really want to do something to serve the Canadian public they will stop talking at large and get down to business on the fuel problem.
>
> There are in this district alone thousands of people living under conditions dangerous to health either because they cannot get sufficient coal to heat their houses or because they cannot pay the prices asked by those who have a strangle hold on the season's

fuel supply. And what is true of the Montreal district is, no doubt, equally true elsewhere throughout the country.

The Canadian public is not going to stand for this sort of thing another season.

With less than one-half of one per cent of the world's population Canada possesses over seventeen per cent of the world's total coal supply. And yet the people of Canada have for the last four months been milked dry for the wholly inadequate supplies of fuel doled out to them by the commercial acumen of an adjoining nation.

Surely there are enough brains and initiative somewhere in Canada to develop the enormous fuel deposits within our own boundaries.

The government has no clearer duty to the people which elected it than this.

We are paying excessive freight rates and high prices, and the consuming public is not getting coal at reasonable rates. Here is an extract showing the proportions given to the miners and to the railways, and showing the high cost of distribution. This is from the American side. It says:

The total wage cost of producing a ton of anthracite and transporting it to the city where it is to be consumed amounts to less than one-third the price paid by the consumers. If mine owners were to reduce the wages of anthracite miners by 20 per cent, it would make possible a reduction of only about 75 cents in the retail price equivalent to approximately 5½ per cent of the selling price in New York, and 4½ per cent of the current quotation in Chicago.

A reduction of 20 per cent in the wages of both miners and railroad workers would make less than a dollar's difference in the price paid by the New Yorker for his domestic fuel.

Similar conditions prevail in Canada as I have the statistics here to show. My statements may sound somewhat radical in the ears of some of the hon. members of this House, so I should like to quote one more paragraph and this from the Free Press of my own city, an old quotation going back as far as 1920. In referring to our natural resources, the article says:

If there is money in it for the capitalist, ship our coal out of Canada to the highest bidder and let the Canadian people freeze; ship out our lumber and leave the people houseless; ship out our pulp and paper and leave them without newspapers, and so on all down the line. The fact that in all these cases the products are primarily the property of the people themselves would make no difference to the Gazette. On with the business of exploitation; the sacred system by which millionaires are turned overnight into multi-millionaires must not be tampered with.

I submit that to-day all along the line we are facing the necessity of adequately protecting the people of Canada. We are facing the problem, in the very first instance, of providing work for the people here in Canada. Notwithstanding the statistics given us —and I would not in any way imply that they are not absolutely accurate, but would suggest they do not afford a full picture of the conditions which exist, partly because of the fact that the workers will not register as they should—the fact is that there is a very large number of people who are unemployed and under-employed here in Canada. The fact is we have abundant natural resources, if they are only developed, but some way or another, under our existing financial and credit system, we do not seem to be able to develop them. The fact is that we have so overburdened our people with the high cost of living and high taxation that they are being driven out of the country, not by the superior advantages south of the line, but by the fact that they cannot possibly make an existence in this country. We can alter our system of taxation. We can shift the burden to those who are best able to bear it. But our government refuses to adopt any of these more radical policies. They say "ship in more people and let them help us carry our load," and do not think of lightening the load.

I want to close by re-affirming my belief in the possibilities of this country supporting an immense population. I would like to think we would be able to welcome a good many people from the countries of Europe. I think we shall do so in the years to come, but I do not think it is any kindness to prospective immigrants or that it is fair to our own children, under conditions which actually exist in this country, to call in more and more people, without making at the same time very very strenuous efforts to alter the conditions which are driving so many of our own people out of the country.

Mr. MacKELVIE: On two occasions in the last few days the minister (Mr. Stewart) who has charge of this very important Department of Immigration, has laid his policy before the House, and I am sure that it has been listened to with a great deal of interest by members here assembled, and that throughout the country a considerable degree of attention has been paid to his announcement. I do not care to level any particular degree of criticism against the special point raised this afternoon so effectively by the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens). Perhaps enough regarding that particular aspect of the question has been said for the present. I may remark, however, in passing, that it seemed to require the united efforts of the minister and the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) to refute some of the arguments advanced by the hon. member for Vancouver Centre, and even then they did not cover them with any degree of finality, leaving entirely untouched the question raised by that hon. member regarding the tremendous amount in commissions which would be paid

out by this government if they tied themselves up to this scheme, and the very large profits which would accrue to the Western Canada Colonization Association by means of the very liberal commissions which they would receive.

I wish to pass on to say a word or two regarding the general nature of the minister's policy. I do not find it pleasant work to criticise any hon. gentleman in a severe manner, and I do not fear that I shall transgress beyond the bounds of courtesy in dealing with this subject. But I must confess that I have been considerably disappointed by the announcement made, after a great deal of eager expectation on the part of the country, by the minister, who, I presume, has given very careful and studious consideration to one of the largest and most momentous problems which confronts this country at the present time. I do not think any person would, perhaps, be justly blamed for saying that "the mountain had laboured"—and hon. members know the rest of the proverb. However, much criticism may be levelled against the minister's policy, or lack of policy, from this quarter of the House, I do not expect any more severe strictures will be hurled at his head than those which have already come from members of the party sitting behind him. Very frank, very outspoken, and I might almost say, very bitter, were some of the criticisms advanced by the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Cahill), who, in the frankest possible way, informed the minister that he was permitting the railways of this country to bleed the people white; that he was responsible to a large degree for the emigration of those Canadian citizens who have sought homes in the United States, from the fact that he and his government had not adhered to their pre-election pledges brought forward in such a forceful way through their election platform of 1919, and thus, after deceiving the people, had brought them to a state worse than their former condition had been. Then, following up that very acrimonious dissertation by the hon. member for Pontiac, came one couched in, perhaps, smoother language, but none the less with a barb concealed in it, or, perhaps, I should not say "concealed," for it really was very apparent, when the hon. member for George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs) arose and also raked over the minister for several sins of omission and commission. So, perhaps, I am not altogether wrong in saying that however much criticism may be advanced against the policy of the Immigration department from this end of the chamber, nothing more severe is likely to be said during this debate than that which has already emanated from his friends.

What I am, however, particularly exercised about as regards this policy, lies in a point touched upon by the hon. member for Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth), who said that unfortunately—and I desire very heartily to concur in his adverb—during the last few years, immigration to this country from Europe has proceeded, not from the northern section of that continent, not from the British Isles, but from the southern and central portions of Europe. I do not consider that the present policy of the minister in this respect is altogether a wise one. If one sifts it right down, it amounts to this. He has permitted Australia and South Africa to skim off the cream from the British Isles of the immigration which we might expect to flow to this country, if proper efforts had been put forth in time to bring it here, and now he has recourse, through his agents in central and eastern Europe, to endeavouring to bring immigrants here from Hungary and Poland.

There is another, broader and more important aspect by far, to my mind, from which this question of immigration should be viewed by the people of Canada. We are building for the future; we must consider what is going to happen to this country of ours if we allow a very large section in the middle of it to be filled up by immigration which has been brought into the prairies for the past number of years. We in British Columbia have previously informed this House of our grievance as regards oriental immigration. Our principal, our vital objections to that class of immigration are that by no manner of means can it be made to assimilate into our population and become in any true sense of the word Canadian. I greatly fear that there is in the prairie sections of this Dominion, a very large element which it will be found very difficult to absorb into our Canadian population and to imbue with any true national spirit. Seventy-five or eighty or, perhaps, more languages are spoken by these people, and the greatest mistake we have made, possibly—

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I thought, perhaps, the hon. member would be referring to the subject again, but apparently he is leaving it. I hope the hon. gentleman has not taken from my remarks the inference that I was making it easy for the people of the Continent to get into Canada in preference to people from the British Isles. If he got that impression, I am sorry, for I never intended to convey any such idea.

Mr. MacKELVIE: I think it is only fair to say that that inference might very readily have been drawn from what the minister told the House, but I am glad to hear the statement which he has made now. Even so, the fact remains that he informed the House that he was endeavouring to procure immigration from Hungary and Poland, and that so far he has not apparently become enamoured of the idea of exerting any great amount of energy or of expending what might be called a comparatively large sum of money in encouraging immigration from the British Isles.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I should like to put my hon. friend right. There are twelve agencies continually working in the British Isles. Moreover, we have been putting on a propaganda that up to date has been bringing results. Within the past few days a very considerable number have been landed from the British Isles. There is no continental movement at the moment, and I want to add that there is no restriction on the people coming from the British Isles, while we have a restriction on those from the Continent.

Mr. MacKELVIE: I should be very much surprised indeed if any minister in this House did inform this assembly that there were restrictions to be placed on the people from the British Isles while freer measures were to be accorded those from other countries. I am quite aware of the fact the minister states. What I did say, however, was that the minister frankly admitted this afternoon that Australia and South Africa had got into the British Isles before this country and had diverted to themselves a large stream of British immigration; and that up to the present very few results have apparently come from any system of encouragement which the minister has been giving to immigration from that source. I very cordially endorse what was said the other night by the member for Springfield (Mr. Hoey) who spoke of the sources from which we should seek immigration. We should secure all the people whom we can get from Great Britain, France, Hungary and the Scandinavian countries including Iceland, and we should gladly welcome them. But going further than that into southern or eastern Europe, I should say that we have no room for immigration from these places. We have now in this country too many of these people whom we cannot properly assimilate. The United States has discovered to its cost what it meant to open its doors wide to southern and central Europe. That country has been called the melting pot of nations, and one of its humorous writers, Mr. George Ade, in an article which I read some time ago, said that this idea of the United States having become the melting pot of nations must be forever cast aside. It was, he said, more properly designated a churn. I think there is perhaps more force in that remark than some of us may imagine at first. At any rate, when you pour into a melting pot metals of various kinds you can hardly expect that they will fuse and that the product will be refined gold or anything of great value.

I am honestly concerned in the question as to the future of our Canadian West. I would gladly support any system that would possibly keep intact as much as possible in their purity of blood the two great races of this northern portion of the American continent. If we could retain as far as possible the purity of the French race, the race descended from the British stock and the people of northern Europe, we should be doing a great service to the future of this country. But if we allow, as has been done in the past, immigration to come in from among people who will not readily adapt themselves to our habits and customs, people whose racial peculiarities are, to say the least, not ours, I fear the time may come when we shall deplore the fact that we have been so generous in that respect in our immigration laws.

I have listened throughout this debate with no very great degree of pleasure, I must confess, to the somewhat doleful strains that have come from the members from the western provinces regarding the situation there. Now, I ought to have a very great amount of sympathy for the farming element in the West. for I suppose, unless I am mistaken, that I was in that country as a settler probably earlier than any man in this House. At all events, I was in Calgary in the spring of 1883, before the railroad reached that country, and I saw the first rush of settlers arrive in Alberta. I took up land there myself and attempted for two or three years to make a success of farming. However, whether through my own fault, or otherwise, I did not attain any degree of success in that province, and it was not long until I sought what I thought were conditions, climatic and otherwise, that would better suit me, and moved across the Rockies to British Columbia. And I have not greatly regretted that change. But I should sympathize with the difficulties which the prairie provinces have gone through; and I was glad to note that, after some distressing tales had been placed before the House by several members of that section of the country, a more optimistic and cheerful note was struck by the

member for Springfield and others who followed him. I am not one of those who views with any great deal of apprehension the future of that country. I come from a section of British Columbia where we have had great difficulties and passed through times of stress and strain, and the people are now suffering from severe depression. But hope springs high among them and there is a steady tendency to courage and optimism; and I know they would not thank me if in this House I gave expression to any particular apprehension regarding the future which awaits them in that really favoured section of the country. I believe therefore that we are justified in bidding our friends from the prairies to be of good cheer and hope. Times are mending, I believe, and much may be done for them and for other sections of the Dominion by the pursuit of a sane, sound and reasonable policy of immigration.

Taxation of course bears heavily on every portion of Canada. In addition to the very serious and, as some may say, alarming burden of national debt, every province is hampered with a very heavy burden of internal taxation. Municipal taxes are high; they are now higher perhaps by one hundred per cent than they were ten or fifteen years ago in most parts of Canada. So that the burden of taxation presses heavily on the shoulders of all. Now, in order to increase
10 p.m. our wealth and lessen that burden it seems to me it is absolutely necessary to have further production; and to bring about increased production it is equally necessary to increase our population. Our railways carry a heavy burden of debt and deficit which bears heavily on the finances of the Dominion, and we know that the only way that burden can be relieved is by giving the railways increased business; and, in turn, the only way that increased business can be secured is through an increased population. I confess that we are almost on the horns of a dilemma in this regard. When we consider the question of unemployment, which is assuming large proportions in several parts of the country, to bring in indiscriminate additions to the population might be to increase that evil considerably. But after weighing everything as well as one may in the balance, we must be forced to one conclusion or the other; and the conclusion I have reached is that the time is now come to begin a more vigorous policy of immigration into this country than hitherto has been in force. I believe in my province. It is a province that has wonderful resources in the way of timber and mines and it has a vast coastal fisheries development, in connection with which more labour could be employed than is at present at work. I believe that in the industrial centres at least the time has come when more labour will be demanded; and I am sure that in all sections of Canada the time is here when more settlers can be found for the land.

I have no particular desire to protract the debate, which has already extended over a considerable time. But any time devoted to the discussion of this subject is, I think, well spent, for no more important question could engage the attention of parliament this session. While I cannot honestly congratulate the minister upon all the details of the policy he has brought down before the House, I will give him credit for having made an attempt to solve the problem with which he is faced.

I am sure he has given the matter earnest consideration, and possibly before his estimates are passed he will revise some of his decisions, which, he has candidly told us, are not as inflexible as the laws of the Medes and Persians. The discussion this afternoon has given him, no doubt, occasion to pause and consider whether to go ahead with the policy he has outlined or to proceed along different lines. Speaking only for myself, I am in favour of a more generous measure of immigration than has hitherto been effective in this country. The time has come when some of the restrictions which have been imposed may with safety be relaxed. We need more people on our land: in fact I believe that in nearly every sphere of activity more people will very shortly be required. I sincerely trust that before this discussion is concluded the minister will give serious consideration to some of the representations that have been made.

Mr. KELLNER: Mr. Chairman, the government went to a good deal of trouble this afternoon to justify the Western Canada Colonization Association and the stand they have taken behind it. But I do not believe that is the crux of the situation at all; what we should justly consider to-day is whether or not we should bring more people into Canada while those already here are having such a hard time to make a living. I do not think that the good faith of the government has been called into question, especially by the group of which I form a part. However, before entering upon a discussion of the question of immigration I would like to make a few remarks in regard to some statements that have been made by previous speakers—not with any intention of criticising them, but simply

because they left the wrong impression upon the committee.

The other afternoon our colleague the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Hoey) dwelt largely upon the over-institutionalized condition of the western country. That condition may exist in Winnipeg, but it does not exist in many portions of the West. The hon. member spoke about the fine, big parliament buildings in Winnipeg. Of these I know very little, and I would not like to tell what I do know. Then he told about their schools and their churches. According to his story they have plenty of room, there being very few scholars in each room of their schools. That is not the condition further west. The member for Swift Current (Mr. Lewis) also referred to the schools, and he made it plain that in Saskatchewan, school room was not quite as abundant as it was in Manitoba. I could not help wondering if that was a progressive broadening out, starting in the east and increasing as it went west, because I assure the committee that by the time you get to Edmonton the schools are very much cramped. I am advised that there are 15,000 school children in that city, in 64 rooms, an average of 51 in each room. There are 17 rooms in the high school, with 933 students, an average of 54 in each room. Twenty-five of these rooms are contained in basements. I mention this simply to show that if there is a large influx of people from outside, our provincial and municipal governments will have to spend considerable sums in order to provide the necessary facilities for them.

One hon. member made a remark about our scratching the ground out in the West. That is a very familiar remark; almost every speaker who does not know much about farming will fall into the same error. However, in this section of the House we could man quite a number of farms and put an experienced farmer on each one, and we could also man the pulpits of several churches and put an experienced preacher in each of those pulpits. But I doubt very much whether we would be well advised to start our farmers in the pulpits or to accept our preachers as authorities on agriculture. The West has proven itself time and again. We have produced big crops year after year—I am speaking of the West as a whole. I do not believe that the country can be criticised, or that the farmer can be criticised. During war years, when we were called upon for a large production, we furnished a production that surprised the world. The hon. member ended up with the statement that if we brought in other farmers to co-operate with us we would enjoy greater prosperity than any other part of the country. About the time he was saying that, our special committee on Agriculture was taking evidence and a sworn witness was stating that flour was being shipped from the United States to England at a lower price than from Canada to England, and further that it was the intention of the transportation companies to raise the rate on cattle. I think it is now $20 and they anticipate putting it up to $25. A good deal of other evidence of a similar character was given. We shall never be a prosperous community so long as things are so arranged that when the price of grain goes up the elevator companies will take advantage of it and when the price of cattle goes up some transportation company will increase its charges and the farmer will get no benefit from the advance in price. If that is the prosperity that we hope to enjoy in Canada, it is of very doubtful quality indeed.

I would like also to make a few comments upon some of the statements made by the minister when he was explaining to the committee his colonization undertaking. Speaking the other afternoon, he said that conditions were worse now than they were in 1892. Well, I do not see how it is possible to compare conditions now with those prevailing at that time; things have changed very considerably since then. For instance, in 1892 there was only a small amount of debt in the world, and that was particularly true of this country. It was a simple matter for everyone to make a living in those days. Your necessary expenditure was very low, and if a man was out of employment for several months or for any considerable time, he would not get greatly involved. To-day it is wholly different; when you get up in the morning you know that you must make several dollars before night in order to pay essential expenses. If for any reason a man's income is suspended for a little while, his overhead expenses will rapidly eat up a considerable amount of money. The minister further stated that twenty-five to thirty per cent of the settlers will be able to establish themselves when they come to this country. I am very sorry that he did not tell us from what country those settlers were coming. I do not believe you could point to any of the European countries at least that is sending out settlers who will be able to establish themselves when they get here.

His next statement was that from fifteen to twenty-five per cent of our western farmers were already in bankruptcy, that from fifteen to twenty-five per cent more are in a serious condition, and that many more are not on

Easy street. Well, I would suggest that that probably means that in his estimation about half of the farmers are in bankruptcy or very close to it. Now it requires a long stretch of the imagination to think that these farmers the minister is going to bring out from Europe, who are unacquainted with farming conditions in our western country, who have little or no money save the $1,500 or $2,000 which I think was the amount he suggested, could establish themselves on, can go on the farms which our experienced farmers have gone into bankruptcy trying to operate, and make good. I ask you, hon. gentlemen, is there any prospect in this world of them making good?

Then he stressed the fact that three months ago the only workers we could consider bringing into this country were those who would engage in agriculture. But to-day that policy is changed, and we can admit some other classes. However, he advanced no argument whatever to show that conditions had bettered in Canada in the meantime, only that conditions had bettered in the United States, and that they had drawn part of our population there, and we could bring in others to take their place.

The question was asked, why the government always advertised the prairie lands. Why did they not leave some immigrants down through old Ontario and Quebec? The minister very frankly stated that it was because the natural resources of the prairie provinces were still held by the Dominion government, and they had been exploiting the western lands. I wonder if the government ever think that the day is not liable to come when an accounting will have to be given for these western lands which they have been exploiting. The hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Garland) speaking the other night made the statement that this government had spent about $30,000,000 in bringing immigrants into Canada, and that they had not an immigrant to show for it. The Prime Minister has spoken since that time, the Acting Minister of Immigration and several members of the government, but not one of them has attempted to refute that statement. Personally, I should like to know whether it is true or not. If it is not true, I should think it was up to the government to disprove it. We who sit in this portion of the House have been frankly criticised as calamity howlers. They tell us that we are stressing this condition, that we are over-drawing it. I do not think that we are worse than the rest. I have in my hand here a paper called The Mirror. I understand it is a new paper starting out on a very youthful career. On the front page is a picture of the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen). It is a very fine picture too, surrounded with a border of maple leaves.

Mr. CALDWELL: It looks like a mourning band.

Mr. KELLNER: It is a picture his supporters may well be proud of. In fact, I expect to see it framed and hung probably in their offices in this building. On page 2 of that paper I find this statement:

> One farmer who in 1919 had a surplus of $28,000 without liabilities was now offering to sell his equity for $1,000 to secure enough money to leave the country. . . . . Some grain shipped by the carload did not pay the freight.

I am very sorry the last speaker has left the chamber. He was one of those who stressed our calamity howling, but I do not think we have ever made it stronger than that. There is no question but that these conditions do exist, and it would be foolish to deceive ourselves and try to make out that they do not. If that statement I have read proves anything it simply proves this, that western Canada is a country where achievement and advancement can be made if we have a chance; else that man would not have had the $28,000. It also proves that certain well established arrangements have been made to separate him from any surplus money he gets from the opportunities he has.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): May I ask where this gentleman's farm is located that is mentioned in that interesting paper?

Mr. KELLNER: I shall be very glad to see that the minister gets a copy of the paper. I think the address is given, but I am not quite sure.

In my opinion there is not a member of this House who is opposed to immigration under favourable conditions, but we would do well to seriously consider whom we are liable to get if we embark on a policy of immigration at the present time. Most assuredly if we get the immigrant whom England and the European countries would like to see us get, we would get the present inhabitant of the bread line. That is the class they would like to send to us. We would also get the man who has probably been broken by the war, or the man who has found his occupation ruined by the war. He is more or less of a misfit. Another thing we will find when he comes to this country, undoubtedly he will have a lot more dependents than the like number of immigrants coming to this country ever had before. Most assuredly in a war where the

majority of the young and strong men have been lost, those who are not able to work for a living will depend upon the remainder to work for them, and if we bring them out to this country we can expect their dependents to come with them. One thing we can be sure of and that is that the adventurous, the strong young man, the man who used to be our ideal immigrant, will not come in very large numbers at this time.

Probably the next matter for our consideration is what shall we do with him when we get him here? I understand that if this government policy goes through, it will be their aim to put these people on the land at considerable expense, and they will keep them there for a while. After a while, when men find out that they are up against a hopeless proposition, they will leave the farms. Some will go to the cities, and some will probably migrate to some other country. It is evidently the policy of this government to have an ever changing farm population. We will have one group of men from time to time moving off the farms, and we will be going over to Europe to get another group to come and take their places. There can be no stability whatever in agriculture under those conditions.

I think we might well stop and consider the spirit of these immigrants who are leaving our country. Let me picture to you what, to my mind might take place in some of those homes. The husband and the wife no doubt will meet in consultation. For months they have been considering ways and means which might enable them to keep going. Hope is fast sinking and finally it disappears. All this time the children have been eager listeners to their conversation. They leave our country and probably go to a foreign land. They make new friends and new acquaintances, and when these new acquaintances come to visit them and find that they have come from Canada, undoubtedly the conversation will again revert to this Dominion, and those children who were born upon our land and were in their early youth citizens of our country, will once more hear reproaches heaped upon this Dominion which gave them birth. I ask you, in all sincerity, do you think it is fitting that we should allow our people to leave our country and our young people especially to receive such lessons as that?

I think there are unquestionably two immigration policies before the people of Canada to-day. One is a policy which declares, although agriculture is in an impoverished condition: We will establish a certain number of farmers and we will keep them on those farms as long as we can; and when the task becomes hopeless they will leave and we will get another group to take their place. Ever changing and ever shifting we will go from one strata of society to another until eventually we will reach the lowest. The other policy contemplates a prosperous farming community, and that is what the group that sits in this corner of the chamber considers we are entitled to. We are convinced that if a man works ten, twenty, thirty or forty years on a farm and saves his money he should, at least, be entitled to a home to live in and a few hundred dollars besides.

In any other line but farming, when production exceeds the demand it is always considered good business to limit that production. For instance, out in the province where I live we produce a large amount of coal, and it is not an unusual thing at all to see a newspaper editorial advising the coal mine operators that the mines have the capacity of producing far more coal than there is any prospect of the market consuming. So the editorial would say "It would be a matter of good business for you operators to get together and decide on the amount of your production, because if you go ahead and produce without any regard to markets you will stall the thing and you are bound to lose money". That ought to be a good business policy for agriculture also. On the other hand they say to the farmers "You go out and produce every bushel that you can, raise every hoof that you can, and the Lord, in some unseen way, will provide a market for you". If I am any judge of conditions I would very seriously recommend that we go slowly in increasing our production at the present time. I would like any advocate of increased production to show me what country is in a position to buy our goods unless we are prepared to take the goods which they produce. Most assuredly there is no European country to-day that can afford to buy largely from us unless we are in a position to re-buy from them. And what do we do? We erect a good big tariff wall around our country and keep their goods out. It is a hopeless proposition: If we will not let their goods in most assuredly they cannot buy ours.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to suggest to this government that instead of spending this money trying to induce people to come here they would be justified in making an earnest effort to first put our people who are now engaged in agriculture on their feet, and there is a real opportunity to accomplish something along this line at the present time. I do not think there ever was a time in the history of the country when the agriculturists

had the entire sympathy of the rest of the Dominion to the extent they have to-day. I believe that if the government would take the money it is proposed to grant to the Western Canada Colonization Association and with it go out and try to organize some form of marketing societies, that would look after the home market at any rate, they could do a real service. It seems to me, let me say here, the height of folly that the price of the wheat that we use in producing flour in Canada should be set in Liverpool. I never could quite understand why, if a miller somewhere in Ontario wished to buy a carload of western wheat he had to cable to Liverpool to find out how much that wheat was worth. I do not think there is any question but that an effort of the kind I have indicated would at least stabilize our home market. I have in my office a little booklet called, I think, Four thousand facts about Canada which states that 80 per cent of our production is used at home. I am not sure that that proportion is right, but it would not surprise me at all if it were. However, whether that proportion be right or not there is a large volume of it used here in Canada. It has been sold away under the cost of production; and if this government had the welfare of the farmers at heart they would be well advised to seriously considering something that would stabilize the home market.

In discussing this immigration policy the arguments which have been advanced so far in favour of bringing in immigrants, I think, to say the least, are very heartless. One of them—I do not know whether an hon. member actually said it or whether it just occurred to me—was that, "Misery loves company." I think it probably is the most impressive argument of all. The next one, and probably the one which is the most advanced, is that it is going to build up our railroads. I believe it is the first time any country, that claims agriculture as its basic industry has made the statement that agriculture should be made subservient to industry. If farming is our basic industry most assuredly it should not be made subservient to the railroads or to any other industry. Then we are told that a vigorous immigration policy and the bringing in of more people will help us to pay our debts; and over in Europe they say "If we could only get rid of our surplus population our debts would not bother us so much." This argument is identical with that upon which the tariff policy is based; I do not think it is necessary to stress it at all.

In conclusion I would call the attention of the House to the fact that the policy which has been laid down by the government is very similar, in many ways, to the old policy which was in force down in the southern states about half a century or more ago. They tell us that they will bring in immigrants and put them on the farms mortgaged to the hilt. For the next thirty-two years—we can say forty years because they will have four or five failures in that time—they will be busy paying the interest and trying to keep out of debt and in the meantime we will have the Soldier Settlement Board supervising their operations and keeping watch over them. Mr. Chairman, is it not very similar to what they did in slavery days in the south? It is true the system is gone; they no longer buy and sell human beings. Yes, the slave is gone, the black snake is gone, but the spirit is there—the spirit of slavery; and I do not believe, if you bring these people in and load them down with a debt such as is proposed, that there is any prospect whatever of their ever getting out of debt in forty years' time. Think of the attractive life which is before them. Every morning when they wake up they will know that through that day they will have to toil in order to get sufficient to pay the interest on their debts. I think it is the most hopeless outlook that any people could be asked to accept. For my part, I intend to vote against the resolution, and I hope this government will yet change its intention and decide on something at least a little more human.

Mr. McTAGGART: In rising to state my tale of woe in connection with this debate, I want to say I have followed the speeches delivered by hon. members from the beginning with much interest. My impression is that some of the speeches delivered here have been far-fetched, yes, almost weird. In this connection I recall the speecch delivered by the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Manion), when he said that if Canada was to have free trade, the East must die. We heard the speech of the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Dickie), who told us about the streams of gold going to the United States and contended that the tariff should be placed higher and yet higher. We also heard the viewpoint of labour as expressed by the hon. member for Calgary East (Mr. Irvine), who told us that he was not in sympathy with bringing immigrants into Canada so long as there were many unemployed in our cities. If these statements mean anything, they mean that these hon. gentlemen advocate the continuance of a policy of exploitation, the same policy we have had in Canada for forty years, a policy the monumental stupidity of which has placed

a blight upon Canadian agriculture and has retarded national development.

But, Mr. Chairman, I do not rise to deal with tariff or streams of gold or unemployment. To my mind the question of immigration must go hand in hand with the land policy of the Dominion. I believe that experience has demonstrated that the whole question of immigration is closely related to that of land settlement. That is the particular question I wish to deal with this evening. It is my intention to endeavour to make a survey of immigration and Dominion land policies in the past, to endeavour, if possible, to point out the mistakes that have been made, to suggest how these mistakes may be corrected, and to express the hope that we may benefit by this knowledge in laying down our immmigration and land policies for the future. We heard about the prosperity of the province of Manitoba, and I was very glad to hear it, but I recall in studying the early history of Manitoba, that previous to the eighties and nineties the industry of agriculture in Manitoba was in a very precarious condition indeed. As a matter of fact, western agriculture never was put on a proper basis until the discovery of the summer-fallow system of tillage. The discovery of the summer-fallow system of tillage was the signal for a tremendous improvement in the prosperity of western Canada, generally, but particularly the province of Manitoba and the eastern part of the province of Saskatchewan. The soil of the province of Manitoba and the soil of eastern Saskatchewan was found admirably adapted to the summer-fallow method, and as a result of that there came the development of agriculture to the westward.

In those days there were many millions of acres of Dominion lands in western Canada. Prior to 1908 I believe 32,000,000 acres of land were given in grants to the railway companies, and about 32,000,000 acres homesteaded. About the year 1908 the government changed their policy in regard to Dominion lands in western Canada. It was decided about that time to discontinue the policy of making grants of lands to railway companies, and because the Hudson Bay railway was then in contemplation it was decided to sell certain lands in the southwestern part of Saskatchewan and southern Alberta, in order to realize enough money to push that road through to Hudson bay. During those years the progress of our railway development was to the westward; as the branch lines extended to the westward, settlement followed the railways. We find that the railways selected in the main the choice land. They did not at that time select much land in the southwestern part of Saskatchewan or southern Alberta. The lands were selected along the northern section, and settlement followed the railways. About the time the Dominion Lands Act was passed in 1908 an area was set aside in southwestern Saskatchewan and southern Alberta, consisting of approximately 28,000,000 acres. Whether it was because of the fact that the railway companies had not selected lands within that area or not, I am not prepared to say, but at any rate there was a general feeling at that time that southwestern Saskatchewan and southern Alberta were not adapted to the industry of agriculture. Stock raising was encouraged in that district at that time. As a matter of fact, the stock raising industry gained considerable dimensions during those years. The Dominion Lands Act in 1908 was the signal for a tremendous inrush of settlement to the pre-emption area. Many of the settlers came from the Old Land and many also from the United States. In the years between 1908 and 1915 or 1916 many thousand immigrants came in from the United States and settled on those lands. Just here I would like to say, in connection with the question I am trying to deal with, that I have not gleaned my knowledge of it from reading departmental reports. I have passed through the experience of homesteading in that area, and in 1908 I also acquired a pre-emption.

At the time of the amendment of the Dominion Lands Act in 1908, the Hon. Frank Oliver, who was then Minister of the Interior, recognized the fact that within that area more land was necessary to constitute the average farm because of unfavourable climatic and soil conditions. In that country there is not as heavy an annual rainfall as there is in the province of Manitoba or in eastern Saskatchewan, and we find, if we look over the debates at the time of the passing of the Dominion Lands Act, that this was used as an argument why the pre-emption privilege should be extended to that area. There was one feature however which the Dominion Lands Act of 1908 did not recognize, and it was the fact that within that large area while there are many lands which are absolutely unsuited for tillage purposes, there are many thousands of acres of probably as choice land as you will find in the Dominion of Canada. I would say roughly that within that area the amount of choice land might be about 30 per cent. Then, perhaps, another 30 per cent of the land might be considered as fair, and probably 40 per cent of it might be considered as absolutely unsuited for tillage purposes. The latter lands have an-

other use, namely for grazing purposes, and some of them have been used in that way.

The great mistake of the Dominion Lands Act of 1908 was in failing to recognize that fact. The land, the good and the bad, was thrown open indiscriminately, and because of the inrush of immigrants at that time, and the demand for free lands, all those lands were taken up and settled. After 1908, and prior to possibly 1916 or 1917, there was a period of marked prosperity. The years 1917, 1918 and 1919 were very dry years, and it was not until those years that the fact became apparent that there were within that area many lands which were not adapted for tillage purposes. In 1920, the provincial government of Saskatchewan, which has ever been alive to the necessities of agriculture in that province, instituted an inquiry into the deplorable state of agriculture in that part of the province. The result of the inquiry was the appointment of a commission to investigate conditions generally, and it was found that the great mistake as regards that area was the throwing open for settlement of lands which should have been kept closed, that is, which should have been used entirely for grazing purposes.

Just at this point let me say that over 14,000,000 acres of land have been sold within that area as pre-emptions and purchased homesteads between 1908 and the present time. The total revenue received from the sale of such pre-emptions and purchased homesteads, within the pre-emption area up to the present time, is aproximately $19,000,000. In 1922, the total revenue received from the sale of pre-emptions and purchased homesteads within that area was but $350,000, notwithstanding the fact that outstanding obligations by virtue of pre-emptions and purchased homesteads within that area are approximately $12,000,000 at the present time. The situation which we have been faced with within that area since 1918 is this, that on those poorer areas which I mentioned, after the first crop or two, when the humus was removed from the soil, the soil commenced to drift, to blow, and consequently our people began to move out. The people were driven off those lands, and many of them went to the States. Also from the lands which I stated were good to fair, there is a movement of population as well. Many of the remaining settlers find it impossible or next to impossible to continue on those lands; but notwithstanding this, the department are demanding from them the full payment of their pre-emption obligations, in spite of the fact that most of those obligations have now been running from eight to ten years.

[Mr McTaggart.]

One of the recommendations of the commission which the Saskatchewan government appointed, was the establishment of community pastures within that area. It was their recommendation that the small rancher farmer should be encouraged. The growing of grain exclusively within that area, it is felt, will not be found profitable. The profitable farm in that area, in the future as in the past, will be that of the farmer who has access to grazing lands. If there is a section or a half section of grazing land near a settler's farm, and if he could have access to that land for grazing purposes for his stock, that would be of great advantage. Where there are grazing areas too large for the private leaseholder, it is felt that such areas should be taken advantage of by settlers adjoining the area and used as community pastures. I hope the minister is familiar with the recommendations of the commission in that regard. As a matter of fact, I believe the department is familiar with the recommendations because, as I understand the matter, any large leaseholds which are to be thrown open in the near future in that district, are to be leased to the provincial government, in the expectation that the latter government will re-lease to associations of settlers, so that they may form community pastures.

As regards the exodus from that area, the figures which I have and which were brought down in the House, I believe, about two weeks ago, go to show that during 1922, 842 quarter sections, pre-emptions and purchased homesteads, were either cancelled or abandoned. So, we see from that the process of depopulation which is going on. The situation as we see it is that the department is forced from time to time to try to collect overdue obligations on those pre-emptions and purchased homesteads, and in this way the department is actually acting the part of driving those people out of the country.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): We are not insisting and have not, since I have been in office, insisted on the settlement of payments on pre-emptions, hoping to give the individual every opportunity. But I would like to point out to my hon. friend that $16,000,000 have been paid in on pre-emptions, and the situation is a rather difficult one, inasmuch as all the pre-emptions which represent the payment of $16,000,000 have been paid for in full. To adopt a policy now to begin to readjust payments on pre-emptions would not be fair to those who are paid up. We are not, however, pressing for payment.

Mr. McTAGGART: I desire to thank the minister for the explanation. As a matter of fact, I was aware that of recent months there have not been as many letters going to holders of pre-emptions and purchased homesteads. The situation is one that we must face in the near future. What is to be done? Those payments have been running along now for many years, and although the extensions from time to time help us to stave off the day when this situation will have to be met, yet I feel that a complete survey of conditions there is very necessary, so that we may be able to clear up the unfortunate situation which exists in that area.

Some reference has been made to the blacklisting of this particular area. The area has been blacklisted to a certain extent. I believe some of the settlers in that area have been as much responsible as anyone else for that blacklisting; but as a matter of fact, the Department of the Interior have recognized that certain sections within that area are of an inferior quality, for they have withdrawn certain sections entirely from homestead entry. There are other areas within which restrictions have been placed upon homestead entry.

Now, the lesson which I think we might learn from the unfortunate situation in the southwest is that there should be, in the case of free lands thrown open for settlement, a classification of lands with a view to setting aside those areas not considered fit for agricultural purposes. And while I am not familiar with the areas of free lands which we have left in Canada, yet I am inclined to believe that we may have a situation similar to that which existed in the southwest. I feel confident to-day that had there been in 1908 a classification of lands in southwestern Saskatchewan and southern Alberta, and had those areas which were thought not fit for tillage purposes been set aside and withdrawn from entry, we should not have the unfortunate conditions which we have in the southwest at the present time. The result has been a hardship on the settlers on the good soil within that area; because when the settlers on the poorer soils were compelled to move out they left a burden of taxation in the shape of school and municipal taxes, the gravity of which I am sure all hon. members will be able to understand. The people who departed left an indebtedness by virtue of school taxes, telephone taxes and municipal taxes, which are adding to the burden on those who are left.

We have heard something about the burdens which agriculture has had to bear. As I mentioned at the outset, I am of the opinion that the tariff is one of the heaviest burdens which we have to bear now and in the past. But it is not the only burden. The burden of labour itself has borne very heavily on agriculture. The hon. member for Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth) told us this evening about how the farmers in the past had exploited labour. I am going to analyse this statement from the standpoint of the farmer. In 1905 I worked in the harvest fields at Indian Head in Saskatchewan, and at that time the average wage was $1.75 per day. The total cost of operating an average sized threshing machine in 1905, a machine with a capacity of say 2,000 bushels a day, was $62 per day; that is to say, the average labour cost, not taking into account repairs, or teams, or overhead, interest, depreciation, oil, fuel, or anything of that kind. I am referring entirely to direct labour cost. In 1915 I had an interest in a threshing machine in the district in which I live, so that I know whereof I speak, and in that year the wage had risen to $3.50 a day on the average in the harvest fields; while the total labour cost of the same sized machine as that I mentioned previously would be in 1915 approximately $95 per day. In 1922, I was still operating the same machine which I operated in 1915, and we find the labour cost in the year 1922 to be $160 a day, with wages from $6 to $7 a day. This certainly was not an exploitation of labour. Now, I want to know if any hon. member in this House will say that we do not need immigration of agricultural labourers into Canada. Since I have been in western Canada I have never known the time when there has been an over-supply of agricultural labourers. Perhaps at times in certain communities there has been a surplus, but to my knowledge, there has never been any time when there has been an over-supply of such labour.

We heard the statement the last day this subject was under discussion that one of the troubles with farming in western Canada was that the farms were too large. To me that statement is a very misleading one, because I fancy that after all the size of farms in any country must be controlled more or less by conditions of location, soil and climate. In this connection I wish to quote a few words from the report of the commission which the Saskatchewan government appointed in 1920 in regard to this matter, as applied to southwestern Saskatchewan. This is what the report says:

> Indeed it seems to your commissioners that unless range is found in more or less extensive blocks for community grazing the size of the farms in the southwest

will have to be substantially larger than a half section in order to provide facilities for grazing.

Let me read in this connection the point of view of the Hon. Mr. Oliver himself as expressed in 1908 in reference to lands in the southwest. I quote from Hansard of 1908 at page 11142:

> Now, we believe that would be a very great deterrent to settlement in that part of the country. We believe that the conditions there, being such as I have described, a 320 acre farm is one of fair average size and means should be offered to new settlers to acquire such a farm, He cannot acquire it from the railway company, because the railway company is not there; the lands are in the hands of the government to-day, and the government is the only person with whom the settler can deal.

Now, we have heard much preaching about patriotism and unity, both in and out of this House, and I think the time is ripe for us to get down to something practical in connection with these professions. I am going to relate to this House the case of an immigrant who came to Canada about the year 1912, a British boy from the Old Country about 21 or 22 years of age. This young fellow, Harry Dawes, filed a homestead and pre-emption in 1912 or 1913, in the territory of which I have spoken. In 1914 he was in my employ when the war broke out, and shortly after the declaration of hostilities this young Britisher, who was an energetic boy, joined the colours and went

11 p.m.

overseas with the first contingent. He went across to France and was killed in action on the 24th of May, 1915. He left a widowed mother in the Old Land and to this day she has not been able to dispose of that pre-emption in Saskatchewan. I have a letter from the administrator of the estate which came just a few weeks ago and I am going to read from it a paragraph or two. He says:

> My point is this. The soldier who returned from the war was allowed to transfer his pre-emption to a soldier grant, meaning that he got it free. Surely the soldier who gave his life for this country earned equally as much as the returned man.

I took the question up with the department, but they could not do anything more than extend the time of the payment due on the pre-emption. I have no fault to find with the department; I wish to make that clear, but I feel that in this case injustice has been done.

As I stated at the beginning, I did not tell the story of the southwest with the idea of enlisting the sympathy of parliament for that part of the country; my object was to ensure that we should derive from the mistakes of the past something that might be of benefit to us in developing the new lands we expect to settle in the future. I am in favour of immigration of agricultural labour into Canada. I am in favour of the immigration of British and Scandinavian labour. I will try to sum up the observations I have made by offering the following recommendations:

1. That encouragement be given the immigration of British and Scandinavian workers with the view of ensuring a steady flow of desirable agricultural labourers for the farms of Canada.

2. That a thorough classification of all Dominion lands be undertaken by competent authority with a view of arranging for the disposition of these lands in a way which shall ensure the maximum of agricultural production, the greatest conservation of soil resources, and the utmost prosperity for the largest possible population.

3. That the minister give earnest consideration to the advisability of cancelling outstanding pre-emption and purchased homestead obligations with a view of arresting the unfortunate exodus of settlers from the pre-emption area.

4. That a thorough survey of the whole question of Crown land administration be carried out at an early date with a view of incorporating the recommendations of such survey in the long overdue revision of the Dominion Lands Act.

In conclusion, I have only this to say: if the minister earnestly desires to do some colonization work in Canada he might profitably turn his attention to the southwest, because in that district he could work in the way of correcting past mistakes that would be of great benefit not only to the West but to the whole of Canada.

Mr. GOULD: Mr. Chairman, this question which has now been discussed for a considerable time, has been well presented to the committee by hon. members from this corner. When I first came to this House four years ago I presented the case of the agriculturists; on many occasions I stated that I did not think due consideration had been given on the floor of parliament to the agriculturists throughout the Dominion. I was the subject of criticism on the part of hon. members, on the ground that I was an alarmist, but to-day all will agree that if at that time I was a missionary sent down here I have since been followed by a goodly number of "alarmists" who have told the same story that I tried to tell in 1920—the story of actual conditions pertaining to agriculture in our western country. The Minister of Immigration (Mr. Stewart) and the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) know that the conditions outlined by speakers

in this debate actually exist. I firmly believe that the Minister of Immigration is doing what he believes best, perhaps, for all of Canada, but I also believe that upon his own initiative he would not advance this proposal. I do not wish my remarks to be interpreted as a criticism of the minister, for I sympathize greatly with him in his endeavour to arrive at a solution of this problem. But I doubt very much whether the solution is to be found through this western colonization scheme.

It has been stated on numerous occasions in this House that there is a leak in our immigration policy. Men and women leave our country after being brought here, and if money must be spent, it should be used to stop that leak. And what will stop it? Nothing more nor less than the making of conditions pertaining to agriculture what they should be. Speaking of the minister's attitude on this question, I have in my hand a reference which states:

> Hon. Charles Stewart, Minister of the Interior and Acting Minister of Immigration for Canada, in open frankness, speaking before the University Club at Ottawa, recently stated:
>
> "The market at home is overstocked with produce, which cannot be sold profitably because of the high overhead of those doing business. This is the result of deflation in some lines and not in others. Particularly affected by those conditions is the farmer. Extreme conditions of deflation in the farming communities of the West have resulted in the impossibility of making the farms pay there. What is the use of bringing people to this country if they cannot exist?"

No truer word has been spoken in this House or in any other assembly than those words uttered by the Acting Minister of Immigration. That, in my estimation, is the real thought that permeates the mind of the minister; he is so well advised regarding agricultural conditions in western Canada that he knows that an immigration policy based upon this principle cannot, of necessity, be successful. After thirty-two years' experience in western Canada I should know something about agricultural conditions there. I have seen many ups and downs in a national way; more have I seen from the individual standpoint. I recollect in the early days the possibility of a person going out, starting up and making headway. It is true that there were many evils in those days, but we fought them and persuaded the powers that be to legislate so that we could overcome them. In that connection I wish to compliment the minister in that he did, when connected with the government of Alberta, rectify many of the evils from which agriculturists suffered. I recall the days when we were not privileged to order a car to ship our grain but were obliged to shoot it through a hole in the side of an elevator. These things, and the principle of co-operation, we have brought about by agitation and by getting the ear of the government. I state that here at this present time in this Dominion parliament we likewise who represent agriculture should have the ears of the government. We maintain that we who do understand agricultural conditions in the West have a right to be heard. We are just as good in the giving of evidence as the Western Canada Colonization Association. I maintain that these gentlemen who are so philanthropic might better go out themselves and demonstrate the possibilities of agriculture in the West, than ask this government to provide them with a percentage to carry on their work of bringing in immigrants. It does seem to me that we have a right to be heard. No one can doubt our sincerity. No one will accuse us of wilfully making statements that have not been corroborated by evidence submitted.

I wish to state that I am in favour of immigration. I do not wish my remarks to be interpreted as disapproving of immigration. But I do not believe in the principle of patrimony or patronage. I remember so well when I was a small boy my father migrating from Hampshire in England and bringing out his family and establishing them without a dollar of assistance in the county of Lambton in Ontario. As his boys grew up they moved westward, and I am proud to say that each and every one of them has made a very fair success. Conditions were better then, but I would point out that no patronage and no patrimony was given, and I think we were proud enough to say that if it had been offered we would not have accepted it. We were prepared and willing to take our chances, and we did take our chances and whatever we became, the credit can be given to ourselves and to our upbringing. Thousands of others went into western Canada who to-day after long years of experience and effort may have a little equity, but thousands and thousands who have come in later under different conditions are finding it absolutely impossible to make a start upon land. They simply cannot do it, and their hearts are broken in a very few years. That is what will happen when you bring in settlers under this immigration scheme. Three years will be a sufficient length of time to break the heart of the immigrant who comes in under this scheme, and the government will find thousands of immigrants coming into the country as a result of this policy. What are we going to do then? Will the government assume another burden of debt? Will these

lands be capitalized and another petition be made to the people of Canada, and another effort made to bring more immigrants into the country and settle on the land? I think that possibly that will be the only solution then.

If you will trace the history of governments at the present time in parts of the world where white people obtain and are engaged in agriculture, Australia, for instance, we find there that the people are lamenting, almost weeping because of the condition to which agriculture has been brought. In Great Britain we find that the same conditions obtain. Go to any civilized country in the world and you will find agriculture bleeding to death, the whole world over. Agriculture's successes are built on agriculture's failures. By that I mean that if we in this country have a good crop and some other country in the world has a poor crop, we have a proportionate advantage, and likewise the other country when conditions are the reverse. So agriculture's successes are based on agriculture's failures. We compete with the world. As Mr. J. J. Morrison says in an article:

> Labour to-day has better homes, better wages while we are at a standstill. Every jail farm in the country is in direct competition with your industry, but you do not object.

Such is the case with agriculture. I do not presume to argue that this government has the means to legislate against such conditions as that. Moreover, I do not think that agriculture is asking for any patrimony or patronage. But I ask this on behalf of agriculture, that when all the interests of Canada, and I care not what institution it is, have through all these years been showing in their anunal returns a dividend—I demand the same privilege for agriculture. I am prepared to take a one per cent dividend on my capitalization if that is sufficient for these other interests, but when they declare a ten or a fifteen per cent dividend, I ask for the same privilege for agriculture. I am not prepared to accept the position that they year after year shall declare a dividend of ten or twelve or fifteen per cent, and just leave me what is left, because I have had a very interesting part in the production of the wealth upon which their dividends are declared. That is only a square deal to all concerned, and surely, in stressing that point we are not asking for too much.

I was particularly interested in the remarks that were made by the hon. member for Springfield in the address which he gave the other day, and I wish to make a few references to them. The hon. member pointed out that in Manitoba, of which he presumed to speak with authority, they were over-

institutionalized, which is very true. In fact, all the grievances he mentioned were of provincial origin, but I would point out respectfully that the things which he cited were an added burden to the things we are debating at this time. We know full well of the over-institutionalism that has taken place in the western provinces, but in this federal House of Commons we have other problems, and I think it was quite beside the argument for the hon. gentleman to make those statements. His solution of the problem was to place cottages at a valuation of $2,400 on farms. That seemed to me to be something that carried us further, placing on us another burden similar to that placed upon us by Kaiser Bill when he declared war in 1914. I have made a little calculation here, and as the hon. member for Springfield spoke for Manitoba, I shall leave that province to him and take Saskatchewan and Alberta. I find that we have in those two provinces approximately 280,000 farms, which at $2,400 for a cottage, would amount to $712,000,000. That is the solution the hon. member for Springfield has for conditions in the West. I would ask hon. gentlemen of this House if they do not think I have enterprise enough myself to build a necessary house or cottage on my farm if conditions warrant it, and if conditions warrant it, by what means and in what manner I choose to do it. Am I to be told to accept a loan and to place this building on my land? That is not a solution. It only exaggerates the problem, makes it worse. But what surprised me most of all was that the hon. gentleman had departed from the stand that he took a year ago, and in that connection I wish to quote a paragraph from his budget address of last year. First let me say in passing that no gentleman from this part of the House spoke as earnestly about the conditions of agriculture in the West or more truthfully than did the hon. member for Springfield last year, when he said:

> So burden after burden was added until I am sometimes afraid, although I trust I am mistaken, that we have added the last straw so far as western Canada is concerned. I have no desire to be unduly pessimistic, but I wonder if we are not living in a fool's paradise when we speak of western Canada and its ability to come back, unless we have a complete reversal of policy in this country.

Those were his sentiments only last year, and I wonder what has brought about the change, so that when he took his seat the other day he sat down amid applause from the government side while the best sentiment in the Progressive group sat silent and sullen. The hon. gentleman spoke

of prosperous conditions in Manitoba. He also said that he had been in this country fourteen years. I desire to state that I have been in Canada thirty-two years, and long before the hon.. member for Springfield was in Canada I trailed across the Riding mountains in a buckboard. I also forded rivers and streams and went into northern Manitoba looking out for suitable land. I stood upon that buckboard while it drifted down the stream but I got across eventually; there were no bridges in those days. I saw 500 of those immigrants who have been spoken of as successful to-day standing in the river stark naked bathing and washing. I went 300 miles further and I saw women hitched to the plough. I actually saw women drawing the plough in that territory in northern Manitoba. Those are the people the hon. gentleman described as being successful settlers. That is true, but the generations that have succeeded the people of those days are to-day in our agricultural colleges, and in our universities, and they are beating our own people in those institutions. But I want to ask the hon. gentleman whether he would ask the progeny of the members of this House—whether they live in the West or whether they live here—to go out there and compete with those people. I do not think, when you come down to realities, that we have got to work under such conditions to make agriculture a success. I do not believe, Sir, that those people could go into that same territory to-day and make a success of agriculture. Concerning the statements made by the hon. member it did seem to me that his whole argument was nothing but paternalism. I maintain that if conditions are right to-day that people can still go into our western country, with its potentialities, and make a success of farming. The hon. member for North Waterloo (Mr. Euler) also discussed the problem and his solution was to have industrial centres in the West where our products could be absorbed. The argument recalled to me the days when I went to school and used to read the verse:

There's a good time coming boys,
A good time coming.
We may not live to see the day,
But earth shall glisten in the ray
Of the good time coming.

I want—after spending my life in an effort to produce something that I might leave to posterity, after spending my life working earnestly and vigorously—to see these good times arrive in my own lifetime. My father hoped to live to see them, I also hope to see them, and it is but a poor consolation for the hon. member to simply assure us that there is a good time coming. We are going to have a good time some day. We will have it all the quicker, I honestly believe, if the members of the government, will only hearken to the members in this corner of the chamber who have spoken in this debate, and endeavour to do something to remedy the evils from which agriculture is suffering. Those evils are economic, there is no question about it; and they are contributed to by interests of a predatory kind. That is where the trouble lies, I believe. There are individuals back of the Canada Colonization scheme who desire to have more people located on the lands throughout the West in order that they may climb upon their backs. Apparently they are on the backs of the people at the present time and we ask them to get off, rather than bring in more people so that they may continue their present operation. These may perhaps seem harsh words, but I am absolutely in earnest. I believe I know whereof I speak and when I believe a thing I have no hesitation in giving expression to that belief.

I have a few figures here that I wish to submit; I know them so well that I believe I could almost quote them from memory. The provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta were formerly known as the Northwest Territories. In 1898 the population of Manitoba and the Northwest Territories was approximately 400,000 people; in 1922 approximately 2,000,000 people. In 1898 the wheat production in the area known as the Northwest Territories was 32,000,000 bushels. In 1922 the production of wheat in that same area amounted to 375,000,000 bushels. In the period from 1898 to 1922 the population increased five times in what is now our western provinces; whilst the production of wheat increased approximately eleven times. And yet the farmers to-day, taking man for man, are poorer than the settlers were in that early period, although the production of wheat is so vastly in excess of the increase in population. We may well ask what the reason is for the existing situation. When one looks at these figures, and they are official, one can readily understand why hon. members in this part of the chamber deem it incumbent upon them to state the facts.

It has occurred to me that if copies of Hansard for the past week were distributed throughout the countries from which we hope to draw immigrants it would be quite enlightening; particularly if an individual received the copies of Hansard at the same time as he received the publications issued by the Western Canada Colonization Association, or even the literature sent forward by the

present and previous governments. It would certainly be illuminating and yet I doubt whether we would accept the statements appearing in Hansard as facts.

From whence do we hope to attract immigrants? There is a difference of opinion in Great Britain at the present time as to whether the number of unemployed is 1,300,000 or 1,500,000. Ex-Premier Lloyd George accepts the latter figure. A lot of unemployed people are in the Clyde district; they are ship-builders. We know that the British government have a fund for sending immigrants to this country and I believe this government anticipates accepting the opportunities afforded by the Imperial authorities in that respect. I have wondered whether it would not be the desire of the Imperial government to get rid of as many of the unemployed over there as possible. But would they be desirable citizens for this country even with the backing of the Canada Colonization Association? Even with the support of this government can we expect those people to come in here and make a success of farming? I do not think it is at all possible, and I believe that even if they did come their experience would be such that in a very short time they would leave this country again.

I might cite as an illustration of what I mean the following: When living at home and thinking that perhaps my neighbour across the road is not enjoying as good a meal as my own menu provides, I might perhaps invite him over and when he comes and sees my fare he turns up his nose. That has been the case with the immigrant coming to this country. He finds out that we have nothing better to offer him than he considers he has at home. The result is that he is discontented and leaves this country as quickly as he possibly can. He finds out that conditions here are not as they were portrayed to him or as he felt he had a right to expect.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I would like to ask my hon. friend a question. I am sorry that he has got such an opinion of the proposed assistance that is provided for in the $600,000 that we are going to ask the committee to vote. No portion of that money will be expended except as the result of the nomination by people living in Canada of their friends, or someone that they know in England, whom they desire to have settle here. We are not indiscriminately offering people the chance to come to Canada. I merely want to put my hon. friend right in that regard.

[Mr. Gould.]

Mr. GOULD: I thank the minister for his explanation.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Are we abrogating the rule in regard to adjourning at 11 o'clock? I notice the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Gould) rose to speak at 11 o'clock.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: As far as the government is concerned, our desire is to adjourn, if possible, every evening at 11 o'clock, but at present we are not making much progress with the business before the House. I really do not see why these speeches should be made just on the one particular item before us. We should make progress. If the hon. member for Assiniboia has much more to say, we might adjourn at the present time, but we should have it understood that when the committee meets again unless we can make progress with supply, we must continue sitting much later than we have been accustomed to sit. I think everything that it is necessary to say might be said and still permit the business of the House to proceed with a little more expedition.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not for one minute object to sitting late. I just want to know where we are. If we are to depart from the 11 o'clock rule I think we should have notice of it. The Prime Minister has told us the next time this order is called we are to expect to sit late, and that progress will have to be made. We are not objecting to that at all. I assume, as no notice has been given of a late sitting to-night, the minister desires to report progress.

Mr. GOULD: I really did not know how long my remarks would take. I have some notes here yet that I might dwell on for some time, but if it is the wish of hon. members that we adjourn, I take pleasure in moving the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): We might adjourn now, and the hon. member could continue his remarks on some other occasion.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King, the House adjourned at 11.35 p.m.

Wednesday, March 21, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

REPORT

Second report of the select standing committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines.—Mr. Cahill.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING

Mr. GAUVREAU moved the adpotion of the first report of the Joint Committee of the Senate and House of Commons on Printing.

Motion agreed to.

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES

Hon. JAMES MURDOCK (Minister of Labour) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 84 to amend The Industrial Disputes Investigation Act.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Explain.

Mr. MURDOCK: The amendments relate to sections 15, 57 and 58 of the present act. No new features are proposed; the purpose is simply to convey more clearly the intent of those sections as they now stand and have been understood for a number of years.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

MONTREAL DISTRICT POSTAL SERVICE

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. How many appointments were made by the Civil Service Commission in the postal service, Montreal district, between April 1, 1921, and the day the late government resigned?

2. How many of the above appointments were made without the candidates having had to pass examinations?

3. How many promotions were made by the Civil Service Commission, in the postal service, Montreal district, between April 1, 1921, and the day the late government resigned?

4. How many of the above promotions were made without the candidates having had to pass examinations?

5. What are the exact dates on which the above appointments or promotions were made?

Hon. Mr. COPP:

1. There were 47 permanent appointments made, including 35 postmasters.

2. All of the 47 appointees noted in question No. 1 fully met the requirements of the law as regards examinations and qualifications.

3. One.

4. This promotion was made on the basis of length of service, efficiency and fitness.

5. Permanent Appointments:

Name	Position	Date of Appointment
Percival Newman	Railway mail clerk	April 1, 1921
Maurice Vezina	Letter carrier	April 1, 1921
Joseph Gigras	Letter carrier	April 1, 1921
Gracien DeBlois	Letter carrier	April 1, 1921
Wm. G. Brooks	Railway mail clerk	April 1, 1921
J. D. Verdon	Postmaster	April 27, 1921
Miss L. Thibault	Postmistress	April 27, 1921
O. Masse	Postmaster	April 21, 1921
Ls. Carriere	Postmaster	April 13, 1921
Wm. E. Eaton	Postmaster	May 4, 1921
R. Beauchamp	Postmaster	May 19, 1921
Mrs. A. St. Jean	Postmistress	May 19, 1921
A. Renaud	Postmaster	May 19, 1921
J. D. Poissant	Postmaster	May 23, 1921
Mrs. A. G. Lefebvre	Postmistress	May 23, 1921
Miss J. L. Trudeau	Postmistress	May 2, 1921
S. Boyd	Postmaster	May 2, 1921
A. Alieff	Postmaster	May 2, 1921
J. T. Arpin	Postmaster	May 25, 1921
J. M. Charbonneau	Postmaster	June 24, 1921
Jos. P. D. Dauphinias	Letter carrier	July 1, 1921
Elzear Larose	Letter carrier	July 1, 1921
Godefroy Jasmin	Letter carrier	July 1, 1921
Leopold Boileau	Letter carrier	July 1, 1921
Rodolphe Comier	Letter carrier	July 1, 1921
Olier Leveille	Letter carrier	July 1, 1921
A. Lavigne	Postmaster	July 29, 1921
E. Beaudoin	Postmaster	July 22, 1921
L. M. Bohemier	Postmaster	July 12, 1921
E. Sirois	Postmaster	Aug. 30, 1921
Hector Guercy	Postmaster	Aug. 9, 1921
J. E. Chicoine	Postmaster	Sept. 1, 1921
N. Pouliot	Postmaster	Sept. 1, 1921
Miss A. deGonzague	Postmistress	Sept. 30, 1921
R. Lachaine	Postmaster	Sept. 21, 1921
Omer Caja	Postmaster	Sept. 21, 1921
Jos. Masse	Postmaster	Oct. 3, 1921
Josaphat David	Postmaster	Oct. 3, 1921
Mrs. J. A. Lanoie	Postmistress	Oct. 11, 1921
P. Viau	Postmaster	Oct. 11, 1921
A. Prefontaine	Postmaster	Oct. 21, 1921
R. Lamarche	Postmaster	Nov. 29, 1921
N. Laplante	Postmaster	Dec. 3, 1921
J. Wm. Hyde	Postmaster	Dec. 19, 1921
F. Lessard	Postmaster	Dec. 14, 1921
J. McAndrews	Postmaster	Dec. 14, 1921
Promotion: J. A. E. Lamontagne	From postal clerk to senior postal clerk	Date of promotion, Dec. 1, 1921.

TANK CARS

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. What ships were used to transport tank cars to Russia during the war?

2. Were any vessels of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine, Limited, chartered to Messrs. Eaton & Nelligan Company, shipping agents, for that purpose?

3. Was a contract signed between that company and the Canadian Government Merchant Marine? If not, why?

4. If so, by whom was the contract signed, and on what authority?

5. What was the total loss suffered by the Canadian Government Merchant Marine, Limited, through that transaction?

Hon. Mr. COPP:

1. No information.

2, 3, 4 and 5. Answered by No. 1.

JUDGES RETIREMENT FUND

Mr. BENOIT:

Does the government intend to bring down, at this session, legislation creating a retirement fund for judges appointed in the future?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: No.

MOUNTED POLICE—PENSIONS

Hon. Mr. STEVENS:

1. What is the total amount of pensions paid to ex-non-commissioned officers and constables of the Royal Northwest Police annually?

2. Of this amount how much is paid at the old scale of pensions as obtained prior to the present scale coming into force?

3. What amount would be required annually to bring the pension of those under the old scale up to the pension rates at present obtaining?

4. What amount would be required to deal with the pensions of officers or their dependents on the same basis as set forth in question 1, 2 and 3?

Sir LOMER GOUIN:

1. $36,393.86.

2. $17,611.52.

3. $27,610.25.

4. The present amount of pension paid to officers is $45,972.50, and to dependents $8,-696.25, making a total of $54,668.75. Of this amount the following is paid at the old scale: To officers, $11,719.80; to dependents, $4,213.-25; total, $15,933.05. To bring pensions paid under old scale to the present rate, $3,888.60 would be required, as follows: Officers $2,875,-60; dependents, $1,013.00; $3,888.60.

MOUNTED POLICE—SCRIP

Hon. Mr. STEVENS:

1. Did officers of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police who served in the rebellion of 1885 receive land scrip for 160 acres on the same basis as members of the military forces?

2. Did non-commissioned officers and men of the regular Royal Northwest Mounted Police force who served in the rebellion of 1885 receive land scrip?

3. If granted, was such scrip granted to the officers because they had been given the honorary title of an officer in the militia corresponding to the rank held by them in the permanent police force?

4. If not granted, was such scrip refused the non-commissioned officers and men on the ground that they were members of the regular police force and acting simply in performance of their duty in the rebellion of 1885?

5. Why was there discrimination between non-commissioned officers and men of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police and members of the militia in connection with the granting of land scrip?

[Mr. Copp.]

Sir LOMER GOUIN:

1. No.

2. No.

3. If any scrip was granted to the police, it was only to those few who may have served on the militia staff—but this department has no record of such scrip having been issued to the few.

4. The scrip was refused the police because their ordinary duties of maintaining law and order were within the disturbed districts. It appears they were considered to be regulars, permanently stationed in the disturbed territory.

5. Order in Council of the 30th of June, 1894, set forth the reasons for discriminating between members of the mounted police and officers and men of the militia, when the question of rewards for service during the rebellion was under consideration, from which the following is an extract:

The president of the Privy Council, to whom the matter was referred, reports that when the subject of rewards for services during the rebellion was under consideration of the government, a distinction was made between the mounted police, whose ordinary duties of maintaining law and order were within the limits of the disturbed districts, and the militia, who were called upon to leave their homes and occupations at great personal inconvenience, resulting in many cases in serious embarrassment to themselves and families.

That this distinction was marked by excluding the police from participation in the issue of scrip and by limiting the issue of the medal to those members of the Northwest Mounted Police Force who were actually under fire.

STEAMSHIP COMBINES

Hon. Mr. BAXTER:

1. By what minister of the Crown, or public official, or commissioner or other person was the interview given to a representative of the Toronto Globe which was published in the issue of that paper of January 20 last, relative to steamship combines on the Great Lakes?

2. Does the purported interview contain lengthy extracts from the report made to the government by Mr. W. T. R. Preston?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING:

1. The article referred to does not purport to be an interview, but it is in the nature of a news article containing information gathered, doubtless, from a variety of sources.

2. Answered by the answer to question No. 1.

DEADMAN'S ISLAND

Hon. Mr. STEVENS:

1. Has an application been received from the city council of Vancouver for leasing of Deadman's Island?

2. If so, by whom was the application presented?

3. Has the title to Deadman's Island reverted to the Crown in the right of the Dominion government?

4. Has a previous lease granted, expired or been cancelled?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Yes.

2. The application was forwarded by the city solicitor under the instructions of the city council.

3 and 4. The matter is now before the courts.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—COAL

Mr. SHAW:

1. What persons, firms and corporations in the province of Alberta supply coal to the Canadian National Railways?

2. What price is paid per ton?

3. Are the contracts for such coal awarded by tender?

4. For what period have such contracts, if any, been awarded?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Brazeau Collieries, Big Valley Collieries, Blackstone Coal Company, Blue Diamond Coal Company, Bush Mine Coal Company, Coal Valley Mining Company, Ellis Coal Company, Lakeside Coals, Coal Sellers, Limited, Spicer Coal Company, Tofield Coal Company, Marcus Collieries, Mountain Park Coal Company, Rosedale Coal Company, Cadomin Coal Company, Humberstone Coal Company, Mount Cavell, Superior Collieries, Sterling Collieries.

2. As tenders are now being asked for supplies for the coal year commencing April 1, next, the management does not consider it in the public interest to bring down this information at the present time.

3. Yes.

4. Such contracts run from April 1, to March 31, each year.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—WAGES

Mr. KELLNER:

When the wages of the employees of the Canadian National Railways were reduced, in July of 1922, was a proportionate reduction made in the salaries of all officials?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

The employees' wages were increased from time to time in accordance with the McAdoo and Chicago awards and supplements thereto, but salaries of officers were not increased proportionately nor have they ever been paid at rates comparable with those enjoyed by officers of competing lines or in other branches of industry; therefore, no reductions were made.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—ATLANTIC DIVISION TERMINI

Hon. Mr. BAXTER:

1. Is it true as reported in the press, that Honourable J. A. Sinclair, a member of the Canadian National Railway Board, stated to members of the delegation of the St. John Board of Trade which attended a conference at Amherst, Nova Scotia, that "it was news to him that Cochrane and Brockville were not to be the western termini of the Atlantic Division as that was the understanding at the last meeting he had attended," or words to that effect?

2. If Mr. Sinclair has been substantially correctly reported, why was a matter of such importance dealt with in his absence?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. The government has no information as to the correctness of the report in question.

2. Answered by No. 1.

CLEMENTSPORT POSTMASTER

Mr. HANSON:

1. Did the postmaster at Clementsport, Nova Scotia, resign as such, in or about the year 1922?

2. If so, did the Civil Service Commission nominate Mr. Howard G. Potter as a fit and suitable person to fill the said position?

3. Was Mr. Potter notified of his appointment by the Commission?

4. Is the government aware that Mr. Potter is a wounded returned soldier?

5. Why has Mr. Potter's nomination not been confirmed and why is he not postmaster of Clementsport, Nova Scotia, to-day?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM (for Postmaster General):

1. Yes.

2. Yes.

3. Yes.

4. Yes.

5. (a) A temporary appointment was necessary on resignation of former postmaster, and an applicant with previous post office experience was placed in charge. (b) Mr. Potter was not resident in Clementsport at the time the vacancy occurred. (c) Acting District Superintendent, Halifax, reporting on various applicants, did not recommend Mr. Potter. (d) Department's duty is to give public service, and while a difference of opinion exists service is being satisfactorily performed by the present temporary incumbent. (e) When the position is definitely filled it will be filled strictly in accordance with the Civil Service Act.

TRENT CANAL—YOUNG'S POINT

Mr. McMASTER:

1. Who received the contract for the work to be done in connection with a dam at Young's Point on the Trent Canal in or about November, 1922?

2. What was the amount at which the work was let to the successful tenderer?

3. What were the amounts of other tenders on this work?

4. What was the amount submitted by the successful tenderer for the unwatering?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. F. R. Wilford, Lindsay, Ont.

2. Amount extended on unit price basis, $107,197.50.

3. Tenders received conforming with department's specified requirements: $107,322.85, $114,978.00, $118,379.75, $119,636.80, $120,234.00, $124,864.50, $132,165.65, $139,073.50, $151,636.60, $208,345.90.

4. $32,000.

GOVERNMENT BOAT EUREKA

Mr. HANSON:

For a copy of all papers, writings, telegrams, affidavits or documents of any kind in the possession of the government relating to appointments of officers and men by the present government on the boat Pitot at Pointe au Pere, or relating to the conduct of the men so placed by the government in charge of such boat.

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries): As I said the other day there is no boat called the Pitot or Pilot at Pointe au Pere. There is, however, a boat for the pilotage service there; its name is Eureka. I suppose that is the one to which my hon. friend refers.

Mr. HANSON: I understand that is the name of the boat—Eureka.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion be amended by substituting the name "Eureka" for "Pitot" or "Pilot" in the motion?

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

SENATE OF CANADA

MOTION BY MR. DENIS (JOLIETTE) FOR AN ELECTIVE BODY

Mr. JEAN J. DENIS (Joliette) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, it is expedient that a humble address be presented to His Majesty the King praying that the British North America Act be amended so as to provide that the members of the Senate instead of being summoned by the Governor General should be elected by the people for a term of six years in special senatorial divisions, the election for one-half thereof to take place every third year or should be elected for any other period of time or by any other mode of election as may be determined by parliament.

He said: Mr. Speaker in moving this resolution I am not insensible of the importance of the subject which I have now the honour to place before this House, nor am I unmindful of the difficulties which lie in the way of any such project as this nor of the opposition which will be offered to it. May I also say, at the outset, that the question which I am now bringing to the attention of the House is by no means a personal one; it is constitutional in its character. I wish to assure the House that I have the utmost respect for the hon. members of the upper house, and that I am not bringing this resolution forward because I am in any way lacking in appreciation of the high status of that honourable body; my reason, purely and simply, is that I wish the popular Chamber to appreciate the constitutional question involved, which, in my judgment, is of the utmost importance.

Anyone who will study this question of the constitution of the Senate will realize not only that it is one of great importance but also that it is very difficult and complex in its nature. In dealing with this matter I propose to do this: In the first instance to examine our own constitution as regards the Senate; secondly to consider the constitution of the self-governing dominions of the British Empire as it relates to their Senate; in the third place to discuss the constitutions of the principal states of Europe in the same relation; fourthly to devote some attention to the states of America in the same connection; and finally to briefly sketch the constitutional nature of our Senate from the time of its creation to the present day, and the functions which the upper house of this country has performed.

In the first place it should be remembered that our Senate is but the continuation of the old Legislative Council. Under the union, and even before that time, there were two chambers in Canada—the Legislative Council and the Legislative Assembly. Under the union—for a certain period at least—the Legislative Council was nominative; and as far back as the early thirties this fact was the cause of much recrimination and many complaints. If we go back to that time we may recall a constitutional document of considerable importance known as The Ninety-two Resolutions. In that famous document the people of Lower Canada complained of several conditions in the administration of the country but laid special emphasis on the nominative character of the Legislative Council. They claimed—even in those early days, nearly one hundred years ago—that it was against the rights of the people and opposed to democracy in its truest sense that a legislative council should be nominated. I need not go into details as to the character of those ninety-two resolutions, or as to the events of those days; they are written in the history of Canada. Although the ninety-two resolutions were not given effect to by the Imperial parliament they undoubtedly had their influence in shaping the constitutional history of Canada because within a few years afterwards we had the Union government in this country, and the resolutions referred to undoubtedly conduced to the granting of responsible government in Canada. The

ninety-two resolutions were not only submitted to the Governor of Canada at that time but were also forwarded to the Imperial authorities. The popular discontent led to the Rebellion of 1837 and other occurrences of an exciting nature. However, in 1840, the Imperial government decided to grant this country a new constitution, and the Union Act was passed. Under that act the Legislative Council was still nominated; apparently the time was not considered ripe to make it an elective body. If we consider that as far back as 1840 very few countries in the world had democratic governments, no one will be surprised that Great Britain, even with the generosity she has always displayed to her colonies, did not think fit at that time to grant Canada an elective Legislative Council. The Union Act was passed by the Statute 3-4 Victoria, Chapter 35. It provided:

> That there shall be one legislative council and one assemby which shall be called the Legislative Council and Assembly of Canada.

It was also provided in the act that Upper and Lower Canada should be represented by an equal number of members in the Legislative Council. The act provides also that the Governor is authorized in her majesty's name by an instrument under the Great Seal of the said province to summon to the said Legislative Council of the said province such persons, being not fewer than 20, as her majesty shall think fit; and that it shall also be lawful for her majesty from time to time to authorize the Governor in like manner to summon to the said Legislative Council such other person or persons as her majesty shall think fit. It is provided that every councillor shall hold his seat for the term of his life. Therefore 20 councillors were nominated for life with the option, on the part of the government, to name other councillors, the number of these councillors not being limited. Under the Union Act all political parties agreed that the Legislative Council which was given them was not what they wanted, and again complaints were heard, and the idea of an elective legislative council made progress until in 1854 the Imperial parliament saw fit to pass an act enabling the government of Canada to change as they might choose the constitution of the Legislative Council. Now, think of it—as far back as 1854 the Imperial government allowing Canada to make the legislative council elective! This was done by the Imperial statutes 17-18 Victoria, Chapter 118, which provides for an act to empower the legislature of Canada to alter the constitution of the Legislative Council for the province and for other purposes. Section I of the above-mentioned act provides as follows:

> It shall be lawful for the legislature of Canada by any act or acts to be hereafter for that purpose passed to alter the manner of composing the Legislative Council of that province and to make it consist of such a number of members appointed or to be appointed or elected by such persons and in such manner as to the said legislature may seem fit.

After the passing of that act in 1854 the then government of Canada decided to bring in a measure which had the effect of changing the constitution of the Legislative Council by making it elective. In the year 1856 the then government of Canada brought in a bill making the council of the time elective. It is well to remember—and I quote this as a very strong argument in support of my resolution—that as far back as 1856, not only did the government of the time pass an act providing that the Legislative Council should be elective, but they passed that act practically unanimously by a vote of 83 to 6. I want to know if the government of Canada will be less generous now than was the government of Canada over sixty years ago. An act was passed by which 48 legislative councillors were to be elected in Canada, 24 for Upper Canada and 24 for Lower Canada. The same act provides that 24 electoral divisions shall be created both in Lower and Upper Canada. These councillors were to be elected for the term of 8 years but they were to be elected in rotation, so that there would be elections every two years for one-quarter of the whole number. In that way they had elections in 1856 for 12 members of the Legislative Council; in 1858 they elected 12 other members; in 1860 they elected 12 members; and in 1862 they elected the last 12 members, making in all 48 elective members for the Legislative Council.

Now we have reached the year 1862, and we find that the Legislative Council is elective. They had the old council and this is how they proceeded with that council. The old councillors, to the number of about 24 at the time the act of 1856 was passed, were allowed to keep their seats during their lifetime, but at their death they were not to be replaced. Therefore, after a certain period of time, if confederation had not intervened we would have had in Canada an entirely elective council.

Now, having placed these facts before the House, one will naturally ask: If in 1856 the parliament of United Canada was practically unanimous in declaring the Legislative Council elective, how is it that at confederation the Senate, which is, as I have said, the body which follows the Legislative

Council, was not made elective? Well Mr. Speaker it is very surprising indeed that the Senate was not made elective at the time of confederation, and I crave the indulgence of the House if I take the liberty of quoting a little, bearing to a certain extent on this subject. I think this is one point which needs explanation and which must be settled before this House. To summarize this question, I will say, first, that according to the Fathers of Confederation the scheme of confederation was a necessity; secondly that, starting with the principle that confederation was a necessity, the different colonies which were to unite in confederation had to make compromises, and surely no compromise should be too great in order to achieve the scheme of confederation, provided no principles of vital importance to one of the provinces should be sacrificed. It is on those theories that the Senate of Canada was made nominative at the time of confederation, instead of being made elective. I will try to prove those three points to the House.

First I shall show that confederation in the opinion of the fathers of confederation was a necessity. I will quote from some of the debates on confederation. I find the Prime Minister of the time, Sir Etienne Pascal Taché, said:

> On the whole, he thought that the confederation of all the provinces had become an absolute necessity, and that it was for us a question of to be or not to be. If we desired to remain British and monarchical, and if we desired to pass to our children these advantages, this measure, he repeated, was a necessity.

Secondly, confederation had to be taken as a whole—the whole scheme had to be accepted or rejected. The Prime Minister of that time said:

> The scheme, it was true, must be taken as a whole, or rejected, since it was not the property of the government of Canada alone, but of all the other provinces as well,

And on that point I might say this further, that it is admitted by all students of constitutional law that confederation is a pact and a treaty. Therefore, when a treaty had been made between the different colonies, it had to be rejected or accepted as a whole. No one colony could alter that treaty, because if Lower Canada, for instance, had altered the treaty in one clause, New Brunswick might alter it in another clause, Nova Scotia might alter it in some other clause, and in that way confederation would have been made impossible. Therefore, the scheme of confederation was presented to the House at that time as a whole, and it had to be accepted or rejected as a whole. No matter whether it pleased or displeased the parliament of Canada at that time, that the Senate should be nominative instead of elective, they had to take it as a whole or reject it as a whole. In view of the necessity for confederation, in view of the immense advantages which would, in the opinions of the makers of confederation, accrue to the different colonies, they decided to accept the scheme as a whole, notwithstanding the defects which in their judgment, might be contained in the scheme; one of those defects in the opinion of Canada—that is, Upper and Lower Canada —being, without any doubt, the fact that the Senate was nominative instead of elective because as I have just said, eight years before the government of Canada declared unanimously that the council should be elective

I have just said that confederation was a treaty and the product of a compromise. I have before me copious quotations from Hon John A. Macdonald, who was then Attorney General of Canada West and who was afterwards Prime Minister of Canada. I have at least half a dozen quotations on that point, and while I will not read them all, I will read one. This is what he said, and he had said it several times before:

> Let me again, before I sit down, impress upon this House the necessity of meeting this question in a spirit of compromise, with a disposition to judge the matter as a whole, to consider whether really it is for the benefit and advantage of the country to form a confederation of all the provinces; and if hon. gentlemen, whatever may have been their preconceived ideas—

Remember—"Whatever may have been their preconceived ideas," because all those men had the preconceived idea that the Senate should be elective and not nominative

> —as to the merits of the details of this measure, whatever may still be their opinions as to these details, if they really believe that the scheme is one by which the prosperity of the country will be increased and its future progress secured, I ask them to yield their own views, and to deal with the scheme according to its merits as one great whole.

This idea of making the Senate of Canada nominative instead of elective was, I must say, very strongly attacked by the minority in the House at that time. Although I would carefully avoid judging events which are not written down in history, I think one can be safe in saying that if it had been left open for one moment to Canada, that is the two provinces, the United Canada, to have an elective Senate, undoubtedly they would have voted for an elective Senate, because those very men who propounded the scheme of confederation, who asked parliament to vote a nominative Senate, admitted themselves, that while they did that, they did it as a compromise and because they wanted to make sure that the scheme of confederation should be adopted.

I have just said that many hon. gentlemen opposed very strongly a nominative Senate, and I will take the liberty of reading an extract from the speech of one of them. The Hon. Mr. Olivier, as reported at page 315 of the Debates of Confederation, expressed himself as follows, and one will see in that speech how far-sighted the hon. gentleman was, because in the few lines which I will now read, he depicted the Senate of to-day, he tells us exactly what is going to happen, and what did happen afterwards:

I took notice of an expression made use of by the hon. and gallant knight—

This refers to Sir E. P. Tache, Prime Minister.

—in speaking of the last moments of the Legislative Council appointed by the Crown. He told us that to restore the credit of the Legislative Council it had been found necessary to make it elective.

Think of this. To restore the credit of the Legislative Council in the year 1856 and before that period, it was necessary to make it elective. Now what will you do to-day to restore the credit of the Senate of Canada? I continue quoting Mr. Olivier:

But this was not the sole inducement for the change; there was another motive quite as reasonable for making the council elective, and this motive was that in causing the councillors to be elected, they would be taken from among all parties in the country, and would, therefore, represent the public opinion of the different parties in it. There was a time, under the old order of things, when the opinions of two or three men residing in the cities of Quebec and Montreal formed the public opinion of all Lower Canada. This had a bad effect, for the public opinions of the different parties in the country ought to be represented in this House as well as in the other. It was for the purpose of attaining this end that the country was broken up into divisions, that it was required that the councillors elected should be residents in the divisions, or should be the owners of real estate within their limits of the value of £2,000; but under the system of Crown nominations to seats in this House, the choice might fall, as it formerly did, on persons residing in the large cities; it would not be difficult for them to acquire £1,000 worth of real estate in the divisions, and the country would not be equally represented in this House. Another reason why the elective system is preferable to that of nominations by the Crown, is that on every fresh election the newly elected member represents the opinions of the people then prevailing, whereas councillors appointed for life may sometimes represent public opinion as it existed twenty years before. The progress of the country requires that from time to time men should enter this House as representatives of the opinions of the day.

Needless is it for me to say on that point, that the Upper House might represent an opinion different from that of the Lower House. We know that from confederation on—I am quoting from memory, but I think until 1903—the Senate of Canada was Tory, notwithstanding the fact that during that period we had the Mackenzie administration, a Liberal administration, for four years in power, and in 1903 we had had the Laurier administration in power for seven years.

What about the elective principle that was introduced in 1856? Did that work well or did it not? I have again the opinion of the Prime Minister of that time. Sir Etienne Pascal Taché, at page 240 of the Confederation Debates, said:

The measure was passed by a pretty large majority—

Of course, he did not want to admit all the truth, but he knew better than this. It was not a "pretty large majority;" it was practically unanimous—83 to 6.

The measure was passed by a pretty large majority, and I think that until now the elective principle has worked remarkably well indeed, and that the electors have sent to this House gentlemen who would do honour to any deliberative body in the world,—I care not where, whether in England, or on the continent of Europe, or in America.

Remember, Sir, that the gentleman who said that was Prime Minister of the time. And the Prime Minister who propounded the scheme of confederation with a nominative Senate did so of necessity. Why did he adopt a course which he knew was an absolute contradiction to the principle he had espoused? He had declared that the elective principle had been very successful and that under it we had obtained the best representatives that could be found in the country, men who could compare with those of any country in Europe or in America. But in the meantime, he said, there should be a change and a nominative body appointed. Now, why did he take that attitude? Sir Etienne Taché was a statesman, and he did this simply because he was bound to. And he says so elsewhere; he had to do it in order to meet the requirements of the provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswisk. It happened that these two provinces—I am not sure about New Brunswick, but certainly Nova Scotia—wanted a nominative Senate. They called it a council at that time, but the two terms are synonymous; because in the Confederation Act we read that there shall be two houses, one, the upper house, to be styled "The Senate." For the first time in Canadian history the upper house was then styled the Senate; until the constitution was drafted it had been called the Legislative Council. Now, Sir Etienne Taché was in favour of an elective Senate; but on the principle of compromise, because confederation was a necessity, he agreed to a scheme which provided that the Senate should be a nominative body. This same Sir Etienne Taché was very much opposed to partisan nomination; and of course he knew that nominations to a nominative council could not

be anything but partisan. It is quite interesting to quote what he says. At page 238 of the Debates we read:

Now, hon. gentlemen, what was the spirit which actuated the appointments to the council from 1841 to 1848?

It must be remembered that from 1841 to 1848 the council had been nominative and not elective.

It was a spirit of partisanship, and where there is partisanship there can be no justice. (Hear, hear). Where there is partisanship there can be no stability; —you can depend upon nothing. (Hear, hear). It is only when justice is rendered to all parties that you can reckon upon stable and permanent governmental institutions. (Hear, hear). To show the difference between the spirit which actuated these nominations from 1841 to 1847, and a spirit which exists now, it is only necessary to refer to the resolutions of the conference.

And he quotes them, the purport of his quotation being that in the first Senate the two parties should choose an equal number of members. That is how the first Senate was constituted; thereafter it was left to the government to appoint senators. Again I ask, because I consider this point immensely important, is it not obvious that the Prime Minister of that time, his government and the parliament of Canada were opposed to a nominative council, notwithstanding the fact that they voted for a nominative Senate? They were opposed to the principle, as Sir Etienne Taché plainly declares. But he had to vote for a nominative Senate in order that confederation might be possible. Now, if hon. gentlemen from other provinces rise in this House and say that to-day they hold the same opinions in regard to this question as their forefathers held in 1867, I am ready to accept their word. Confederation is a pact; it is a treaty; and if hon. gentlemen from other provinces say that they do not want a change there may be some argument in that position. I do not say that such an argument would be decisive, but it might be a strong argument. But times have changed, Mr. Speaker, and had it not been for the province of Nova Scotia at that period of our history we should have had from 1856 to confederation an elective Legislative Council and from confederation down to the present time an elective Senate. Now, I have said that the lower provinces were opposed to an elective Senate. This is what Sir Etienne Taché says:

Some remedy had to be found, and gentlemen of opposite parties wisely came together with the view of devising a plan which would not only cure our domestic difficulties but give greater power and force to the British North American colonies. To bring this about we determined that we would endeavour to obtain a federal union of all the British American provinces. Delegates from below, and the gentlemen composing the administration of Canada met together. Some of us might have preferred still to retain the elective principle, but then we had to meet those gentlemen from below and we had to give and take. We could not carry everything our own way. (Hear, hear). The gentlemen from the lower provinces were opposed to the elective principle and went strongly for the system of appointments by the Crown.

I think I can safely say that we have the secret, if ever secret there was in the matter, why the government of Canada voted for a nominative Senate after it had voted eight years previously for an elective Senate. The reason was purely and simply because they wanted to meet the wishes of the lower provinces, although they themselves had always been opposed to a nominative Senate. What was the population of these colonies at that time? I have not the exact figures, but Lower Canada was about 1,100,000 and Upper Canada 1,400,000, and the two together surely had a population three or four times greater than the lower provinces. Therefore, it was not the wish of the majority that prevailed, but that of the minority. The lower provinces were the minority, and when they succeeded in carrying the question and making the Senate a nominative instead of an elective body they imposed the views of the minority on the majority.

Mr. CARROLL: Was it not intended at that time that the Senate should be a protection for the minority?

Mr. DENIS (Joliette): It has been said, and we find it in the debates, that gentlemen from the lower provinces were of the opinion that they would be better protected by a nominative instead of an elective Senate. I must confess, however, that I cannot concede the point, although it has been given as one reason for a nominative Senate.

Mr. WHITE: What were the other reasons advanced by the Nova Scotian people in favour of a nominative senate?

Mr. DENIS (Joliette): I am glad my hon. friend has asked that question because the point I am about to deal with will enable me to answer him. Prior to the Quebec conference in 1864 representatives of the governments of the lower provinces—Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island—had decided to meet at Charlottetown to discuss a scheme of confederation, and as the governments and the people in the Canadas were favourable to a confederation, they feared that if the provinces by the sea formed a union it would be a good many years before they would be inclined to join a wider confederation. The government

of Canada asked permission to send representatives to the conferences, which permission was generously accorded. The representatives of Upper and Lower Canada met the representatives of the Lower Provinces at Charlottetown on the 1st September and the conference lasted until about the 10th. Then the delegates adjourned to Quebec and continued their deliberations in that city on the 10th October of the same year. Now comes the answer to my hon. friend's question: What was said at that conference when the representatives from Nova Scotia asked that the Senate should be made nominative instead of elective. Unfortunately the report of the Quebec conference—which, after all, was the most important conference that preceded confederation—is very fragmentary, in fact all we can find are the resolutions which were discussed. I have carefully perused the report but I cannot find who was responsible for the change making the Senate nominative instead of elective. However, after the Quebec conference, when the question of confederation was threshed out in the parliament of Canada, and when members of parliament who were not present at the Quebec conference asked the government why the change had been made, the answer was: We made that change because the Lower Provinces asked for it. I take it for granted that the government in so answering spoke the truth, although in the proceedings of the Quebec conference the request of the Lower Provinces does not appear.

It was my intention to examine the various motions that have been brought before parliament since confederation asking that the Senate be made elective, but it would be altogether unreasonable for me to take the time of the House by going into these details. Suffice it to say that almost immediately after confederation there were complaints against the Senate being nominative, and similar complaints have been made from time to time since. Of course, constitutional law is not understood to-day in quite the same light as it was fifty years ago, and the reasons advanced soon after confederation against a nominative Senate are very much stronger to-day in view of the development of our constitutional rights than they were when advanced even so recently as fifteen or twenty years ago.

There is one fact, however, which I cannot pass in silence, namely, that the Liberal party at a national convention in 1893 passed a resolution declaring that the Senate should be elective instead of nominative. This is the resolution:

> The present constitution of the Senate is inconsistent with the federal principle in our system of government, and is in other respects defective, as it makes the Senate independent of the people and uncontrolled by the public opinion of the country, and should be so amended as to bring it into harmony with the principles of popular government.

Mr. HANSON: Would the hon. member please explain to the House and to the country why the Liberal party abandoned that plank in their platform?

Mr. DENIS (Joliette): I am sure my hon. friend thinks he is making a very strong point when he asks that question. I may tell him that the Liberal party at that time at least was animated by good intentions, and I believe there are in the Liberal party to-day men of equally good intentions who will be willing to carry out this proposal. But if the Liberal party held the principles of the Tory party to which my hon. friend belongs, the people of Canada would be certain never to see a change in the constitution of the Senate for the next hundred years. While I am on this point I wish to recall what was said a few days ago by the hon. member who in the last preceding government was Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton). When this resolution was called the other day he got up and said: Of course, we know how futile these resolutions on the Senate are. I was very much surprised, but after thinking it over my surprise moderated and I said to myself: This is only a Tory opinion; the hon. gentleman is a Tory, and he speaks like a Tory. The Liberal party has always been the champion of the rights of the people, but the Tory party has always attempted to thwart them. I consider that an elective Senate is a right that naturally belongs to the people, and therefore I am not surprised at hon. gentlemen on the Tory side being opposed to it. Not only is it to be expected that they would be opposed to it, but their eyes are so obscured by Tory tradition that they cannot see that there may be two sides to this question. They appear to think that a resolution of this kind is simply the sport of some hon. gentleman who wants to make himself conspicuous before the people and to please someone in the House. Let me assure my hon. friend that I am bringing forward this resolution to please, I hope, a majority of hon. members, although it may not be palatable to my Tory friends.

4 p.m.

Mr. HANSON: Mr. Speaker, I am very much obliged to the hon. member for replying to my question—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. DENIS (Joliette): My hon. friend is welcome to ask me another question if he chooses to. Mr. Speaker, I was dealing with the resolution passed at the Liberal convention of 1893. I do not pretend for a moment that when a Liberal government came into power in 1896 they were bound by an opinion expressed in a convention of the party in 1893, because many of the members of the Liberal cabinet, and many of their supporters in the House perhaps, were not present at the convention, and indeed might hold opinions on the subject different from those who passed the resolution. I am not quoting this resolution adopted by the Liberal convention in 1893 as an authority beyond which the government that came into power afterwards could not go; I presented it simply as the strong opinion of a representative body, the Liberal party. I entertain the hope, and I shall always entertain it until it is realized, that when the Senate of Canada is modified or reformed, that reform will come from the Liberal party.

I stated at the outset that I would pass over our constitutional provisions respecting the Senate. I now come to a subject which is very interesting indeed, that is, a comparison of our Senate with similar bodies in other countries. In matters of constitutional law we invariably find that authorities and others who are studying the question compare the constitutions of different countries for the purpose of demonstrating whether a particular constitution is good or bad, adequate or defective. If there is a sphere of knowledge in which it is necessary to proceed by comparison, it is certainly in connection with constitutional law.

I wish in the first place to compare the Senate of Canada with the senates of other self-governing dominions of the British Empire. There are at present five self-governing dominions, namely, Canada, the Commonwealth of Australia, the Union of South Africa, Ireland, and New Zealand. These self-governing dominions have about the same status as Canada has, so that it is very interesting to compare our constitution with theirs so far as provision for a senate is concerned.

The Commonwealth of Australia consists of six colonies, now denominated the original states of New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland, South Australia, Western Australia and Tasmania. The constitution was proclaimed at Sydney on the first of January, 1901. The legislative powers were vested in a federal parliament consisting of the King, represented by a Governor General, a senate and a house of representatives. It is provided that there must be a session of parliament at least once each year. The Senate is made up of six members for each of the original states voting as one electorate and senators are chosen for six years. In general, the Senate is renewed to the extent of one-half every three years, but in case of prolonged disagreement with the House of Representatives it may be dissolved and an entirely new Senate elected. The House of Representatives, with twice as many members as there are senators, continues for three years from the date of its first meeting unless sooner dissolved. Since the first parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia was instituted, an electoral act has united the franchise for both chambers on the basis of universal adult—male and female—suffrage. The population of the continent of Australia in 1921 was 5,436,794.

Let us take now the Union of South Africa —and I will give only the facts which refer directly to the Senate. The Senate of the Union of South Africa consists of 40 members. For ten years after the establishment of the Union 8 are nominated by the Governor General in Council and 32 are elected, 8 for each province. Four of those nominated by the Governor General in Council are selected mainly for their acquaintance with the reasonable wants and wishes of the coloured races. The white population of the Union of South Africa is 1,522,924, and the coloured population is 5,399,889; total, 6,922,813. In the statistics given, reference is made to the coloured people in regard to the nomination of senators.

The constitution of Ireland is perhaps the most interesting of the constitutions of the British dominions, in the first place, because it is new and also because of the troubles and difficulties which have arisen in Ireland during many years. Since 1914 three acts have been passed by the Imperial parliament giving a constitution to Ireland. The first act was entitled, "The Government of Ireland Act, 1914." Under that act each province was to have the following number of senators: Ulster, 14, Leinster, 11, Munster, 9, Connaught, 6; total, 40. These senators were to be elected every 9 years. The second constitution of Ireland was passed in 1920 and was entitled, "The Government of Ireland Act, 1920." This act provides for parliament for both Northern and Southern Ireland, and under it Ulster was divided from the rest of Ireland and was given a separate constitution. We find, again, that the provision is for an elective senate, both for Ulster and for the rest of Ireland. Then, the third constitution given to Ireland was adopted last year as "The

Irish Free State Constitutional Act, 1922," which received Royal Assent on December 5, 1922. This, therefore, is the youngest constitution in the world, at any rate, in the British dominions. The constitution of 1922 provides that there shall be 60 senators elected for 12 years. One-quarter of the members of the senate shall be elected every three years from a panel especially constituted. The senators are therefore elected by an indirect or restricted vote. In many countries the senate is not elected by the popular vote. In France, for instance, the senate is elected by a selective or indirect vote, but it is an elective senate, just the same. The last quotation concerning the British self-governing dominions I wish to make refers to New Zealand.

In New Zealand the legislative power is vested in the Governor General and a "General Assembly" consisting of two chambers—a legislative council and a house of representatives. The Legislative Council consisted—as of September, 1921—of 41 members. Those appointed since September 17, 1891, hold their seats for seven years only, unless re-appointed. One life member was appointed before that date. Provision has been made for the legislative council to be made elective at a date to be fixed by proclamation. Twenty-four members are to be elected at the first election and forty at subsequent elections. Three Maori members may be appointed by the Governor General. Present sitting members hold office till the end of the term of their appointment.

Therefore, Sir, to summarize, taking the five great British self-governing dominions, Canada is the only one that has a nominative senate.

I will now proceed to make a comparison with some countries in Europe. I would like very much to place before the House the constitutions of the principal states of Europe at least but I now see that were I to do so I should occupy the entire afternoon. I will therefore only deal with some twelve or fifteen of those states, taking them in alphabetical order:

Austria. The new constitution has been in force since October 1, 1920, and her senate is elective.

Belgium. According to the constitution of 1831, the senate of Belgium is elective.

Czecho-Slovakia: The constitution of the Czecho-Slovak republic was passed by the National Assembly on February 29, 1920. The national parliament, which constitutes the only legislative body for the whole of the republic, is composed of a chamber of deputies elected for a period of six years and containing 300 members, and a senate comprising 150 members to be renewed every eight years. The franchise for the senate is open to all citizens who are over 26; and all citizens over 45 are eligible for election. The electoral system is based on proportional representation.

Denmark: Denmark is a kingdom, Christian X. being the reigning king since 1912. The house of representatives is at present composed of 149 members; 117 members being elected by the method of proportional representation in twenty-three districts. The term of the legislature is four years but the king has the power to dissolve the house of representatives before the end of the four years. The members of the senate are elected indirectly by the voters of the house of representatives of 35 years of age in the following way: In every electoral district electing a member of the house of representatives, electors in number corresponding to the population are elected by the method of proportional representation. The whole country is divided into six senatorial districts. In each of these the electors elect a number of the senate between ten and twelve. In this way 56 members are elected. One is elected for the Faroe Islands. Moreover, there are 19 members elected by the former senate according to the system of proportional representation. The members of the senate sit for a term of eight years. There are elections every fourth year for the half of those elected by the electors, while those elected by the senate go out all at once after an eight-year term.

France. The constitution of France is rather well known. It may be sufficient for me to say that in France the senate is composed of 314 members, elected for nine years from citizens 40 years old, one-third retiring every three years. The election of the senators is indirect, and is made by an electoral body composed (1) of delegates chosen by the municipal council of each commune in proportion to the population; and (2) of the deputies, councillors-general, and district councillors of the department. Besides the 225 departmental senators elected in this way, there were, according to the law of 1875, 75 senators elected for life by the united two chambers; but by the senate bill of 1884 it was enacted that vacancies arising among the life senatorships would be filled by the election of ordinary nine year senators, the department which would have the right to the vacant seat to be determined by lot. According to the original constitution there were 314 senators of whom 75 were to be nominated

and the balance elected. That seems to be generous enough treatment for those who were in favour of a nominative senate—one-fourth nominated, and three-quarters elected. Only a few years after that, in 1884, they changed the constitution of the senate; they found that it was not reasonable, it was not necessary, it was not democratic to nominate even 75 members in the senate, or one-fourth of the whole number. I may say that the opinion of many authorities on constitutional law—English and German authorities as well as French—the French constitution as respects the senate, taking it as a whole, is, perhaps, the best in the world.

The German republic. Immediately after the Kaiser left Germany, Germany was declared a republic, and it is very remarkable indeed how the constitution of that republic was framed without any greater trouble than actually happened. However, my intention is not to speak of the German constitution otherwise than by describing the constitutional system which prevails there. The senate is called the Reichsrat and it consists of 66 members; 26 for Prussia, 10 for Bavaria, 7 for Saxony, 4 for Wurtemburg, 3 for Baden, and 16 for other states. Lest I should forget it, I should at this stage place before the House the fact that in almost every country in the world, consisting of a confederation or a union, the provinces elect their senators either directly or indirectly, either by popular vote or otherwise. I do not recall any country which does not elect its senators in that way. In the United States senators are elected by popular vote. The constitution has been changed but I will come to that in a moment. Two senators are elected for each state, but they are not elected for the whole United States. In Canada we have the anomaly of an appointive senate. For example, the senators from Prince Edward Island are nominated by the Dominion government. Those senators should be elected directly by the people of Prince Edward Island. Or they might be elected in an indirect way by the people. But each province should elect its own senators. In that way we would be doing what practically all other countries are doing, with one exception—no, I do not think there is even one exception. Our system of having senators for one province nominated by the whole government is an absolutely obsolete system. It is a relic of the Middle Ages and should not be longer maintained in a democracy like Canada.

Italy. So far I have not taken one single country where they have a nominative senate. None of these countries is in favour of a nominative senate, but my hon. friends directly opposite will be delighted to know that the senate of Italy is nominated. It is nominated by the king, and is chosen, I think from as many as 23 classes of citizens. If I mistake not, Italy is the only country or the only democracy in the world, except Canada, which has that system, and I may say that it is only half democratic. Italy is a kingdom, a constitutional monarchy. But it is the only country in the world that I know of besides Canada, which has a nominative senate to-day.

The Netherlands. According to the constitution in the Netherlands, they have a constitutional and hereditary monarchy. The upper or first chamber is composed of 50 members elected by the provincial states—I repeat, by the provincial states, not by the confederacy, not by the dominion, but by the provincial states. Although the Netherlands is a monarchy the senate is elected and not nominated.

Norway. This country is a constitutional and hereditary monarchy. Properly speaking there is no upper chamber in Norway. Every third year the people choose their representatives, the total number being 150. The country is divided into districts, each electing from three to eight representatives. The Storthing, which is the assembly, the Storthing, when assembled, divides itself into two sections, one composed of one-fourth of the members of the Storthing and the other of the remaining three-fourths being the second section.

The first section composed of one-fourth of the members of the Storthing might be compared in some respects to the upper chamber in countries where such a chamber exists. As I have said, in Norway, properly speaking, there is no uppper house. They elect one single house and divide that house, one-quarter acting as the upper house and three-quarters as the lower house, but the fact remains that both houses are elective. Therefore, if the first section be considered as a senate their senate is elective.

Portugal. This country is a republic, the republic was proclaimed there on October 5, 1910. On August 20, 1911, a new constitution was adopted, which provides that there shall be two chambers. In the first, which is called the national council, the members, 164 in number, shall be elected by direct suffrage every three years; the second or upper chamber, 71 in number, shall be elected by all the municipal councils and shall be renewable half at a time every three years. The president of the republic is

elected by both chambers with a mandate for four years, but he cannot be re-elected.

Spain. Spain has 360 senators, one-half of them, namely 180, are nominated, and the other half are elected. I said a moment ago that Italy was the only country that had a nominative senate, and I maintain it, because although in Spain one-half of the members of the senate are nominated, the other half are elected. Therefore, they are better off in Spain than we are in Canada as far as that is concerned.

Sweden. This country is a kingdom. The first chamber is the senate. It consists of 150 members. Their election takes place by the members of the Landstings, or provincial representation, and electors of six towns, not represented in the Landstings. The constituencies are 19, arranged in eight groups, in one of which an election takes place in September every year. The manner of the election is proportional and is regulated by a special election law. Members of the first chamber are elected for the term of eight years. To summarize, the senators are elected for eight years, but there are elections for one-eighth of the total number every year.

Switzerland. Switzerland is a confederation with a constitutional government. The supreme legislative and executive authority is vested in a parliament of two chambers, a state council and a national council. The state council corresponding to the senate in other countries is composed of 44 members chosen by the 22 cantons of the confederation, with two for each canton.

In Switzerland, the last country I am quoting in Europe, they have an elective senate, and not only an elective senate, but they have senators elected for each canton, which might correspond to a small province or state. And I bring this forward in support of my contention that, at all events, the senators for each province should be nominated or elected for that province.

I have quoted so far thirteen of the principal countries in Europe, and we find that, with the exception of one country, Italy, and one other country where the senate is half elective and half nominative, in every other country in Europe the senate is elective.

I come now to America. In the United States, according to the original constitution, the senators were elected by the several state legislatures, two senators for each state. The members of the legislature voted openly, viva voce, to elect two senators for each state. That was fairly democratic but it was not found to be democratic enough for the United States. That would appear to be reasonable, but in their opinion it was not reasonable, and they changed it. There have been, so far, nineteen amendments to the constitution of the United States. They changed the constitution of their Senate by the seventeenth amendment, which was proposed to the legislatures of the several states by the sixty-second Congress on 15th May, 1912. The amending provision was in lieu of the original first paragraph of sections 3 of article 1, and of as much of paragraph 2 of the same section as related to the filling of senate vacancies. This amendment was declared, in a proclamation by the Secretary of State, under date of 31st May, 1913, to have been ratified by the legislatures of thirty-seven states, these states constituting three-fourths of the whole number of states. Therefore, since the 31st May, 1913, in the United States the senators are elected, two for each state, by the people at large.

I will name only the republics of South America to which I would refer. The most important republic in South America is the United States of Brazil. The United States of Brazil form a confederacy comprising some twenty states, if I am not mistaken, and all those states elect their senators by direct popular vote. In the Argentine Republic, the same condition exists, senators are elected by popular vote, either directly or indirectly. The same condition exists in Colombia, Peru, and Chili. Those are five countries in South America. I have not gone any further, but I feel safe in saying that in every republic in South America, the senate is elective.

I am coming to the last part of my remarks, and I hope the House will be lenient enough to bear with me for another five minutes. After making comparisons with other countries, in Europe, America and elsewhere, and between our constitution as a self-governing dominion and the constitutions of the other self-governing dominions, I think I have proved these points—1st that Canada is the only self-governing dominion in the British Empire that has a nominative and not an elective Senate; 2nd that in Europe with the exception of one country, namely, Italy, not one country has a nominative senate; 3rd that in America, there is not one country in North or South America that has not an elective senate, wherever they have a senate —because in some cases they have no senate, but only one house,—but wherever there is a senate, the senators are elective in every country.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): How many states in Europe have hereditary senates or houses of lords, as compared with those which have elective senates?

Mr. DENIS (Joliette): There is only one, Great Britain.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Does the hon. gentleman know that in Great Britain they have a way of electing some members of the House of Lords by votes? Although that is by votes of peers, still they have a recognized elective system there.

Mr. DENIS (Joliette): I am very glad that the hon. member has reminded me of Great Britain, because I was in such a hurry to conclude my remarks that I would have forgotten all about it. I will, however, say a word about Great Britain, and I will show my hon. friend what difference exists between our Senate and the House of Lords of Great Britain. I have no doubt my hon. friend knows well the constitution of the House of Lords of Great Britain; but as it is a little complicated, I will place before the House the constitution of that House as it now exists. The House of Lords consists of peers who hold their seats, first, by hereditary right; second, by creation of the Sovereign; third, by virtue of office,—that is law lords, English archbishops and bishops, the archbishops numbering two and the bishops twenty-four;—fourth, by election for life, Irish peers, twenty-eight in number; fifth, by election for the duration of a parliament, Scottish peers, sixteen. The full House would consist of about 728 members, but the voting strength in January, 1922, was about 708. I think it is sufficient for one to enumerate the composition of the House of Lords in England to prove at once that no comparison can be made between it and our Senate. But I have a better argument than mine on that point. I have the argument and the opinion of a man whom my hon. friend respected very much while he was living. That gentleman is Sir John A. Macdonald. Before Sir John A. Macdonald received the title, when he was simply the Hon. John A. Macdonald, Attorney-General for Canada West, in the debates on confederation he expressed his opinion as to what difference there might be between the Senate and the House of Lords. All those questions were threshed out, and Sir John A. Macdonald said that there was no comparison between the two. This is what he said, at page 37 of the Confederation Debates:

> In this country, we must remember, that the gentlemen who will be selected for the Legislative Council stand on a very different footing from the peers of England. They have not like them any ancestral associations or position derived from history. They have not that direct influence on the people themselves, or on the popular branch of the legislature, which the peers of England exercise, from their great wealth, their vast territorial possessions, their numerous tenantry and that prestige with which the exalted position of their class for centuries has invested them. (hear, hear).

It seems that everyone was of his opinion, and he continues:

> The members of our Upper House will be like those of the Lower, men of the people, and from the people.

I agree with that, with the exception of the last four words. "Men of the people," very well; but "from the people," never, until they are elected by the people.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): I hope the hon. gentleman does not infer that I am in favour of the system as in the House of Lords in England. On the contrary, I agree with his view.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Will the hon. member tell us how, in the new Irish States, the second chamber is constituted?

Mr. DENIS (Joliette): The last one?

Mr. CHAPLIN: The two of them.

Mr. DENIS (Joliette): I have quoted three acts. Does the hon. gentleman mean the last one? I do not want to take too much time; I have been through all that already, and I do not want to repeat what I have just said.

When I was interrupted I was just about to observe that there is no other country in the world that stands in the same position that Canada occupies with regard to the Senate, unless we want to make a comparison between our Upper House and the House of Lords in England, which comparison in my opinion is out of the question. But there is no other country in the world that stands in the same position as Canada in this respect.

In the concluding portion of my address I had intended going into the question as to the way in which our Senate has functioned. I shall, however, very largely dispense with what I had to say on this point. Every hon. member knows how the Senate has worked, that is, I mean, constitutionally; for I am not referring by any means to the senators personally. How has the Senate worked constitutionally? This body, the Upper Chamber of the Canadian parliament, should be the most important of our legislative councils; it ought to be the more important of the two Chambers of parliament, the one that should command. But we must admit, without in anyway insulting anyone, that by far it is the less important of the two. Take the constitution of every country in the world and you will find that the Senate is the most important chamber; it is the most important because it has been made so by constitution. But here

in Canada our Senate has simply drifted, and all the good that I can see in the principle of the nomination of senators is that it might serve some useful purpose perhaps for the government; and undoubtedly, it is a good thing for those who are nominated senators. Apart from that, however, I do not see what good it is. We all know, for it is a secret to no one, that, although in principle senators are nominated by the whole of the cabinet, they are in fact and in practice nominated by the ministers of the respective provinces which they represent. Hence we have had a system by which for eighteen years, under the Macdonald administration, a Tory administration, the government, I would not say usurped, because the word is perhaps too strong, but took to itself the right which was the people's, of nominating gentlemen to the Senate. The same thing happened during the Laurier administration and under the late Tory regime for a period of ten years. And now that this government is in power, who are going to receive senatorships? Those gentlemen who in the opinion of the government deserve the position. Well, as between the opinion of one or two or three members in the cabinet representing the different provinces, and the opinion of the people, I stand for the opinion of the people.

We must recognize, Mr. Speaker, that the democracies of the world have developed tremendously during the last few years, and particularly since the war; and if to-day a constitution were being framed for a new state, no one would think for a moment of imposing upon the people of that state a nominative senate. We are behind the times; we were behind the times at confederation. Canada was in line with events in 1865 when the legislative council was made elective, but since that time we have not progressed with the rest of the world; and the more democracy advances the further it leaves us in its wake. We find ourselves therefore to-day in a serious and, I would add, a humiliating position, for we have the unique distinction of being the only country among the nations of the world with a Senate such as we have.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): My hon. friend referred to the fact that in 1856 the then existing parliament in Canada was given the right to amend its constitution, and he has also mentioned a number of commonwealths in the British Empire that have elective senates. Would he tell us how many of these commonwealths have in their constitution a provision to change that constitution in order to deal with this very question under consideration?

Mr. DENIS (Joliette): I do not want to be in error, and as I have not studied that particular question very carefully I cannot answer my hon. friend with finality at the moment. But from the knowledge I have of the subject, and from the researches I have made, I think I am safe in saying that every self-governing dominion has the right to change its constitution in regard to its senate. That is my opinion. Now, I am drawing to the close of my remarks, and once again I crave the pardon of the House for having detained it so long; but as I said before, the subject is of immense importance, and as we discuss it to-day it is of even greater urgency than it was ten or fifteen or twenty years ago. From the debates that took place at that time we cannot get very much enlightenment, but the subject to-day is of the greatest importance and I think I am justified in devoting to its consideration the time I have given it. In closing I desire to say that I am not the guardian of the Liberal party; much less am I the adviser of the Prime Minister and the cabinet. But if there is one sincere wish I do want to express it is this, that the Liberal party as now constituted in Canada should take the lead and institute this wonderful reform of the Senate, because if the Liberal party does not do it somebody else will, sooner or later. You cannot stem a river, Mr. Speaker; you cannot stem democracy; you cannot keep Canada from forging ahead until she is in the same rank with the other nations of the world in regard to this question. So far as our Senate is concerned, our constitution is certainly obsolete; and surely Canada cannot remain in that position. She will move forward, and when she does the people of this country will take advantage of that magnificent privilege of electing their own representatives to the Senate. I hope, therefore, that when that privilege is exercised by the people of this country it will be through the instrumentality of the party to which I belong and of a government supported by that party.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): I do not know whether my hon. friend from Joliette (Mr. Denis) contemplates asking for a division of the House on this question. I hope he will not do so, because I do not think that the House is in a position, even after listening to his very interesting and instructive address, to come to a conclusion. I will say this, however, that the hon. gentleman has rendered a very valuable service to the country in opening for discussion a question of great importance, one that arises from time to time and one which, if not to-day cer-

tainly at no distant day, will press for a solution. I am glad therefore that the hon. gentleman has brought forward the matter to-day and has given so much time and study to it in order to place before the House the history of the movement with regard to elective and nominative chambers in Canada. I am not sure, however, that I can congratulate him on the accuracy of his study of the Nova Scotian history in this matter. He has intimated that the evil of a nominative senate—and the expression is his, not mine—has been brought upon this afflicted country chiefly because the Maritime provinces, and particularly Nova Scotia, insisted upon it. I can assure him that he is mistaken. From my reading of history and the little personal knowledge I have, if I may dare make the confession, of the events of that time, I can assure him that so far as the people of Nova Scotia were concerned they were not at all concerned about the question whether the Senate should be elective or nominative. Nova Scotia did not want a nominative Senate; she did not want an elective Senate; she did not want a Senate at all. Nova Scotia did not even want a House of Commons. What Nova Scotia wanted in regard to these things was pretty well illustrated at the first Dominion election that took place after confederation, when the people of Nova Scotia had their first opportunity to declare what they wanted. In the month of September, 1867, they elected nineteen members to this House of Commons, and eighteen of them were against confederation. They elected thirty-eight members to the legislature, and thirty-six of them were against confederation. Now, if we are reviewing history let us at all events not be mistaken as to what Nova Scotia was thinking about at that time. I can assure my hon. friend (Mr. Denis) that the people of Nova Scotia were not worrying whether the Senate should be nominative or elective.

Now, I have long entertained some views of my own on this question, and I thought I might have an opportunity of presenting them in concrete form—not necessarily to parliament, but on some occasion when I might invite public attention to them. I am sorry that I have not had that opportunity. Now that my hon. friend from Joliette has given me an opening I am going to use his resolution as a peg upon which to hang my own opinions. I cannot give my scheme to the House in detail, but I can give in outline what I think would be a wise change to make in the constitution of the Senate. Let me hasten to say that I do not undertake to speak for the government; these are entirely my own personal views.

[Mr. Fielding.]

I agree that the constitution of the Senate to-day is not satisfactory. I do not join in any condemnation of the Senate. I think even as organized to-day it is capable of, and does, very good work. But unfortunately the distribution of our legislative work is such that we do not get the best out of the Senate. For about a month after the Senate meets the chief business is to inquire what is on for the next day. There is nothing, and "Satan finds mischief for idle hands to do". Then, towards the end of the session the Senate is rushed and is not able to do properly the work for which it is specially designed; that is to say, the work of a revising body.

I do not agree with those who say that the Senate should be abolished. I know, some of my own friends take that view, and even among the Conservative party there are those who advocate the abolition of the Senate. For a country like Canada, with its wide distribution of almost conflicting interests, I think it is desirable and expedient that we should have a second chamber, a chamber that should act as a brake—not a block—on the House of Commons; a chamber useful in many ways. I think a second chamber is useful and necessary in these days of so-called democracy, to guard against hasty legislation. I think the Senate is necessary as being a second chamber, not necessarily in its present form, but always necessary as a part of our constitution. And I think it is more necessary in these days of democracy when we are most apt to act first and think afterwards. In a word, I believe the Senate is desirable and necessary as a revising body. I need not tell hon. gentlemen that most of our work in the House of Commons is done somewhat hurriedly and under great pressure, and that many measures will be the better for careful review by the Senate whose members have more time to deal with details. That is the purpose of a second chamber, and I should like to see the Senate continue that purpose.

If we admit the necessity of a second chamber, how should it be constituted? I would not disturb the present senators. I think they each have a vested right, and in my reform I would not disturb their tenure. But when they reach the age of, say, seventy-five, I would give them the right to retire, if they cared to, on a pension of two-thirds of their sessional indemnity. If they wanted to retire, well and good; if they preferred to stay on, all right, no harm would be done. Then I would give the government at Ottawa one-half of the nominations. My hon. friend from Joliette has playfully alluded to members of the House

5 p.m.

of Commons being appointed to the Senate. Many of those appointed to the Senate are chosen after service in the House of Commons, and some people laugh at this as unfair and undesirable. But I think men who have served on either side in this House have as a rule acquired a knowledge regarding public affairs which is useful to the country, and I would willingly see any government, whether Liberal, Conservative or Progressive—if the latter blessing is to come—appoint one-half of the senators including some who have served in this House, for in this way you are placing men of ripe knowledge and judgment in a position where they can still give good service to the country.

Then, as to the other half, I come to the point raised by my hon. friend. Why not recognize the provincial governments? I would not have any senators elected at all. I think we have enough elections in Canada to-day, and if we are going to have elections for the Senate we are going to create a chamber which will rival the House of Commons. My hon. friend thinks that the Senate is the superior chamber. We speak of legislation as being enacted by "His Majesty with the advice of the Senate and the House of Commons." The House of Commons theoretically is the inferior body. But we know that in the vital things of politics, of government and of legislation this House is the real body. I would have it kept so, and I would not put the Senate in a position where it would rival the House of Commons. I think the people of Canada have abundant opportunity of expressing their views when they elect members to the House of Commons, and therefore I do not want to call upon them to elect the Senate. I would give the provinces—not the provincial legislatures but the provincial governments, for executive power carries responsibility—the nomination of what I might call the provincial senators. I would divide the present senators by some method of balloting —that is a matter of detail—into two classes; one-half might be called federal senators and the other half provincial senators. Whenever a vacancy occurred among the federal senators the federal government would fill the vacancy, and similarly, whenever a vacancy occurred among the provincial senators the provincial government would appoint a successor.

One of the evils referred to by my hon. friend for Joliette is that under our present system there is too much centralization of power at Ottawa. He has pointed out that in 1896 when the Liberal party came into power they found the Senate mainly Conservative; in 1911, when the Conservatives came into power they found conditions reversed and the Senate crowded with Liberals; now it is overwhelmingly Conservative again. I think these conditions are not desirable. I do not think we have a single Conservative provincial government to-day. That condition is not going to last.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. FIELDING: My hon. friends cheer that remark. Well. I admit a change is possible, but I do not say it is likely to happen. In any of our provinces you may have a Conservative government—not in my own province; that never happens—but to-day we have several provincial governments representing my hon. friends of the Progressive party. If a vacancy occurred in one of these provinces, the provincial government would have the right to nominate a successor. In that way you would have some recognition of provincial rights. And it is better so. The original constitution of the Senate contemplated the recognition of provincial rights. It was taken for granted that it might be a danger to minorities and that the Senate might be needed for the protection of minorities.

I would appoint a senator for ten years. I would make him eligible for a second term, and retire him at, say, eighty.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Would that limited period apply to both classes, those nominated by the federal government and those nominated by the provincial governments?

Mr. FIELDING: Yes. If a man were appointed while still young he might, after ten years, be qualified for another term. If appointed well on in life he would probably not be re-appointed or he might reach the age limit. At any rate, if he at any time reached the advanced age of eighty—taking that for convenience—he should thereupon retire. Of course, the present senators would hold office to the end.

This is only a rough outline. I have thought sometimes that I could put it into concrete form, but I am not attempting this afternoon to elaborate it, I am not going into it in detail. I am simply offering a few thoughts for the consideration of those who are willing to take up the question. I believe the question is going to be thrust forward for consideration, for I do not think the country is going to be satisfied with the present constitution of the Senate. While I agree with my hon. friends of the Progressive party that Senate reform is desirable, I do not think it would be wise to increase the number of elec-

tions in the country by making the Senate an elective body. I want to say again, in answer to my hon. friend's comments with regard to an elective Senate, that if the people to-day have abundant opportunity of giving expression to their views through their elected members in this House, let us not have an elective Senate which would be a rival body and would undertake to interfere with some of the things we now regard as our sacred property.

Mr. HALBERT: Will the minister allow me a question? He points out that the people elect their representatives to the House of Commons. Suppose the majority of the representatives so elected adopt certain legislation; does he think it is fair that men who are not responsible, who are not elected by the people, should veto the wish of the people as expressed in that manner?

Mr. FIELDING: I used a moment ago a phrase which, I think, is an answer to my hon. friend. I said that the second chamber should be as a brake, not a block, to the locomotive. I think it is well to have a second chamber which can ask us to reconsider things. I do not complain in any case when the Senate says: You are in too much of a hurry; we want to wait for another year in respect to this particular legislation. That is a legitimate function of the Senate. If they attempted year after year to veto our legislation, I would agree with my hon. friend that that would be wrong. On the other hand, if you give the Senate, by electing its members, the same powers that this House has, the elected Senate may say: What right has the House of Commons to say it represents the people?—we claim to represent the people as well as it does. I do not want the Senate to represent the people in that direct way; I want the House of Commons to represent the people. I do not want the second Chamber, as I have already stated, to be more than a guard against hasty legislation. Again let me say I am not expressing any opinion of the government; I am simply giving an outline of what I had hoped some day I could present somewhere in more concrete form. It may not represent even my own finality of judgment. There will be much discussion of the question before the change is made in the constitution, and it is just possible that in the light of that discussion I would like to modify my views. But, for whatever they are worth, I am offering these suggestions, and would ask that they receive the consideration of all who may be interested in the subject.

[Mr. Fielding.]

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) has made an excellent suggestion here to-day. In passing I wish to congratulate the member for Joliette (Mr. Denis) upon his careful presentation of his case. But what I want to point out to the Minister of Finance is that he ignored the point I raised in the question I put to the member for Joliette, whether Canada ought not now to have the right to make her own constitution. Until we have that right I do not think the minister or anybody else should put forward a proposal setting forth the manner in which the Senate should be constituted.

The defect in the proposal of the hon. member for Joliette is this: He was bound, in taking up this question, to give consideration to the powers vested in British dominions which have been given constitutions since we got our own, namely, the right to make or amend their own constitutions. What we should have had here to-day was a real substantive proposal that Canada should be given what Australia has—the right to amend and improve her own constitution in any way she likes. I agree with the hon. member for Joliette that the Senate as now constituted is the most irresponsible body known to the world. Yet it does a lot of good work; I agree with the Minister of Finance in the tribute he has paid to the Senate and his reference to the careful consideration it gives to many questions. But there is no reason why it could not be improved. One of the best legislative bodies in the world to-day is the Senate of the United States. That body has the power to originate expenditures, and I do not know why that right, perhaps, should be denied to a reconstructed Canadian Senate.

One of the unfair features of the present constitution of the Senate is that it does not recognize the group system. Hon. gentlemen to my left, members of the Progressive party, represent, I think it is, sixty-five votes in the House of Commons, but with the possible exception of one senator who has declared that he supports their views, they have no representation in the Senate. That is not a fair condition and it should be rectified in some way. Any group that goes into politics in this country is entitled to representation in both chambers, and I do not see how under the present system they can be represented unless they obtain control of the government of the country. While England has in many ways the best legislative body in the world to-day, its legislative system suffers under the great impediment of a more or less irresponsible House of Lords. But we know that England is rapidly moving in the direction of a re-

form of the House of Lords. The greatest thing achieved in that line was when the British House of Commons three or four years ago took away from the House of Lords the right to veto legislation originating in the Commons. The change thus brought about is one evidence of the pronounced constitutional agitation now going on in England for the reform, more or less, of their political system. I noticed in the press of yesterday that there had been a discussion in the House of Lords about the reconstitution of the various commonwealths of the Empire with a view to connecting them all up. That may be all right, and these questions are coming up, but before they are decided I want to see Canada have the full right to settle what her future is to be, in her own way, and in a parliament that represents all the people. I say the Senate to-day does not fairly represent the people of Canada. We have not come to a conclusion yet as to how we are to settle the problems that are before us. An irresponsible Senate is an important factor in the settlement of those problems. Certainly we ought to take up this question of having the right to amend our own constitution. Australia has it; South Africa has it; New Zealand has it.

Mr. FIELDING: Our own provinces have it.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Our own provinces have it; then why should we not have it? A great deal was said by the member for Joliette about democracy. I hope that when the Liberal party recognizes the principle of democracy as applied to the Senate they will recognize also the principle of representation by population in the redistribution measure that is to come before parliament.

While I agree with a great deal of what the member for Joliette says, and while I agree with the Finance Minister that the Senate can be greatly improved, I say that the paramount question before us to-day is that of the right of Canada, through its parliament to amend its own constitution and direct its own destiny.

On motion of Mr. Fortier, the debate was adjourned.

NATURALIZATION ACT

PROPOSED REMOVAL OF RESTRICTIONS ON REPATRIATION

Mr. W. F. CARROLL (Cape Breton South and Richmond) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the Naturalization Act should be immediately amended to the effect that persons of Canadian birth or British by naturalization under Canadian laws, who became subjects or citizens of foreign countries by naturalization or otherwise, and who returned to Canada during the war for war service or other patriotic motive, may again become British subjects by naturalization in Canada without the necessity of a five-year residence and without the formalities now required by the Naturalization Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to take up very much of the time of the House in connection with this resolution. I have had communications from some hon. members and from persons outside the House to the effect that the resolution is ill-timed, owing to the fact that the period of five years following the conclusion of the war will expire some time this coming year. I pointed out to them, and I now point out to the House, that very many persons of Canadian birth who had gone to other countries, and in particular to the United States, had when the war broke out returned to Canada, joined the Canadian expeditionary forces, and gone overseas to fight the battles of the Empire. At the close of the war they returned to this country, were discharged here, and then went back to the United States. No inconsiderable number of men of this class were American citizens, Their residence in Canada, during the war, was very brief, but I have had communications from quite a number of such men as to the prospect of their becoming naturalized should they return to Canada again. I pointed out to them, of course, that under our present Naturalization Act a five years' residence in this country was required before they could become naturalized British subjects. Well, I take the ground, Mr. Speaker, that in the case of persons who were born in this country and who for some reasons,—valid reasons in their own estimation,—went abroad and became citizens of other countries there should not be the same impediment placed in the way of their being repatriated and becoming British subjects once more as might be necessary in the case of the naturalization of people of foreign extraction. I believe the Secretary of State would do well to investigate the whole question of repatriation and make it easier for persons such as I have described to again become domiciled in Canada as British subjects. The case of the returned soldier, of course, is somewhat different. If an American citizen, who had previously been a British subject, spent four years in the war and on his return remained in Canada for one year that would count as the five year term which is required before being able to become naturalized. However, as I pointed out, very many of those men did not remain in Canada on the termination of the war, but they are now anxious to return

and acquire the status of British subjects. It is on their behalf that I am proposing this resolution.

I do not suppose that it is quite the proper thing for the mover of a resolution to move an amendment to that resolution. I entertain the hope, however, that some hon. member will propose an amendment to the effect that the resolution shall also apply to former Canadians who went abroad, especially to the United States, but who came back to Canada and afterwards served overseas, and who now wish to be repatriated—that they should not have to fulfil the five years' residence qualification in order to again become British subjects. Our naturalization laws have been very much changed in recent years, and the question arises here as to whether or not this parliament has any right of its own motion to amend the present statute dealing with naturalization, that is the act chapter 59 of 1920. The old Naturalization Act was chapter 77 of the Revised Statutes of Canada 1906. To this act there were various amendments. One amendment, made in 1907, performed for persons in the service of the government of Canada the very thing which this resolution of mine attempts to do for soldiers, former British subjects, who served overseas in the Canadian expeditionary forces. In that statute, I think the act was chapter 31, the five years' residence qualification in the case of persons resident in Canada and employed in the service of the government, was done away with. That is what I am asking to be done in the case of the men in question. Various amendments have been made to the Naturalization Act, dealing mostly with matters of procedure, until the advent of the year 1914. Then, growing out of negotiations and conferences between Great Britain and the dominions, which began, I think, in 1901, there was an understanding that we should follow along the lines of the Naturalization Act passed in Great Britain in 1914. Previous to that year the position of one who became naturalized in Canada, or any of the other dominions, was somewhat anomalous. For example, a person who came to Canada from some foreign country and spent the five years entitling him to seek naturalization did become naturalized under our law but he was not regarded as a British subject in the true sense of the term; he was not recognized as a British subject either in Great Britain or in any other dominion outside of Canada. However, as a result of the legislation enacted in 1914 by Great Britain and Canada, any person who became naturalized in Canada under the provisions of that statute also became a British subject in all parts of the Empire. That act had its advantages and its disadvantages. At any rate, the law of 1914 was, I think, in 1919 displaced by another statute. There were not so many changes made in the latter act; it had principally to do with the citizenship of persons who were enemy aliens, or were friendly to enemy aliens, during the war and therefore were not considered proper persons for citizenship. Coming to 1920 we find this legislation replaced by another statute. Now the question which presents itself to my mind is whether or not this parliament can amend the Naturalization Act without first having a conference with the Mother Country.

In this connection I might refer to a memorandum by the Under Secretary of State in which he says, that while there is nothing in the Imperial legislation of 1914 to that effect, he considers it has been the custom, since the enactment of the legislation referred to, for the Mother Country and the self-governing Dominions to confer with one another whenever a demand was made for an amendment to the Naturalization Act. I was in the House of Commons in 1914 when the act went through, and, of course, that was the first occasion on which this parliament took advantage of the Ontario Act of 1914. What happened in 1918 I do not know. I do not know whether the then government did confer with the Mother Country as to the various amendments which they made, for example the amendment of 1919 and the amendment of 1920. Notwithstanding that difficulty I suggest that it would not be a very difficult matter to confer with the Imperial authorities on the matter of amendment to this act. I do not think, however, that that is necessary. I think that Canada should have the right to say what her nationalization laws should be. The great principle involved in the Imperial act of 1914 was that it enabled the colonies to take advantage of this law to naturalize a person who would be a British subject all over the world, and I do not think it was ever the intention of the Imperial legislation of 1914, or that it was ever the intention of the Imperial parliament, or of the various colonies, when conferring regarding the matter, that if we wanted some slight amendment to our nationalization act we must confer with the Imperial parliament. I do not think it was ever intended, and if it was ever intended I think the intention was wrong, because surely we in this country, with our knowledge of our own land, know what our naturalization act should contain, and surely we have good common sense enough not to amend our nationalization act in any way which would be detri-

mental to the Mother Country, or detrimental to the intention of the Imperial act of 1914. I am not going to make any extended remarks as to the rights of soldiers in this country. I am simply saying that there are in my opinion, as a matter of fact I know there are, a large number of Canadian people who took part in the Canadian expeditionary force, and who returned to the United States, who would be more apt to come to this country to-day if they would not have to spend five years here before having a voice in the government of the country, and it is on their behalf principally that I move this resolution. But I say also that I believe that our naturalization law, as regards persons who want to become repatriated Canadian subjects, is altogether too strict, and I believe that the five years' residence should be eliminated, so far as they are concerned, provided, of course, that they are proper citizens.

To-day we are seeking for immigration. We want to get back all good Canadians who have gone to other countries. We are spending money to bring in the Irish and Scotch people to Canada. I do not know, but I do not believe we give sufficient attention to bringing back into this country persons who, for various reasons, left here and became citizens of other countries, and I believe it would be a step in the right direction if the government undertook to amend this act, so that the five years' residence in this country for such persons who had been Canadian citizens, and who had become citizens of other countries, would be eliminated, and these citizens could be repatriated. It would be some small inducement to bring some of our one-time good Canadian citizens back to this country. I am in hopes that steps will be taken, not only to fulfil the letter or the spirit of my resolution, but that some steps will be taken to extend the resolution in the direction I have indicated.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): I am not as familiar with the question of naturalization as I would like to be. My colleague has had the matter under consideration, and I would prefer that my hon. friend should move the adjournment of the debate, so that it may be resumed at a later date, if necessary. I do not wish to shut out any hon. member from speaking, and if any hon. member wishes to move the adjournment of the debate, I presume he can do so.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON (West York): I recognize that, in some particulars, as the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) points out, questions may arise which may require grave consideration. It is a subject which I do not know very much about. I just rise to make one suggestion. The hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Carroll) shows that the real object of the motion was that those soldiers who fought in the war, and who are at present out of the country, and who wish to return, ought to be allowed to do so in welcome at the earliest possible moment. The hon. member says that that is the chief object of his resolution. The hon. member makes suggestions in connection with matters of general policy. I would suggest to the hon. member that he confine the motion to just what he wants. I do not believe that any member of the House would or could object to his primary idea, which is the repatriation and re-naturalization of the soldiers. Of course, if the motion is adjourned we will never hear of it again this year. I would suggest an amendment be made in this motion. The latter part of it reads:

> —and who returned to Canada during the war for war service or other patriotic motive.

I suggest that he should make it read:

> —who returned to Canada during the war and entered into war service.

He would then absolutely cover all the cases he wishes to cover, and I am quite sure no one could object to it.

Hon. A. B. COPP (Secretary of State): The question my hon. friend has brought before the House is one of very great interest unquestionably, but the House probably very well knows that during the past number of years conferences have been held from time to time between the representatives of the Imperial government and representatives of the colonies on this subject of naturalization. Formerly each colony had its own naturalization act. We passed our own naturalization act relating to Canadian subjects. In 1914 an act was passed, after several conferences with the Imperial authorities, in order to make uniform the naturalization laws of the British Empire and all her colonies. Since that date from time to time, amendments were made to the Naturalization Act, for the purpose, as my hon. friend has said, of making uniform the naturalization laws, and making us all British subjects in any part of the British Empire. The only difficulty I see in the resolution moved by my hon. friend is that we undoubtedly can pass any naturalization law, in so far as it affects Canada, and make any person we like a Canadian subject. But if we do that this person is only a Canadian subject, and not a British subject, unless

we continue along the same lines as we have been acting for a number of years, by conference and agreement with the British government along the same lines, and make the law uniform throughout the British Empire. Last year the British parliament introduced an extensive amendment to their naturalization act, which was passed, I think, in August, 1922. Before passing that act they sent a copy to Canada, and we conferred by correspondence and cables, and agreed to that act.

I want to say to my hon. friend that I will present to this House in the course of a day or two a bill to amend our naturalization act, to conform entirely with the British act passed last year. I do not think the bill I have prepared covers the point which the hon. member makes entirely, but I can assure him, and I can assure this House, that the government will be very glad indeed to make very careful inquiry into the matter the hon. member brought before the House this afternoon, and if it is at all possible, in the interests of returned soldiers, particularly referred to by my hon. friend for South Cape Breton as well as my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton), by inquiry and investigation to accomplish the re-naturalization of the soldiers returning to this country, particularly for repatriation purposes, we will be very glad to do so.

As far as the department over which I have the honour to preside is concerned the matter of naturalization has been under consideration for some time and I can assure my hon. friend that I will have my officials make a very careful investigation into the matter, and irrespective of whether this motion passes or not, I assure him that the question will be given every possible attention. If any scheme can be worked out by which this matter can be furthered and it be made more easy for the soldier who has come back to this country after doing service at the front, the department, the government, and, I am sure, parliament will be very glad to co-operate and assist.

Hon. D. D. McKENZIE (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, the matter which has been brought forward by the hon. member for Cape Breton South and Richmond (Mr. Carroll) is very important, and he has put his case very well before the House. The Secretary of State (Mr. Copp) has dealt with the question of law, and for that reason I do not propose to say anything beyond this. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) suggested that the hon. member for Cape Breton South consent to the adjournment of the debate; but in view of the observations of the Secretary of State and the bill which he has under consideration, and which will be introduced in this parliament, I would expect the hon. member to withdraw his resolution altogether and let the subject matter of it be dealt with in connection with the bill which the Secretary of State proposes to introduce.

Mr. CARROLL: I have no objection if the House is agreeable, to withdrawing my resolution with the suggested amendment of the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton).

Motion withdrawn.

OLEOMARGARINE

On the proposed resolution of Mr. Carroll:

Resolved, That it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend The Oleomargarine Act, chapter twenty-four of the statutes of 1919 (second session), and the amending acts, by providing that notwithstanding anything contained in The Dairy Industry Act, 1914, or in any other statute or law, the manufacture in, and importation of oleomargarine into Canada, and the offering for sale, the sale and the having in possession for sale, of oleomargarine, shall henceforth be permitted, subject to the provisions of the said Oleomargarine Act and to such regulations as are now or may hereafter be established by the Governor in Council.

Mr. CARROLL: I am ready to go ahead, but I do not wish to do so at this hour of the afternoon. I am willing to let the motion stand if I have the assurance that it will be allowed to go ahead on Monday.

Mr. FIELDING: I am not sure that anyone can give any assurance that this resolution will be taken up on Monday. As regards the government, we have no objection; but the matter is one for the House to determine when notices of motions are called.

Motion stands.

INCOME TAX—EXEMPTION FOR CHILDREN

Mr. JOSEPH ARCHAMBAULT (Chambly and Verchères) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the Government should consider the expediency of amending the Income Tax law by increasing the amount of the exemption for each child from three hundred dollars to five hundred dollars, and by exempting altogether the father of five children, under eighteen years of age, who has an income less than five thousand dollars.

He said:

Mr. Speaker, I cannot be accused of having taken much of the time of the House this session; following the principle, that nature having given us two mediums for hearing and only one for speaking, I believe it is much wiser to listen than to talk. The

motion which stands in my name asks for an amendment to the income tax of 1917. I made a similar motion in 1920, which was lost then through the opposition, I believe, of the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton). Last year I had the same motion again on the order paper. Unfortunately we did not reach that order; but I was successful in convincing the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) that he should increase the exemption for each child from $200 to $300. Needless to say, I approve the amendment which was introduced by the Minister of Finance and made law, but it does not go far enough. Everyone who is blessed with children knows that it costs more nowadays than $200 for the upkeep of a child. I have made a careful calculation of the amount necessary, and it is far above $500. The principle at the basis of the section of the income tax law which exempts the married man for $2,000, is that this amount is necessary to provide for the upkeep of his wife and himself. If that principle is good—and nobody will deny that—it follows that the principle should apply also if the man needs more money for the upkeep of his children. The cardinal idea of the income tax is that a man should be taxed only in respect of his net income. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it is a bad principle to enact laws that tend to discourage the raising of large families. We have at the present moment tremendous financial difficulties and we can hardly meet the expenses of the administration. Nearly every economic student of the situation believes that the best way of meeting our expense is by increasing the population. The government has brought in a policy of immigration which has been under discussion for some days and which has been criticised by both sides of the House, and I give credit to the Liberal party for the fact that a man can stand up on this side of the House and state his own views without fear of expurgation from the party as was the case under the old regime. I may say that I am in favour of a sane and select immigration with the examination of the immigrant at the port of departure. But after all the most desirable citizen—and I say this with due respect for those who are not such—is the Canadian-born. He is preferable to the European, the American, or even the British, because he has sprung from the soil to which he will be always attached. And there is no hyphen appended to his nationality; his only country is Canada.

This legislation which I submit to the government for consideration has been approved by all countries. I read the other day an article by Dr. Mareli in reference to France in which he stated that laws had been adopted in that country against depopulation in virtue of an act of 1913. There is a monthly subvention given to families who have more than three children, and there are also subventions to the workingmen for their children, with a reduction of the tax on their revenue. There is also a special tariff for large families. Since 1920 laws have also been passed aiming at the removal of all conditions that might tend toward depopulation. The Montreal Gazette of March 9, 1920, contained the following article:

> France's new inheritance tax will be a novelty. It will be based upon the principle that the more children man has the less estate should be taxed, and vice versa. the fewer children he has, the more tax should be levied. If a man dies without children, the state will take fifty per cent of his estate. If there is one child, the state will take 33 per cent. If there are two children to be provided for, the tax will be 25 per cent. Should there be three children the tax will be 18¾ per cent. In the case of four or more children there will be no inheritance tax. Fiscal experts estimate this new tax will bring in 3,000,000 francs annually.
>
> The French government statistics show that half the French army in the World War came from families having four or more children. The same statistics show that one family in five has as many as four children. Further, more families whose estates are the largest are not those who have four or more children as a rule.

When I brought this motion to the House in 1920 the principal argument advanced against it was that the amount allowed in the United States was not over $200. Since then, however, the law has been changed. The exemption is now $400. I have here a copy of an act to reduce and equalize taxation, to provide revenue, and for other purposes, and section 216 reads:

> That for the purpose of the normal tax only there shall be allowed the following credits:
>
> (d) Four hundred dollars for each person other than husband or wife dependent upon and receiving his chief support from the taxpayer, if such dependent person is under eighteen years of age or is incapable of self-support because mentally or physically defective.

In England, it is true, the tax for the first child is $200, but there are other exemptions. There are allowances for life insurance premiums on the life of the taxpayer and his wife. I have in my hand Pratt and Redman's Income Tax Law, 9th edition, and at page 19, I find:

> Allowance for life assurance premiums—Subject to the restriction imposed by the Finance Act 1915, the acts allow the general reduction of premiums up to one-sixth of the gains of the person chargeable, paid for life assurance by the person on his own life or that of his wife, or on any deferred annuity in a British company registered under the Joint Stock Companies Act.

And at page 218 of the same work, section 3, the following appears:

> As we have seen, a taxpayer who has insured his own or his wife's life, or contracted for any deferred

annuity on his own or his wife's life, or who shall under any act of parliament be liable to the payment of an annual sum or to have an annual sum deducted from his salary in order to secure a deferred annuity to him, or provision for his children after his death, is entitled to the extent of the annual sum so paid by him or deducted from his salary, to deduct the same from the duties to which he is assessed under any of the schedules of the act (16 and 17).

Then there is relief for small incomes. I may also add that England does not seem to care at the present time for an increase in population. On the contrary, there is such unemployment there that means are being taken and money is being expended for emigration to different parts of the Empire particularly.

I should have liked to touch upon another point regarding those who are married under a contract which does not call for the separation of property as we have in our province. This is a very interesting point, but as I have such a short time at my disposal before the House adjourns, I will not take it up now; also because the House will adjourn in three minutes I will not read the numerous resolutions which I have received from important bodies supporting my proposal.

I congratulate the minister on the amendment he made last year, and I hope he will adopt my suggestion this year and still further increase the exemption. Everyone acknowledges that the family is the basic element of a well co-ordinated state. By this legislation we would reap results beneficial to the country both morally and materially, and we would put our official approval on the teaching of nature and God—crescite et multiplicamini.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): As my hon. friend has stated, the representations he made last year were so effective that we did make a change along the lines of his recommendation. All he is asking now is that we consider the question. Well, we are always ready to consider, so we can all vote for this resolution. I am prepared to consider it. An alarming situation, however, presents itself to my mind—alarming at all events to the Minister of Finance—and that is the many demands for exemptions, reductions and so forth. My hon. friend wants an exemption from income tax. I have many deputations—some of them have already appeared, others are coming—all wanting different forms of exemption. One wants to be exempt from the sales tax, another from some other tax, and so on. It would be very pleasant if I could say to these deputations, "Oh, surely you are all paying too much tax; you are exempt." But I am afraid I shall have the disagreeable duty of telling them "We need the money." I have come back always to that old formula. I hope my hon. friend does not expect that I may do more than that. However, I will consider what he has asked for.

[Mr. Archambault.]

Motion agreed to.

At six o'clock the House adjourned, without question being put, pursuant to rule.

Thursday, March 22, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

REPORT

Second report of the select standing committee on miscellaneous private bills.—Mr. McGiverin.

MINES AND MINERALS

Mr. W. F. CARROLL presented the first report of the select standing committee on Mines and Minerals, as follows:

Your committee beg leave to recommend that their proceedings be printed from day to day for the use of the members of the committee, when deemed advisable, and that rule 74 be suspended in relation thereto.

MARINE AND FISHERIES

On the motion of Mr. William Duff the first report of the select standing committee on Marine and Fisheries was concurred in.

NATURALIZATION ACTS AMENDMENT BILL

Hon. A. B. COPP (Secretary of State) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 85 to amend the Naturalization Acts, 1914 and 1920.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

ICEBREAKER MIKULA

Mr. HANSON:

1. Is it a fact that the Icebreaker Mikula, formerly known as the J. D. Hazen, went ashore at Cap a la Rouche, near Quebec, during the present month of March?
2. Has any investigation been held by the Wreck Commissioners, or any one else, as to the cause of the stranding of this ship?
3. Who was the Captain in charge at the time of the stranding, and when was he appointed?
4. Has the officer in charge at the time of the stranding been suspended?

5. What is the estimated cost of the repairs of the ship, now in drydock at Lauzon?

6. Did the government have during the present season, a supply of coal at Three Rivers for this ship?

7. Is it not a fact that if a supply of coal had been on hand at Three Rivers at the time of the stranding, there would have been no necessity for the ship to travel to Quebec for coal and return, a distance of 180 miles, and thereby have avoided the possibility of stranding?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. The steamer Mikula while proceeding to Quebec on March 13, was overtaken in the narrow channel at Cap a la Roche by a heavy snow squall and grounded.

2. No investigation has been held but the engineer of the river St. Lawrence ship channel who was on board the vessel at the time has submitted a full report.

3. Captain John Hearn, appointed master C.G.S, Montcalm 25 March, 1919; on April 15, 1922, Capt. Hearn was appointed master to bring the Mikula out to Canada. Capt. Hearn took charge Mikula again 16 December, 1922.

4. No.

5. The ship is not in dry dock and as the extent of the damage is as yet unknown no estimate of the cost of repairs has been made.

6. A supply of coal for the vessel was available at Three Rivers.

7. The vessel was returning to Quebec not for the purpose of obtaining a supply of coal but to make an examination of difficulties that had arisen with the port propeller. Inasmuch as the vessel had to return to Quebec for this purpose it was deemed more advantageous to obtain the necessary coal requirements there, the price per ton being $8.50 as against a price of $9.50 per ton by the Dominion Coal Company at Three Rivers and a price of $12 per ton offered by J. H. Giroux. Investigation in the meantime reveals the port propeller as having two broken blades.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

TEMPORARY EMPLOYEES

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. How many persons were employed in a temporary capacity by the various departments of the government on the 31st December, 1921?

2. How many persons were employed in a temporary capacity by the various departments of the Government on the 31st December, 1922?

TEMPORARY CLERKS MADE PERMANENT

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. How many temporary clerks in the Civil Service have been made permanent by the Civil Service Commission since the 1st January, 1922?

2. What are the names of such clerks and what are their positions?

3. At what date were they made permanent?

PURCHASING COMMISSION

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton):

1. Are all the departments of the Government making their purchases through the Purchasing Commission of Canada?

2. If not, what departments are, and what departments are not?

3. If all are not purchasing through the Commission, what is the reason?

PUBLIC LANDS—PAYMENTS

Mr. BROWN:

1. What amount of School Lands have been sold on which payments are now over due?

2. What is the maximum length of time of these over due payments?

3. Can the purchasers be divided into resident and non-resident? If so, what proportion of each are there?

4. On what lands other than the school lands are the purchasers in default of payment?

5. Are there any real estate or other corporations in default of payment for lands?

6. If so, what are their names?

7. What is the amount of indebtedness in this connection?

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

QUESTIONS AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS—QUESTIONS AND THEIR ANSWERS

On the Orders of the Day:

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): Either on this order or on the order "Questions," I desire to enter a protest against such question as No. 12 being passed as an order for return. If the length of the answer and the cost of inserting it in Hansard is the reason for this procedure, I would say that the answer might be only one word.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): That is not passed as an order for return.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It was so called. Perhaps it was a mistake; I hope it is.

While I am on my feet I desire also to call attention to the fact that a great number of answers to questions this session, particularly of late weeks, have not been answers at all; they have not even been evasions; in many cases they have been simply a mass of irrelevant words. It seems to me there should be a discussion in this House at an early date of what the obligation of the government is in relation to answering questions. I have questions that I can bring to the attention of the House the answer, or supposed answer, to which does not even bear relation to the subject.

Mr. D. M. KENNEDY (West Edmonton): I understand that question No. 4 has been passed as an order for return. The answer would not be a very lengthy one, and I think the question ought to be answered in the ordinary way.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am informed in regard to that question that the information has to be gathered from different parts of the country, and that that is the reason why it is passed as an order for return, rather than have the question repeated day after day while we are waiting to get the information.

Mr. T. W. CALDWELL (Victoria and Carleton): I would like to say a word further with regard to questions passed as orders for returns. I spoke of this matter once before this session. The answer to a question that is passed as an order for return is not incorporated in Hansard and is not available in that way to members of the House. True, a copy may be had by applying to the proper authority, but I would point out this: I had a question that was passed as an order for return and the information was brought down, but since then I have had numerous inquiries for a copy of the return and I have had to have a stenographer make several copies. I do not think that is economy at all. Questions that can be answered without being passed as orders for returns, I think should be answered in the ordinary way, so that the information will be available in Hansard to members of the House, especially such questions as No. 4, relating to the Purchasing Commission of Canada which is very important.

Mr. SPEAKER: The remedy is by applying to the proper officer, as the hon. gentleman did. If a number of copies are required for distribution the hon. member might well apply to the committee on Printing. I am quite sure that an application made by the hon. member would be granted by the committee.

Mr. CALDWELL: I have no fault to find with the treatment that has been accorded to me personally in this matter, but I think you will realize Mr. Speaker, that members who are sitting on three or four committees and attending committees during the time the House is in session have very little time to spend in galloping around, if I may use that expression from one office to another to hunt up these matters. I think the answers to questions should be prepared as fully and as expeditiously as possible, and should be made available to the members with the least delay, because we are certainly putting in pretty full time as it is.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): Perhaps I might suggest that members in framing their questions should show equal care, because sometimes questions are needlessly extensive and serve no good in the end, I venture to think.

Mr. CALDWELL: I realize that is so in some cases, but generally questions are to the point.

INTERNATIONAL LABOUR CONFERENCE

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. MEIGHEN: May I ask when the House may expect the report of the last meeting of the International Labour Conference?

Mr. MURDOCK: The report of the last meeting was issued in the Labour Gazette of December or January. I am not sure which.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman, maybe, refers to a report of a conference held at Ottawa. I refer to the International Labour Conference.

Mr. MURDOCK: I was referring also to the International Labour Conference.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The report has not been laid on the Table, has it? I made inquiry and I was told it had not been.

Mr. MURDOCK: I will ascertain as to that.

SUPPLY

IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION

The House again in Committee of Supply, Mr. Marcil (Bonaventure) in the chair.

Immigration—outside service—salaries, $700,000.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Might I make a brief statement before the discussion begins? A very large portion of the discussion so far has hinged upon the next item, and it has become apparent to me that on this item, which covers a very wide range of grants and votes of moneys a great many questions are coming up which I am not in a position to answer at the moment as I have not the material at hand. I propose to the committee that this item stand if we can make progress with the others. I am not suggesting that we stop the discussion, but simply that this

item, which includes the vote to the Canada Colonization Association, and a number of other items upon which I have not full information, should stand for a few days, as it will have to do in any case until I am in possession of the material necessary to give answers. Some of this information has to be got from the United States and some from Great Britain. If we let the next item stand for a few days I will then be in full possession of all the facts and can give the committee the information it desires. I am not suggesting that we cut off the discussion now. I am merely stating that so far as the Canada Colonization Association is concerned, I may wish to make some statement about it when that item comes up again.

Mr. GOULD: As the one who adjourned the debate on the evening of 20th March, I shall be glad to co-operate with the minister. I may state that my further remarks would have particular reference to the Canada Colonization Association, but assuming that I shall have the privilege of speaking when the question comes up again I am prepared to accept the minister's suggestion and let the item stand in the meantime.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have no objection to the item standing; I think that is the minister's right, but I do not like the Chairman to call it "carried" if it stands.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): It was the second item, No. 53, that I was speaking of. That is not the item under consideration and we have really not reached it yet.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The first item, No. 52, stands?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No, the next item, No. 53, over which the controversy arises.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Then what is the minister asking about the item under consideration?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I am quite prepared to give all the information with respect to it. It is the second item, No. 53, that I was referring to.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The committee then is open for discussion of the first item?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Do I understand that item No. 52 stands?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No. I was simply informing the committee that I did not intend to press for the passing of item No. 53, but proposed to let it stand for two or three days, until Tuesday next at least, in order that I might be in possession of the necessary information to enable me to answer questions. I am not now in possession of that information.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I understand that. I thought the minister asked for item No. 52 to stand.

Mr. SHAW: If I understand the minister correctly, he is simply making application that item 53 be allowed to stand; but as regards general remarks on the subject of immigration, I do not imagine for a moment that he intends to limit the discussion at this particular time. If I am mistaken, of course I have no objection to that particular procedure; but I have some few general observations to make which I would like an opportunity of making, and which, I think, should be made at this time.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I have no authority to prevent discussion; that is the prerogative of the Chairman. I simply stated to the committee that I was desirous of having item 53, to which so much of this discussion that we have been having really refers, stand to-day and of bringing it up on Tuesday next, or at some later day, when we might discuss it fully.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Where the confusion arises is in this. We are having the discussion on item 52. The minister says that much of the discussion would better come under item 53, which he proposes should stand. That may be reasonable; but we have had the discussion on item 52, and I think it would be better to finish it. If we get to item 53, and if there is any particular information the minister is waiting for, that item can stand; but the general discussion, now that it has gone so far, had better be closed.

Mr. GOULD: Practically all the remarks that have been made on this subject have been in the nature of a general discussion on the principles of immigration. Evidence has been adduced to show that the state of the present immigrants in this country is not what it should be; and while some may endeavour to interpret our efforts to show to the minister and to the government what those conditions are, particularly as regards the West, as being designed or intended to be obstructive, my firm conviction is that on the part of any hon gentleman with whom I am acquainted or have conversed, there is no intention to obstruct. It is certainly my belief that the evidence I propose to adduce

as well as that of my colleagues is evidence that should be placed before the country. I have endeavoured time and again to point out the conditions that obtain, and we believe these conditions are not generally known throughout Canada. Consequently, we believe it is in the interest of Canada and the Canadian people as a whole that these things should be placed upon Hansard.

As I was stating, when I was on my feet before, to me fell the task of adjourning the debate on the night of March 20. It is rather difficult to co-ordinate my remarks of that night with the few remarks which I shall make to-day; but it seemed to me that we were then jockeyed into a position where, at a late hour of the night, it was left for three successive members of the Progressive group to carry on the debate. That is the reason why I rose and was making extensive remarks when it was suggested that the debate be adjourned and that I continue my remarks to-day.

At that time, I had stated that it was my belief that the evidence that had been placed upon Hansard during the last few days of the debate in regard to this question, would make really good evidence if it were handed to our prospective immigrants. I was not advocating that this should be done; but if, by chance, it was taken to those countries from which we hope to draw immigrants, it would at least be very enlightening for them to read those speeches, particularly if in one hand they had the pamphlets that were printed by the Western Canada Colonization Company, or those beautiful lithographed booklets which the Immigration department from time to time send into foreign countries to persuade people to come to Canada and settle.

Speaking more or less in a local sense—and I notice that is the habit of the majority of hon. members who have so far spoken on this question—I wish to place a little more evidence on Hansard to-day. One of the latest letters I have received comes from a hard-headed Scotchman in western Canada, a man whom I have known for twenty years, a good conservative Scotchman. In his letter he complains that he had sold a carload of oats which he had sent to Fort William, and he had likewise sold some oats on the street. He received sixteen cents per bushel less for the oats which he sold on the street than he received for the carload he shipped. His shipping point is only 730 miles west of Fort William, and he wonders why with a freight rate approximately of ten cents per hundred pounds, sixteen cents per bushel should be subtracted from the amount he received on the carload sent to Fort William. I point this out only to show that what I have complained of many times, namely, that some of these institutions in the West seem to be almost laws unto themselves.

Of course, remedies have been suggested from time to time for these evils that we complain of. I do not wish to condemn, nor to have this interpreted as a desire on my part to condemn, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell), for I have great faith in him; but we are told at the present time to produce a better quality of pork, beef, butter, cheese and all other farm products, so that we may be able to compete with Denmark, Belgium, and all other countries that export these commodities. For the past forty years in western Canada we have been producing the best quality of grain known in the world, namely, No. 1 hard wheat, and when we had produced a commodity of one hundred per cent value, what happened with our wheat? Why, immediately vested interests in this country came to former governments and obtained the right to rob us by mixing this grain. That condition obtains to-day, and that is what we get when we produce a hundred per cent article. That is one thing that is the matter with agriculture in the West at the present time, and one reason, by the way, why I have always pleaded that the producer should have an opportunity of presenting his case before commissions appointed from time to time, so that their grievances may be remedied.

These are only small items, but they affect each and every individual in the West who is engaged in raising grain. I cited this case to the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Robb) last year. I regret sincerely that the minister is not in his seat at this time; but I cite the case of a neighbour of mine who sent a carload of wheat to Fort William asking that it be stored. The wheat was presumably stored, and anyone who stores wheat knows that it is cleaned wheat that is stored. This man received a bill amounting to $2.29 for storage, and he was paid 33 cents for 26 bushels of screenings, cracked wheat, that were taken out of his grain. That is the condition I pointed out to the minister from my place in this House, and his reply was that he would look into the matter. The man who owned the grain has never heard anything about the matter since, nor have I, and that is only another illustration of conditions that obtain in our western country. I would tell prospective immigrants that there are hundreds of schools in western Canada closed because of the inability of people to

pay taxes. That is a well-known fact, and it is a truth that applies to very large areas not alone in Alberta and Saskatchewan but elsewhere as well. I would also tell them that in nearly all judicial districts in western Canada in sheriffs' safes there are from 1,000 to 4,000 judgments. That too is a well established fact. If we told the prospective immigrant that such a state of things existed, he would ask; What is the matter with agriculture in Canada that such conditions can prevail? There is something else also which hon. members may regard as of little moment, but which I can assure the committee is, on the contrary, of much importance. Our Dominion government in the past have sold school lands, entering into contract with the purchaser and selling those lands at a capitalization of five per cent. This has happened, for instance, in the district from which I come where a goodly number of people bought lands under these terms. We all know very well that there were visitations of Providence in the way of drought, hail, rust, grasshoppers and all the other evils which have afflicted the people and which have gone to affect the proceeds of their crops. What do we see? Those people who were unable, through these Providential circumstances, to meet their obligations found themselves compelled by the Dominion government to meet an additional two per cent on their obligation, their indebtedness being thus capitalized at seven per cent, as though the visitation of Providence were not a sufficient burden. It does seem to me that the government were not in any way obliged to add that two per cent, and considering the circumstances of the case I think they might well remit this seven per cent which was inflicted upon the people at that time in connection with these lands.

In short, if we are going to send out any propaganda, I would advise that we tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, and then see how many people we could get by so doing. I have here the figures in connection with immigration to and emigration from the United States alone. I might inform the committee that the figures in regard to this country I have obtained from the Canadian Year Book for the year 1922, while for the other figures I am indebted to the records of the United States Department of Labour. The first figures I have are for the year 1911, and it would be well for us to remember that they relate to a country where conditions are supposed to be very much the same as they are in Canada. And while we thought that we were drawing immigration from the United States it turns out that in the final result there has been a distinct, a decided, loss to the people of Canada as compared with the country to the south of us. In 1911, we had a gain of 52,000; in 1912, a gain of 68,000; in 1913 a gain of 55,000; in 1914 a gain of 12,000. Hon. gentlemen will remember that in 1915 we had one of the largest crops in Canadian history, particularly in the West. I mention this fact only to show that because there happens to be a big crop in the West it does not necessarily follow that the population will be beneficially affected. In the four instances I have cited it will be seen that we had gains. But in 1915, when this big crop occurred, what happened? We had a loss of 30,000 people; in other words, 30,000 people left Canada more than came into the country from the United States. In 1916, another year that was not bad, we had a total loss of 68,000 of people going to the United States. In 1917, there was a total loss of 48,000 from Canada; but in 1918 the tables were turned and we had 36,000 of a gain. In 1919, however, we had again a loss of 22,000; in 1920, a loss of 47,000; in 1921, a loss of 30,000; and in 1922 a loss of 17,000. To sum up, we lost by actual emigration to the United States alone, in the decade I have mentioned, 39,000 people. Now, there is something wrong; and each and every one of these 39,000 people will testify to just what is the matter with colonization conditions in Canada. And whether it be a matter for rectification on the part of the government—and I believe that the government can do very much to make conditions better and more equitable in this country—, the fact remains that 39,000 of our people have gone to the United States, 39,000 missionaries who will tell the truth, perhaps too luridly. And that is the reason or at least one of the reasons, why we may not expect a large influx of immigration from the United States—a country which, by the way, gives us our best settlers—until such time as conditions are, in their estimation at least, as good in Canada as they are in the country to which they are going back. I made the statement that in all civilized countries, at least where the white peoples have come from, agriculture was bleeding to death. And I have authority for the statement. In Australia, they have borrowed moneys for the purpose of settling people on the land, and as nearly as I can ascertain, capitalizing it at only five per cent, which I may say is my own estimate, the amounts borrowed will produce the sum of $250 for every settler going into Australia. In the plan we contemplate we provide approximately $500, or twice the amount which in Australia the gov-

ernment, or whatever patronizing source it comes from, is prepared to give. Now, I do not see why Canada, with all her potential wealth, should be obliged to pay $2 as against $1 in comparison with Australia for the immigrants that come into the country.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The point is very interesting and I should like my hon. friend to tell me how he arrives at his conclusion with regard to cost.

Mr. GOULD: I have taken the figures from the Journal of the Empire, and the five per cent at which I capitalize the moneys is my own estimate. I believe that the government, of western Australia particularly, applies the interest on every £1,000 to the initial assistance of the settler.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): How does the hon. member arrive at his figures with respect to Canadian immigration?

Mr. GOULD: I made a computation of the value of the lands and the ten per cent commission which it is proposed to give.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I beg your pardon, I did not understand you were speaking of one particular point.

Mr. GOULD: In the United States there has been before congress a bill asking for $300,000,000 to assist agriculture there. Now, in spite of their high tariff wall, the purpose of which we are told is to protect American agriculture, it seems that they still realize that agriculture is not receiving sufficient encouragement and it is now being given patronage from the government. Three hundred million dollars is a huge sum, and I am not advocating such financial assistance to agriculture. All I contend for is that we may have equal opportunities to take the potential wealth from the soil—opportunities which I believe have been largely denied us, or at least if we have not been actually denied them we have been prevented from retaining what we consider our fair share of that wealth when produced.

In the western country we have vast areas which are still unsettled, and I think that any settlement scheme should be carried out under the supervision of the government and not through the Western Canada Colonization Association. The Minister (Mr. Stewart) is well aware of the conditions in the West, and he knows the importance of community life to those who settle there. I have often considered a community plan which would concentrate the people and give them the opportunity of having their schools and other public institutions close in. One of the great drawbacks even in the organized districts in western Canada to-day is the lack of school facilities and the difficulty experienced in securing the attendance of children from remote farms. Consolidation has been tried in a few places, but I would like to see it attempted in a broader form whereby townships or divisions of townships might be brought together and roads and other conveniences provided so that the people would receive more of the benefits of community life, the absence of which is one of the great drawbacks to settlement in western Canada. Imagine a man taking his wife and family into a remote district two or three, and very often five or six, miles from his nearest neighbour. Naturally enough the woman's heart is broken. I recommend this important feature to the attention of the minister and I hope something will be done along these lines to make prairie life more attractive.

I have under my hand an advertisement sent out by the Bank of Montreal in which it is stated:

> Canada in the past three years has exported surplus vegetable and animal products to the value of $1,900,000,000.

That naturally would strike the mind of the immigrant as a huge sum, indeed it would impress anyone at first sight, but when divided up among our agriculturists the sum per capita is comparatively insignificant. Taking the farming population of Canada as approximately fifty per cent of the total, and multiplying it by three, the number of years covered, we have as a result 13,500,000 farmers, each of whom would receive out of this huge total of $1,900,000,000, the small sum of $140.75, or taking it on the basis of a family of five, the sum of $703.75. Neither sum is such as to cause the average farmer or his family to go into ecstacies. And yet this represents merely his gross return. I submit that transportation costs and taxation must be deducted say, $100 per capita, or $500 per family. Deduct this from the figures I have already given and we find how little the agriculturist has left to provide clothes, fuel and the other necessaries of life. It is at once apparent that the farmer is faced with an absolute physical impossibility in attempting to make a living under such conditions; and yet these are the conditions that obtain.

Mr. CARROLL: What do the exports consist of which are included in that aggregate of $1,900,000,000?

Mr. GOULD: The statement in the advertisement runs:

> Canada in the past three years has exported surplus vegetable and animal products to the value of $1,900,000,000.

Mr. CARROLL: Does that include wheat?

Mr. GOULD: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It also includes whisky, brandy, liquor, beer and so forth.

Mr. GOULD: Possibly. If further evidence were needed regarding the conditions prevailing in the West I could furnish it in plenty. I have here a statement issued by the Canadian Bank of Commerce which is illuminating. It declares Canada to be suffering, like many other countries, from over-extension of the functions of government whose financing calls for greater taxation than can be borne, and it instances the total taxes in Manitoba for the year 1921 at $57,190,000, against the total value of cereals produced in the province of $40,500,000. That bears out my assertion that nothing can be left for the farmer when these figures are analyzed.

In passing, may I recommend these figures to the consideration of the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Hoey) who spoke so slightingly of the farmers of Manitoba "scratching" the soil. That statement rather stuck with me because the majority of my relatives live in that province and on their behalf I resent the suggestion that they merely scratch the soil. As a matter of fact they carry out the instructions issued by the Department of Agriculture, which are to the effect that the first seven inches will produce the best results from an agricultural standpoint.

Mr. GOOD: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that perhaps my hon. friend was taking the hon. member for Springfield a little too literally. He might have been using the word "scratch" metaphorically.

Mr. GOULD: But when that statement was backed up with the illustration that a hen was supposed to cover two hundred eggs I think I have good reason to take the hon. member very literally.

Mr. HOEY: It was a pictorial illustration.

Mr. GOULD: I cannot bring myself to believe that the Western Canada Colonization Association is at all necessary. A few days ago letters were read by the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) which had passed between the Western Canada Colonization Association and certain hon. members. I think, Mr. Chairman, that further evidence might be submitted in regard to at least one of those letters, and I propose to make this statement, not because I have been instructed to do so, but because it is common knowledge. Upon three occasions the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Forke) has asked the association to remove his name from the list of directors, but they have paid no attention to his request.

Hon. members who were in this House during the last parliament will recollect the earnestness and ability exhibited by the then member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) when he spoke in condemnation of the Canada Shipping Company. He stated that some four or five years prior to that time the Canada Shipping Company had been capitalized at $8,000,000, and that they proposed to enter the British Empire Steel Corporation, the promoters of which were then anticipating a merger of $500,000,000 embracing the Canada Shipping Company, the steel and coal industries of Nova Scotia and even the Western Canada Colonization Association. Not only was the Canada Shipping Company over-capitalized at that time, as the then hon. member for East Lambton stated, but he added that the company, not satisfied with this capitalization, was entering the merger at a capitalization of $40,000,000. Now, it seems to me that I have a right to believe that the Western Canada Colonization Association had the same ambitious ideas. Incidentally I may say that they certainly thought they could afford to pay $35,000 salary to their manager. It is well known in the West that a certain person was offered $50,000 to act as manager of that organization. There is no area of land in western Canada that can yield one-fifth of that amount by way of salary or dividend. But gentlemen who have big ideas in the way of extracting huge sums from the people for the purposes of salaries in connection with this organization have not the ability to extract these sums from the soil; they find it much easier, perhaps with a little assistance or patronage from the government, to extract them from the poor prospective settler. Let these enthusiasts go out and demonstrate to me their ability to extract that profit from the soil. I defy them to do it. Knowing they cannot do it, I stand in the way of their taking it out of persons whom they want to get the wealth out of the land. I stand in the way—

Mr. MARLER: What does the hon. member stand in the way of? He stands in the way of our ever bringing any immigrants into Canada, through the attitude he is taking now and the kind of advertising he is giving to the country.

Mr. GOULD: The hon. gentleman, in his address on this subject, said, I think, that he personally knew nothing about the conditions in the West, but that he had read some papers

on the subject. Surely he will admit that one who has lived thirty-two years in the West should know what he is talking about.

Mr. MARLER: I am not disputing my hon. friend's knowledge of the subject. But what my hon. friends on the other side are saying will go all over the world and we shall never get anybody to come here. People who are here might as well pack their bags and go out of the country if that is the attitude we are to take.

Mr. GOULD: I do not wish to say anything that will irritate my hon. friend; I want to be very peaceable. But I would like nothing better than to have him come out west and work beside me; I will pay him $3.50 a day and let him demonstrate his ability to make good. I warrant he will sleep his solid seven hours per night, and I question whether his horses will be very well cleaned in the morning.

Mr. MARLER: I am not questioning my hon. friend's statement at all in regard to farming. I am simply saying—and I repeat it—that if he has any constructive suggestion to make, let him offer it. Everything that has been said from that side has been destructive in its character.

Mr. GOULD: Does the hon. gentleman contend that the figures I have given the House are false?

Mr. MARLER: I think some of the figures given respecting the migration of Canadians to the United States are very questionable. They have been questioned during the course of two separate investigations made at the instance of the government, and it has been held on two occasions—the hon. member can see it in the Canadian Annual Review for 1921—that many people going to the United States did not stay there although they were counted as having stayed there. I question those figures very much indeed.

Mr. GOULD: The hon. member will have to admit that for all the $30,000,000 that has been expended for the purpose of bringing immigrants to this country, there cannot be shown to-day one per cent of increased population.

Mr. MARLER: What I admit is that this country is a good country, but what my hon. friends have been telling us in this House for the last week is such that it will be impossible to put any policy of immigration in force. That will be the result if the kind of advertising we are getting from our hon. friends across the way is continued.

4 p.m.

[Mr. Gould.]

Mr. GOULD: Notwithstanding the remarks of the hon. member, I consider I am doing my duty to the people just as well as he is. Moreover, I think I know the subject better than he does, for I have actually lived in that country. Will the hon. member produce any figures which will substantially contradict those I have presented? Of course, the figures I give may in some respects be only approximate, but I do not think my hon. friend can challenge them in any material respect. No one on this side has ever stated that he objected to Canada as a country. I have positively asserted on a dozen occasions that the potential wealth of Canada is great, but something stands between. For instance, the hon. member stood up two or three times and interrogated hon. gentlemen on this side, asking them whether they would take dividends from the Canadian Pacific Railway. That is what is the matter; the attitude is taken that organizations of this character should have the right to extract their dividends first and let those who produce the wealth of the country take what is left. That is my interpretation of the attitude of the hon. member; that is possibly his concern at the present time. We have heard many statements that there is to be a trade revival in Canada; that better times are coming. But I want hon. members at the first opportunity, to look at the individual who makes this prophecy and see whether he himself sits on the mourners' bench. It is safe to say that those who prophesy better times are not among those who sit on the mourners' bench.

Mr. MARLER: No; the hon. member himself is sitting on the mourners' bench.

Mr. GOULD: Mr. Chairman, I have expressed what are my firm convictions in this matter, and I think I have said enough to make my position clear.

Mr. SHAW: Mr. Chairman, the question of immigration has since confederation been an important and pressing problem. We have through the years framed various policies with a view of increasing the numbers of our people, and whether our efforts have achieved a measure consistent with the amount of public money expended is perhaps open to some question.

In announcing his proposals the minister indicated that he was not bringing before the House any, as he described it, brand new policy; he informed us that he was taking the middle course. His position could perhaps have been more adequately described had he suggested that he was sitting on the fence, and I am sure he has earned the at-

tacks which are usually made upon those who assume that attitude, because. if I mistake not, his emotions must have run through the whole gamut of human sentiments when one considers the reluctant expessions of appreciation which came to him from some members of his own party and, in addition, the sledge hammer blows which have been directed at his policy by other members supporting the government. I think, perhaps, the minister must have had in his mind the injunction which many years ago was given to one of the leaders of the Jewish people when he was enjoined not to make "any graven image, or any likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth." It seems to me, that the position of the minister can only be compared to that of the heroine who was "There twixt heaven and earth suspended while the bell tolled to. and fro."

I think it is desirable, Mr. Chairman, that we should pay some attention to the census statistics in so far as they may be of value in determining the policy of parliament in connection with this problem. The House, I think is indebted to the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Garland) in indicating the exact history of our emigration problem. I would like to suggest that the statistics of Canadian emigration, so far as they are disclosed to us by the United States, show that in the decade between 1901 and 1910 some 179,226 people left this country; whereas in the following decade, between 1911 and 1920 some 742,000 odd emigrated from Canada. We find also, if we take the decade—and I do not intend to weary the House unduly with figures—from 1911 to 1921 that, allowing for the natural increase, according to the figures there must be a loss to this country of something like, 1,200,000 people. Now let me quote one or two other figures with regard to immigration during the past two years. In the fiscal year ending March, 1922, approximately 90,000 people came to Canada; the year previous the arrivals numbered 148,000 odd; and in the year 1920 some 117,000 odd. So that last year, if we except the war years from 1916 to 1919 the low water mark in inmmigration was reached taking our history as far back as 1902.

In connection with these facts I want to make a few observations. It seems to me that we have two problems to solve—the problem of emigration and the problem of immigration. I have already indicated the extent of the emigration to the United States as indicated by the figures I have given. I would like to point out that that emigration is a voluntary emigration; it is not induced by any advertisements on the part of the United States government. That is a distressing feature of the situation because experience shows that that sort of emigration, that is voluntary emigration, is made up of the young, the industrious and the ambitious. That is an unfortunate fact. What is the reason that the best of our manhood and womanhood are leaving the country? Occasionally in former days people in emigrating were influenced by religious considerations; at other times they were influenced by political considerations. To-day there can be no question at all but that the reason for the emigration to the United States is due to the fact that our economic conditions are not all they should be. It is quite apparent that the emigration to the United States is due to the desire either to escape the existing economic conditions, or else to obtain better economic conditions. I mention these facts not because I am discouraged; on the contrary I am not; I mention them because they constitute an appalling and a tragic fact that our own people—our own Canadian and Canadianized people—are unable to obtain that measure of satisfaction which they look for in this country and are therefore seeking a refuge in a foreign land. That is not an easy thing for a Canadian to do, it is not an easy thing for a Canadianized individual to do, because it necessarily means the severance of the ties of kinship, the severance of the ties of devotion which binds everyone to this land. Therefore, I say, Mr. Chairman, that the primary duty of this government is to investigate this condition with regard to emigration.

In this connection I am reminded of the statement of Sir Andrew Macphail. Speaking some time ago at McGill university he said; referring to the government:

> You put a little less stress on this policy of immigration until you are quite sure you can keep the immigrants you pay for.

After some further references to the number of people leaving the country he said:

> The people of Canada cannot save themselves by this process of immigration any more than could the Romans by their system of slavery.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I would like to point out to my hon. friend that the United States have an embargo against all other nations except Canada.

Mr. SHAW: I quite appreciate the fact but my point is that the United States, as a government, is making no effort to induce

immigration from this country. It seems to me that the government should take this matter of emigration into consideration, not in any panicky mood because there is no necessity for panic. I think they should ascertain, as far as it can be humanly ascertained, the existing cause and then fearlessly apply the remedy whatever it may be. I am not going into the causes for emigration; it is not necessary to do so at this particular time. I do suggest, however, that if you want to keep people in this country there must be a determined effort to reduce the cost of living, there must be a determined effort to reduce the burden of taxation under which this country is reeling at the present time. Now what is the government's attitude toward this question of emigration? What is their policy in regard to this important matter? I suppose that if I were to ask the Minister of Finance he would tell me in Asquithian language "Wait and see." It appears to me that the government are assuming the fatalistic position that little can be done to stem the tide of emigration. I do not agree with that view at all. Personally I would vote for a very definite, a very clear cut, and a very courageous programme for the purpose of stopping the emigration from our land.

There is another interesting fact to which I would draw the attention of the House in connection with the census figures. At the census of 1901 the figures indicated that 62.3 per cent of our population was rural. The census of 1911 indicated that 54 per cent was rural, a decrease of some 8 per cent in that decade. The census figures of 1921 indicate that 50.3 per cent was rural, a further decrease of something like 4 per cent. There must be some reason for the rural depopulation that is evidently going on. I mention that because I am impressed with this fact: That every person who migrates from the land into an urban centre becomes a potential emigrant from the country. The person who leaves the land and endeavours to compete in the city necessarily finds difficulty in carrying on there owing to the specialized conditions prevailing, and therefore I think it is important, if we can check the rural depopulation, that we should do so. At least we should make some determined effort to ascertain and remedy the cause, and thus to my mind shut off one of the potential taps leading to emigration from Canada.

May I be permitted to mention what occurs to me as one or two important reasons for rural depopulation? There is, of course, the lure of the city so-called, but more important than that are the hardships incident to a pioneering land, the difficulties and hardships which must be overcome. I for one regret that during our entire history we have never seen fit, or at least on very few occasions, to pay any honour to those who pioneered in Canada. We have multitudes of honours, titles and otherwise, for those who have achieved political success, and we have the same conditions prevailing for those who have achieved some measure of commercial success, but for the man who lives on the frontier we have never been able to award or accord to him what seems to me his fitting recognition.

The second cause for rural depopulation is necessarily the high production costs, and I use the word "high" as compared with the amount received by the producer in return for his efforts. It seems to me that these causes can be ascertained with a fair degree of accuracy. What are the causes which create high production costs in relation to the returns received. First of all I want to suggest, and I know my friends to the right will entirely disagree with me, that chief among these deterrents, chief among the difficulties is the tariff. We have built for forty years on a policy designed to put tall chimneys in eastern Canada. It seems to me that our policy for a time at least should have that degree of orientation which will enable farmers to reap the just reward for their efforts. Some hon. gentlemen may think that the farmers do receive a just reward for their efforts. But I presume that no one will dispute the view taken by the president of the Dominion Bank in his annual statement for the year 1922. He says:

> Of the unfavourable features, immigration returns are most disappointing and, so far, it appears that no sound measures have been devised by governments, or others, that will bring any improvement. The many attractive features that Canada has to offer to settlers have been more than offset by the poor results that farming operations have shown in the past two or three years.

He goes on:

> Excessive taxation is a great detriment, and there can be no relief while provincial governments and municipalities so freely spend money which they obtain from the public with astonishing ease.

Why he eliminated the Dominion government from his observations I do not know.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What was the date of the speech?

Mr. SHAW: It was in December, 1922. I say that the question of the tariff and its bearing upon the primary producer is a matter of vital importance, and I think our policy should be changed in so far as the tariff is concerned.

Another important element, and I propose to give the government credit for having made some progress, lies in the fact that our whole country, our whole transportation system at least, seems to be in the hands of combines, combinations which have as their avowed purpose apparently the raising of rates to the extent that the traffic will bear. I am sure that hon. members of this House cannot but be impressed with the evidence that has been given before the Lake Shipping Commission and the evidence also taken before the special committee on Agriculture, from which it appears that not only the railways and the ocean companies, but also our own National Railways and our own Canadian Government Merchant Marine have been to some extent at least implicated in this effort to maintain rates at what they deemed to be a proper standard instead of, as the people have a right to expect, competing with other railways and other transportation systems. The government, I think, is entitled to some credit for having undertaken these investigations. I think, too, they are entitled to credit for having inaugurated or at least given promise of inaugurating a policy which will do much to eradicate combines when and where they are found.

Another important element, it seems to me, that must be considered before an immigration policy can secure that measure of success which is desirable is to free western lands from the group of exploiters and speculators who now have them under control. I think that perhaps in consultation with provincial governments a progressive and scientific system of taxation could be undertaken with regard to the speculatively held lands in order that they will either be put to productive use or come back into the hands of the state, and thereby be of service to intending immigrants.

These, Mr. Chairman, are only a few of the difficulties which confront the farmer in western Canada, and I believe, for that matter, in all parts of Canada to-day. I think some effort should be made in order to relieve him of these burdens which, to my mind, unnecessarily make his position perilous.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I think I agree with my hon. friend very largely so far as the unoccupied lands are concerned, but is it not a fact that in our own province these lands are coming into the hands of the government very rapidly, much more rapidly than the government would wish, and is not that also the case with the municipalities, so that taxation is almost a burden to-day on account of the large areas of land owned by the municipalities? I am not inferring that the speculator should get one cent. I am just pointing out the actual conditions.

Mr. SHAW: There can be no question that large areas of lands are coming back into the hands of municipalities and of the government as well, but that is not true of the lands adjoining the railways to the same extent as it is of lands further removed. What I should like to see is a progressive and scientific system of taxation applied to these lands adjoining the railways, which, if they were in the possession of the government, could be used for colonization purposes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am aware personally of lands adjoining the railways the taxation on which is now ten per cent of the value, or something near that. How much higher does the hon. member think the taxation ought to go?

Mr. SHAW: In my judgment it ought to go to the point where the speculator or exploiter will either turn to production or forfeit his right to the land.

Mr. MEIGHEN: These lands have been bought from and paid for to the province, of which the whole people got the benefit at, say, $10 an acre. The taxes now have amounted to more than the land is worth and are still at the rate of ten per cent. In a word, the whole value has already been confiscated and the province has got the money. How much further would he have the province or the municipality go than that?

Mr. SHAW: If the province has the lands and they are now in a position where they can be turned to productive use—

Mr. MEIGHEN: The province got the $10 an acre, and because it does not pay to hold at a ten per cent tax the province gets the lands too. I am asking how much further he advises they go.

Mr. SHAW: I do not very well see how with regard to that particular parcel of land, the government can go much further.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member knows that in a few years taxation takes back the whole thing. Then, of course, payment of that rate of taxation for the future is impossible, for no human being will pay it, and the man turns the land back too. Thus the province gets the land and the $10 an acre. The poor fellow who bought it gets nothing at all. I ask, how far should the province go beyond that?

Mr. SHAW: There is no necessity of the province going further.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. SHAW: I certainly would not for a moment suggest that the province, by confiscatory legislation, should seize all the lands simply by imposing an excessive rate of taxation.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That already exists in at least two provinces, if not three.

Mr. SHAW: I have no desire to join issue with the right hon. gentleman with regard to that matter But I know, regardless of whether the taxation be high or not, there are, adjoining railways in Saskatchewan and Alberta, vast areas of land which are unproductive, which are not put to any proper use and which are simply being held by speculators against the great day when, perhaps, boom conditions will again exist. I think the government should direct its best energy, and give primary consideration to that particular problem.

With regard to the question of immigration itself, I have no objection to a vigorous immigration policy. I have not the slightest objection to bringing people into this country who can, if conditions are favourable, make themselves into efficient citizens. I have no objection to a well-considered immigration policy, provided that that immigration policy is synchronised with an efficient. if I might so call it, emigration policy, or a policy designed to prevent emigration. I do not ask that all immigration must be stopped until the emigration problem is solved. I think these two problems should go side by side. If this House will give to the problem of emigration its serious and undivided attention, and at the same time co-ordinate that with a policy of immigration, progress will be made.

As regards the problems which touch the farmers of western Canada, the problems to which I refer, and which are the exciting cause of the emigration which exists to-day, I do not ask the government simply to look in the direction of a solution of those problems; I do not suggest to them that there should be what the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) called a mere "molecular movement" in the direction of reform. They should courageously undertake the solution of those problems in order to accomplish some results in preventing further emigration from our country. After all—and I have said this before in this House—the best immigration advertisement is a contented and prosperous farmer. I ask the Acting Minister of Immigration how he can expect farmers or others brought in from foreign lands, unacclimatised to our conditions, unfamiliar with our life, to succeed where we have to-day men who have had the advantage of free land and who, despite their strenuous efforts, have not achieved that measure of success which, at least, would constitute them the best of immigration agents for this country.

There is, however, one point in regard to which I have very serious objection to the government's policy. I refer to the Canada Colonization Association. This scheme was born in the heads of various transportation and manufacturing interests. The Canada Colonization Association is the subsidiary and the inheritor of the Western Canada Colonization Company. It is now, as the minister has indicated to us, a headless organization. The government has apparently no written agreement with that organization; but it has agreed to pay them $100,000 this year, of which $40,000 has already been paid. I have looked with some interest at the advertisements of this association, and I find amongst other things that they tell us that the whole wide world is their field of activity for immigration purposes. They tell us that, as regards the United States, there will be hundreds of agents canvassing on behalf of this country, drumming up immigration, I think they call it, before the snow flies. May I say, just in connection with that, to show that that was the situation, that I have had the advantage of reading a copy of a letter directed by the Minister of Immigration to a gentleman by the name of Mr. Crawford? Mr. Crawford wrote to the minister on the 11th October last in these words:

> We are leaving for Europe this month to arrange for agriculturists to come to Canada, and as we have a letter from Ukrainia asking us if we can make the necessary arrangement for fifteen thousand families to come here in the spring, we would like to have a letter from you saying what assistance we can have from your department, and one that we can show them when we arrive in Ukrainia.
>
> These people are Christian agriculturists and will have plenty of means to start farming. Some of them we intend to settle on Canadian Pacific railway western land, Canadian National railway land and some on homesteads in the Peace river block.
>
> Through our paper the "Friend of Ukraine" we are receiving many enquiries about Canada as besides the western Canada distribution we are mailing a large number to the United States and Europe. The paper is printed half in Ukrainian and English, which will be a means of education to these people in Canada.
>
> We are enclosing some of the recent issues of this paper, and we would ask that you advise the Post Office department that we should have the 1½ cent rate as we are now paying 8 cents per pound. We have over 2,000 subscribers although they are not all paid up.
>
> We would like an appointment to talk this matter over with you, and although we have been trying for

weeks to do this we have not been successful. We think our work will be a benefit to Canada.

Yours very truly,

CRAWFORD and KURDYDYK.

These gentlemen are apparently not asking for anything. They are asking simply that certain regulations of the Post Office department be applied to them, and they give indications of bringing to this country some 15,000 Ukrainian families who have adequate means. The Acting Minister of Immigration and Colonization on the 14th October last answered these gentlemen in these words:

I have your letter of the 11th. instant, enquiring what assistance the Department of Immigration can give in connection with bringing out a number of Ukrainian families to Canada next spring.

In reply I may say that the question of assistance to immigrants coming to Canada has been given careful consideration, but it was felt that, in view of our present financial condition, the department would not be warranted in asking for an appropriation for this purpose at the present time. However, I may point out that the Canada Colonization Association, with headquarters in Winnipeg, Manitoba, has rather elaborate plans for assisting immigration, and I wish to suggest that you get in touch with Mr. M. A. Brown, the vice-president of this association, at the Bank of Hamilton building, Winnipeg.

For your information I am enclosing herewith copy of the Immigration Act and regulations, which will give you full information of the qualifications required of immigrants coming to Canada at the present time.

So that it is perfectly clear that on the 14th October last the minister had made no restrictions, and, in fact, the Canada Colonization Association had made no restrictions, with regard to the field of their activities. But the situation seems to have been changed, because we find now, according to the words of the minister, that this association is restricted to the United States, the most fertile field, the best field for immigration for this country, and it has no authority or apparently exercises no authority beyond the confines of the North American continent. We also find that although this company had advertised that hundreds of agents would be carrying on, drumming up the work of immigration in the United States before the snow commenced to fly, according to the minister only some sixty agents are operating to-day. Now why this state of coma that characterizes this organization at the present time? I suggest that in this vital and important matter the government has no right to abdicate its function to the Canada Colonization Association, a headless organization of this character, which has in no measure lived up to the promises it made, which has no written agreement with the government, or perhaps if anything only a verbal contract, and whose responsibility is based on such verbal contract. Therefore I most strenuously object to the government carrying on any further negotiations with that association. I am quite satisfied that that position represents the feeling of a large number of members of this House. The promoters and associates of this organization have themselves withdrawn support from it. Then why should the parliament of Canada now bolster it up further with an appropriation of $60,000? I think that the government can without any loss of dignity simply refuse to subsidize the organization further and put this matter of possible immigration from the United States into the hands of its own responsible agents. In addition to that, those members of the House who have written letters expressing, to some degree at least, confidence in the organization have repudiated the suggestion that they meant to convey that the government should give any financial assistance to the organization. I say, therefore, that the government can and should have no further dealings with the association; In any event I am perfectly satisfied that after the publicity this association has now received its work will be of little avail in the future.

Let me say in conclusion that, if I judge rightly, the country does demand a vigorous policy designed to prevent indiscriminate immigration but which will bring into the country those who can make a success under the conditions that prevail to-day. Personally, I have the greatest faith in this country. I see no reason why we should at this time be discouraged or why we should lose faith. I think there is great hope for the future; and I believe that if we bend our energies to the consideration of these problems we can accomplish something of real service to Canada. We are fortunately situated. We are not embroiled in the many difficulties and entanglements which are so typical of European and other countries to-day. We have a great opportunity in this country, and we simply need to apply ourselves to the task. I am confident, as a Canadian, having in mind the lofty type of patriotism, characterizing our citizenship and believing that our people have courage and devotion to their country, that we can achieve success even though some hon. gentlemen seem to think that that is out of the question nowadays.

Mr. LUCAS: I doubt whether much more can be said in this debate, as the field has been pretty well covered. But there are a few observations I want to make, as some hon. members have misconstrued some of the ideas which we in this corner have tried to place before the committee. I think I can safely say that there is not a member in

this group who has not the greatest faith in this Canada of ours; and in painting the conditions as they exist, hon. gentlemen on this side have had no intention of advertising this country other than as a place of splendid opportunity, but which opportunity is handicapped by the artificial conditions which surround us; and I claim, furthermore, that there is no one who can possibly have a greater love for this country than the man whose feet are firmly implanted in the soil.

With regard to our population, I think that anyone who travels over this vast country must be convinced that it is necessary that we should have more people. Personally I am sincerely anxious to see more people come into the country in order that we may develop the immense resources which we possess. But what do we find when we look back over our history during the past forty years or more? We find that as a result of the pursuit of a certain policy, our population instead of increasing has actually subsided. During the past generation at least we have been boasting about our great natural resources in Canada, and as yet we have only three persons to the square mile as compared with thirty in the United States and 903 in England and Wales. And we find that the stream of population is not increasing but actually subsiding.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is my hon. friend not aware that the last census returns showed the largest percentage of increase in Canada, over the ten years before, of any country in the world?

Mr. LUCAS: That may be quite true, but the fact remains nevertheless that in the last ten years, in spite of the immigration that has come into the country, we have lost more people than have come in.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am not referring to emigration, but to the actual increase in population. The percentage of increase in Canada is the largest of any English-speaking country in the world, indeed, I think, of any country, as shown by the official census returns. I know that it has been pretty bad since 1921, but the condition I speak of prevailed for the ten years before.

Mr. LUCAS: I do not wish to take issue with the right hon. gentleman on the question, but I believe that the facts as we have them from our own Bureau of Statistics will bear out the statements I have made. I was about to remark that the facts suggest two or three conclusions. We have either misrepresented our natural resources and grossly exaggerated them, or we have proved that we do not know how to handle a great estate. We know as a fact that we have not exaggerated our resources; and we know also, that we have as industrious a class of people in Canada, and as good a class of farmers, as can be found anywhere in the world. And speaking of our farmers' achievements, we know what they have been able to do in competition with outsiders at any of the great expositions that have taken place, especially on the American continent. I speak from memory, but I think I am safe in saying that at the great international fat stock show at Chicago last year Canada carried off 19 out of the 25 prizes. So that the trouble rests not with our farmers or with the country itself; there must be something wrong with the policy which we have had since confederation. We have heard a great deal, and I know that much has been said from this corner, in regard to the conditions in this country; and hon. members have stood up in this House and told us practically that we did not know what we were talking about. Those hon. members have offered us sympathy. Well, Sir, I want to tell hon. gentlemen that the farmers of western Canada are not coming here looking for any sympathy; they are asking for a square deal, for a chance to make good, for an equal opportunity with others. My hon. friend (Mr. Marler) the other night in an excellent speech told us that what we wanted was courage. I would ask hon. gentlemen of this House to consider for a moment the character of the men and women who have carried civilization into those western plains, who have endured the hardships and the toils of a pioneer life, who have combatted through hail, frost and insect pests and other natural afflictions, and then say whether these people are lacking in courage.

We are told that one of the solutions to remedy our adverse conditions is to reduce our standard of living and do as our forefathers did in the old pioneering days. It is even suggested that the peasant type of settler should be brought in from Europe. Mr. Chairman, since when have the British stock become such weaklings. Are we going to admit that the combination of the two greatest races that the world has ever known is about to fall down in the development of this country and is to be supplanted by the peasant type of immigrant from Europe? I think it is time that we as Canadians woke up and faced this matter squarely.

We hear a great deal about the necessity of the farmers reducing their standard of living and undergoing the privations of pioneer days. Perhaps we have all gone a little too far in the high standard of living. But why should we expect the farmers to be the only

class to reduce their standard? Would it be unfair to say to our manufacturers, for instance, that perhaps they could do something along this line as well and so be able to produce goods at a price which we could afford to pay?

The hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Hoey) last week in a very eloquent address told us about an ingenious young Irish immigrant who by following out a course of semi-starvation rose to a very high position in our public life. Well, while he was talking I wondered to what heights that immigrant might have risen had he remained at home and applied the same ingenuity and ability. He might not only have become member of parliament, but he might even be the ruling power in the Emerald Isle to-day. I think some hon. gentlemen were led to believe that such a successful career as depicted by the hon .member for Springfield was only possible in Canada. Let me remind the committee that in Great Britain notwithstanding her great burden of debt and other troubles, there are still possibilities for the individual who possesses ability and application. In this connection we cannot forget the wonderful career of that little boy in a Welsh village who rose by sheer ability until to-day he is regarded as one of the greatest statesman the world has ever known. It is not the material resources of a country that make for great statesmen. Recently I read an article by Mr. Otto H. Kahn concerning British-American relations, in the course of which he said:

> It is not the possession of raw materials and other latent resources, it is not the bounty of nature, it is the qualities and efforts of its people that make a nation great.

The immigration estimates now before us show a large increase for the purpose of bringing in new settlers. The question naturally arises, what have we got to offer our settlers to-day. Comparing present conditions with those of twenty years ago, our settlers were then able to take up free land. If a man took up a quarter section and was not able to make his farming operations pay his overhead was not piling up. At that time we had a very energetic railway policy, and the workmen engaged on railway construction provided ready purchasers for anything the settler produced and if in the fall season he needed some ready cash he could go out with his team and work on the railway grade and thus secure enough ready money to carry him over the winter. We hear a great deal to-day about the men who put up with hardships in those days, and that they were not even able to secure postage stamps. That may be true, but while they were waiting for postage stamps their overhead expenses were not accumulating to any alarming extent. Now immigrants are to be placed on land of an average value of $18 to $20 an acre, and unless he has the requisite amount of capital to purchase his farm outright he must be successful from the very beginning, otherwise interest charges, taxes and the high cost of living are going to force him out of business.

I am not going to relate in detail the conditions now prevailing in the West; those have been already presented at sufficient length. But I would just like to say that conditions are undoubtedly bad, and our people are getting so discouraged that unless this government can give us some policy which will instil fresh hope into our people, I fear for the results. I do not suggest that we should not allow anyone to enter Canada until we get conditions perfect, but I do say that if the government could give us some ray of hope for these people so that we can tell them: The government is honestly endeavouring by bringing in a new policy—because it has been amply demonstrated that our present policy is not producing the results expected—a policy that we hope will improve your condition, such a message would mean a great deal to these people and they would take fresh courage, because I believe there is not a single farmer who would not dig in and work harder to pull through if we could give him some ray of hope that he would succeed.

After the arguments that have been advanced in this House the government and the minister (Mr. Stewart) should be fully seized of the fact that we are not in favour of the colonization scheme which he has placed before the committee. I hope the government will fully realize the responsibility they will be assuming in letting it appear to the country that this Canada Colonization Association scheme is being backed by the Dominion government. It may be safely assumed that the high-powered salesmen who will be engaged to drum up settlers, having in view only their commission of $320 if they land a settler on a half-section, will paint some very rosy pictures to prospective immigrants, and when these immigrants find conditions have been misrepresented naturally they will look to the government to assume responsibility for the statements which they were led to believe were true.

I do not believe in criticizing any scheme without endeavouring to offer some suggestions along constructive lines. I believe that the first essential in keeping settlers on the land is to have the right kind of land settlement policy. The next is the reconstruction

of rural life around various forms of co-operative enterprise. The old policy of bringing settlers into the country and leaving them to shift for themselves will not do. They must be taught the best methods to ensure success. And, furthermore, hand in hand with, or rather in advance of an aggressive policy to obtain this type of settler, there must be action by the federal government to ensure that those already on the land and those about to come may have adequate markets and marketing facilities, to the end that they may obtain some reasonable profit for their labour and investment.

I have made a note here of four suggestions that I think might well receive the serious consideration of the government. In the first place, there is the question of a reduction of the tariff. The people are getting discouraged because they have always felt that the Liberal government stood for a low tariff. The very fact that the people turned out the old government indicated their dissatisfaction with the then prevailing conditions, and they are looking for a change.

Another suggestion would be a reduction in our transportation costs and equalization of our freight rates so that we may be able to get our goods out more cheaply. I would submit also the desirability of considering a long term credit scheme for agricultural loans. I do not offer this suggestion with the idea that the farmers should be given more credit; possibly one of the things we have been up against in the past is the fact that we have had too much credit. But a three months' loan to the farmer is of no use. The United States is realizing the necessity of taking some action along this line. If the government could do something to assist in the providing of capital with which we could replace the present loans that are piling up at a high rate of interest, the effect of which in the end will only be to drive us out of the country; if we could have these extended over a long term so that we might have some hope of ultimately getting out of debt, I am sure it would mean a great deal.

Another suggestion is that there be some encouragement of co-operative enterprises. I do not refer now merely to the little co-operative store; we must get some method of pooling our grain and our live stock. After all, this is not purely a farmers' question; it is a national question, and if the government could offer encouragement along this line the result would be very beneficial indeed. The hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Hoey) expressed the view the other day that his part of the country at least was over-institutionalized. I largely agree with that view, not as respects schools, but as respects almost every other line. Speaking about our grain, any hon. members who have travelled through the West will bear me out when I say that in every little town along the railway—and they come every seven or eight miles—one is impressed with the large number of elevators that have been built I think I am safe in saying that in practically every little town there are from three to five elevators. That means that, in the first place, there is the capital outlay; then there is the local buyer, who is actively engaged only about three months in the year but who receives an annual salary; then there are inspectors going up and down the country, and there are the head offices with their general managers and staffs of clerks. That load is getting too heavy for the farmers to carry. The same conditions exist in our banking system; in every little town there are two or more banks; there is hardly a town in the West which has only one. Going from here to Toronto via the lake shore route one cannot help being impressed by the fact that three lines of railways paral. each other, requiring three stations and three sets of employees in every little town. That is what our competitive system has done for us, and it is something I think the government should take into its serious consideration.

5 p.m.

I hope that the government will bring in some policy that we may be able to take back to our people with the view of giving them a little hope and inspiring them with fresh courage to go on for the future. I believe we have in Canada, not one of the finest countries, but the finest country in the world. It is a matter of regret for me to see hon. members, as has sometimes been the case in this House, seek to obtain party advantage rather than face squarely the issue before the country. The time of the House was taken up noticeably last year in an effort to place the responsibility for our railway situation upon one party or the other; in fact, we fought the election campaign of December 6, 1921, all over again. I do not think that is what we are here for. If we could get away from that sort of thing; if we could forget who is responsible for what has happened in the past and get down to a solution of the problems actually before us, it would be a good thing for the country. The people are demanding that we give them a lead in the matter of bringing them out of the very serious conditions now prevailing. I hope therefore, that hon. members in every quarter

of the House will lend their ability to the solution of the important problem we are now considering and do their best to make this Canada of ours a place we would love to live in.

Mr. LAPIERRE: I wish to interject only a word or two into the discussion on this important subject, I would begin by calling the attention of the committee to at least one section of the good old province of Ontario where the farmer still has confidence in the resources of our great country. New Ontario offers to-day the greatest field in the world for colonization. The constituency that I have the honour to represent has nearly doubled its population in the last two decades. Throughout that broad section of the northland the farmer is happy and prosperous and new land is continually being taken up by a hardy type of settlers who have gone into that country to remain. Our colonization problem has more to do with the getting of a suitable class of immigrants.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Are these people we would call immigrants— people from outside of Canada?

Mr. LAPIERRE: Not for the most part. Most of them come from elsewhere in Canada. The most prosperous and the happiest in that north country came from the province of Quebec.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: You would not class them as immigrants, then?

Mr. CASGRAIN: They are French; they do not emigrate.

Mr. LAPIERRE: Let me illustrate what occurred in my own constituency. Twenty-five or thirty years ago Father Paradis went to Michigan and induced fifty or sixty families to come into the district which is in the vicinity of Verner. The second generation of these hardy pioneers comprise to-day the most prosperous farmers in Ontario. I invite hon. members, either of the Progressive party or from among those who represent the cities, to look through the train windows as they pass through Nipissing and see what has been accomplished by settlers who were reclaimed from the United States. The same conditions obtain along the three national railways. These hardy settlers followed the lumbering concerns into the wooded lands of the north. They cleared those lands and developed their farms under the most difficult conditions; but, endowed as they were with courage and possessing large families, they have succeeded in transforming that lumbering country into a prosperous and happy farming community. This process of colonization is still going on, but let it not be thought for one moment that the difficulties which the settler has to face in northern Ontario are any less than those which the settler in the West has to overcome. The farmer who has gone into New Ontario has had many obstacles to surmount, and one of his greatest handicaps has been the forest fires from which the western farmer does not suffer. All through that northern section the farmers have established comfortable homes, with large outbuildings, and the value of their lands is constantly growing. In my own constituency the population in 1901 was 24,931; in 1911, it was 43,679; and in 1921, it had risen to 58,525. This constituency is largely rural, and thirty years ago it was almost a wilderness. At the present time the lands contiguous to the three railways which traverse new Ontario are gradually being taken up by settlers of the same class. There has also been a continuous influx of the same type of farmers across the border into the district of Abitibi, in the province of Quebec, and to-day that section of Quebec is peopled by from fifteen to eighteen thousand happy and prosperous farmers. Again I say that if we are going to settle our immigration problem in a satisfactory manner, the class of settlers brought to the land is a paramount consideration; to my mind it forms the crux of the whole situation. The French Canadians in northern Ontario have had to face other difficulties besides those attendant upon the development of the land. The province of Ontario does not give the French Canadian minority the same privileges or the same treatment that the English minority enjoys in the province of Quebec. Nevertheless, those men have clung tenaciously to the lands they have developed, and to-day they still have confidence in the good will of the English speaking majority of Ontario and look forward to an early settlement of this disability which presses upon them so heavily.

There has been no exodus from the farms in northern Ontario. We have there a class of farmers who, during the days of prosperity, laid aside a sufficient amount to carry them through the period of depression. The prosperous farmer in the north listened to the counsels of those more familiar with our economical conditions and to-day are passing through the prevailing hard times without complaint.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): Does my hon. friend mean that the class to whom he refers took the advice of financial organizations and others to provide for the future?

Mr. LAPIERRE: They were largely advised by an independent press, who, knowing their conditions, urged them to prepare for the reaction which must ultimately follow the period of prosperity.

In connection with disabilities from which the farmers in that district may suffer there is one matter to which I wish to draw the attention of the Acting Minister of Immigration and Colonization. At the outlet of lake Timiskaming, during the past winter, lumbering operations have been carried on on a very large scale. At a point on the Ottawa river on the Quebec side, where the stream is quite narrow, six hundred men have taken out 200,000 logs. On the Ontario side, since the 4th of October, one thousand men have taken out 450,000 logs. The results have been that on both sides of the river there are two great areas covered with from four to six feet of slash. On the Quebec side, is located Kippawa Pulp and Paper Company's plant which cost fifteen millions to build and which would be jeopardized were a fire to take place in these immense quantities of slash. I wish to go on record as stating these facts because there is at the present moment a great deal of anxiety among the people of that section of Ontario on account of the conditions I have described.

In conclusion I wish to say that there is one feature about the agricultural conditions in New Ontario which has contributed a great deal to the prosperity of that country; it is the fact that they have a market practically at their own doors. The mining industry has undoubtedly helped very largely towards the successful development of that north country. But even so the government of Ontario have unlimited confidence in the possibilities of the northern district and are now extending the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario railway to within 130 miles of James Bay. It is safe to say that as soon as this railway is in operation we will see a continuous inflow of immigration into that northern country. There never was a more opportune time for the farmer who is prepared to accept the hardships that necessarily accompany the development of northern lands to go in and settle in that country. Mother nature has been generous but she does not easily give up her treasures. Still we invite that class of settlers to go into the north where the prospects of creating a home under the most favourable conditions now exist and advantages of the most promising character may be reaped.

Mr. CAMPBELL: The feeling that I entertain towards the Acting Minister of Immigration and Colonization cannot be described as sympathy as so many hon. members have expressed it—it can only be expressed as commiseration. Pressed as the minister is on one side by the business interests of the country, to a vey large extent by the press, and by a large section of the population, to institute immediately a vigorous and an energetic immigration campaign, and knowing as he undoubtedly does the inability of the agricultural industry either in eastern Canada or in western Canada to absorb any very large immigrant population at the present time the position he is in is not a very pleasant one.

This debate has been very interesting and instructive. I must congratulate particularly the hon. member for Springfield and the hon. member for Pictou for the very eloquent and very able addresses that they have contributed to this debate, and let me say, Sir, that if to stir up enthusiasm in this chamber, if to disseminate into the atmosphere a spirit of optimism is the most effective way of contributing to this debate, then I would hand the laurels to those two hon. members. But, Sir, it seems to me that a more serious, a more solemn duty rests upon the members of this House than merely making optimistic speeches. I think it is much more important to lay before the committee the facts as we know them in our particular districts than to camouflage the issue in any way. After all, what has this optimistic spirit brought us to in the past? It has been responsible for the building of a third transcontinental railway. It has been responsible for the erection in the city of Winnipeg of that edifice to which the hon. member for Springfield referred, a legislative building that stands the people of Manitoba to-day about $11,000,000. That, Sir, is what some of the people of the West, and of the East too, have experienced, and they want no more of that kind of optimism. I quite realize that to make a speech in what is considered a pessimistic vein, such as was made by the hon. member for Bow River, and in which tone perhaps to a certain extent I will also present my case, is not one that will receive the plaudits of the multitude or the commendations of the press, but I feel it is much more important for me to express the actual feelings of my constituents and for the government to know before it launches actively on any particular immigration policy just what are the conditions prevailing in each section of the country.

The hon. member for Springfield—I regret he is not in his seat—stated that he had been studying agricultural conditions for upwards of fifteen years. Now, Sir, there are two dis-

tinctly different schools in which agricultural conditions can be studied. One is in an arm chair in a library, and the other is out in the fields, battling with the elements and trying to make farming pay. He referred to the large farms, to the burden of land that the farmer had bought, as perhaps the principal reason for his present position, and he referred to farming operations as "tickling the soil." I am prepared to grant that there is some force to the contention that the farmer in the West is overloaded with land, but I will not admit that it is entirely his own fault, because what was a proper sized farm three years ago, and could then be made to pay very well, with the large machinery with which they operate in the West, will not pay at the present time with the high rates of interest and the low returns from the products of the farm. During this year, 1922, the farmers of the West, in spite of frost, in spite of hail, in spite of drought, in spite of sow thistle and a thousand and one other difficulties and enemies with which the farmer has to contend, have raised in the three prairie provinces 400,000,000 bushels of wheat. I think that should be sufficient answer to the charge of any uninformed hon. gentleman who says that the farmers of the West are merely tickling the soil.

As to some of the reasons why the farmer is in his present position, let me refer to a chart drawn by Professor Jackson of Toronto University. He takes twenty-five basic manufactured articles and establishes the price of them at 100. Then he takes the price of wheat, and he shows the purchasing power of wheat in so far as these manufactured articles are concerned. This chart covers the years 1919, 1920 and 1921. At the beginning, in 1919, we find the line starts at 85; that is 85 of wheat would purchase 100 of these manufactured articles. In other words, wheat was above its normal purchasing power. Professor Jackson explains that by the fact that the wheat market was then controlled and the price set, and the farmer got in that way a little better than the normal price. From that time the line steadily rises, with an occasional drop, until in December 1921 it reaches 150. By the end of the year it drops to 145, and I think you will find that it is pretty near that point to-day. This means that the farmer who incurred liabilities in the spring of 1919 for which perhaps he had given notes payable in the fall of 1921—and that farmer's name is legion,—found that whereas he could have paid that debt at the time he purchased the goods for 85 bushels of wheat, it took 145 bushels by the time the debt came due. In his observations on this matter Professor Jackson says:

> The recurrence of similar conditions in the wheat market, at any future time, is likely to produce the same result; and the reasoning which has here been applied to Canadian experience is evidently no less applicable to any other young country which fulfils two conditions—whose principal crop is wheat; and whose manufacturing industries are restricted, by protective tariffs or otherwise, mainly to the home market.

It seems to me, Sir, this is perhaps the crux of the situation. When the period of deflation came, the farmer was deflated but the manufacturer was not. The law of supply and demand operated on the farmer's product, but the manufacturer, having a preserve of the home market, having that market guaranteed to him through the protective tariff, was not affected by the law of supply and demand, so that the farmer's purchasing power and his ability to pay off debts already incurred was automatically cut in two.

I might observe that while the farmer is still obliged to sell his wool, his hides and other products in the open market in competition with wool and hides from the Argentine and the United States or any other country, he has to pay approximately from 40 to 50 per cent duty and sales tax on the manufactured articles coming into this country. I think that one of our real difficulties is the heavy tax that lies on the necessaries of life, and I think that is one of the principal reasons why people are seeking new homes in the United States and leaving here by thousands because even if there is no increase in the wage received that same wage will purchase the essential articles of life over there at a very much lower price.

A great many hon. gentlemen have referred to the fact that the United States is a high tariff country. Undoubtedly it is, but I would point out this, that within the confines of the United States is to be found the largest free trade area in the world, and the competition within that country itself is sufficient to give to the consumer and to the producer to a large extent the full benefit of competition.

In comparing the speeches of the hon. member for Springfield and the hon. member for Bow River—and they have been frequently compared in this House—I want to point out that there are geographical differences between the position of the province of Alberta and that of Manitoba. The farther west the farmer lives, the less he gets for his wheat and the more he is obliged to pay for what he buys. Therefore, in that regard Manitoba is in a much more favoured position than Alberta. The farmer of Manitoba is

also provided with a fairly good home market, with a city of 300,000 at his door, which supplies him with a very good market for dairy and other small farm products. But even if we take into consideration these facts, are the farmers of Manitoba in such a prosperous condition as one might infer from the speech to which I refer? I have in my hand a copy of the Manitoba Free Press of February 6, 1922. The Free Press is a western paper, imbued with the western spirit, a paper that is always boosting for the West, a paper that believes to-day in a vigorous and energetic immigration policy. Yet, in that issue some very illuminating figures are quoted. After referring to the budget of the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) for the fiscal year 1921-22, it observes that Manitoba's share of the taxation contained in that budget, on a basis of her population, is $28,800,000. To that is added interest on the provincial debt, $8,140,000, taxation in the city of Winnipeg, $9,500,000, and also taxation of the municipalities within the province, $10,750,000, making a total of $57,190,000. It goes on to quote some figures in regard to the cereal crops. I will not weary the committee by quoting them all; but the total value of the cereal crop of Manitoba for that year is shown to be $40,500,000. The paper subtracts this from the total amount of the provincial taxation and interest, and this leaves a deficit of $16,690,000. I do not propose to be an alarmist; but these figures are rather startling when we see that the whole cereal crop of Manitoba in the year 1921 came nearly $17,000,000 short of paying her taxation and interest. It seems to me that the question that we should be considering to-day in all its seriousness is not immigration, but emigration.

I have in my hand a clipping from the Yorkton Enterprise, a paper published in my constituency, and in an editorial in a recent issue, it states:

> Although thousands of people have left Canada for the United States during the past winter, from the self-complacency and indifference exhibited by our legislators at Ottawa—once again ensconced in their magnificent quarters for the transaction of the nation's business—one would imagine that all was well with the country.

Let me say that the handwriting is on the wall for this parliament. This is what the people of western Canada and, I believe, of eastern Canada as well, are thinking of to-day, namely, the problem of emigration, and not that of immigration. From Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island on the east to British Columbia on the west, people are leaving this country in thousands. In a recent newspaper article, I saw the statement that fifty families per week were leaving Nova Scotia. I was reading the Charlottetown Guardian a few days ago, and it stated that in twenty years that island had lost all its natural increase and 1,000 of its population per annum in addition. We have not heard very much from Ontario or Quebec as to these conditions; but I noticed that the hon. member for St. Mary (Mr. Deslauriers) in his speech a few days ago—this speech was in French and I have just recently read it in English—refers to the very serious emigration from Quebec. There are some illuminating figures in that speech which I would commend to the consideration of some hon. gentlemen in this House.

I have a clipping from this morning's paper, a despatch from Windsor, Ontario, dated March 21, which states:

> Lured by high wages, hundreds of young Canadians are emigrating to the United States. According to the railway and ferry companies, no fewer than eighty families a day are entering the States at Detroit.
>
> On one train arriving here this afternoon from the East there were forty-five young men who said they were on their way to Michigan industrial centers. A majority of the men are between 25 and 40 years of age. Most of them came from Toronto, Hamilton and other cities of eastern Ontario. Lack of work and prospect of high wages, they explained, induced them to leave the Dominion. More than half of the 45 are mechanics connected in some way with the building trades.

We come to the prairie provinces again, and tens of thousands of people have left those provinces for the United States. If I might be pardoned for making a brief reference here to another article in the Free Press, it is a report of a meeting of the United Farmers of Manitoba at Elm Creek on November 14. I notice the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Forke) was present at this meeting. The article states:

> The president read a letter in which the Hon. D. L. McLeod, provincial secretary, suggested co-operative help from the local for distressed and needy farmers, it being understood that in some districts this year, there are many in need of aid. This subject was freely discussed, and a motion carried that local secretary notify the central organization to the effect that Elm Creek is anxious to help.

When the situation in parts of Manitoba is of sufficient seriousness for the provincial secretary to circularise the locals of the United Farmers of Manitoba, soliciting aid on behalf of indigent farmers, surely this is something that should not be ignored and evaded by this House. It seems to me that in considering this situation we are taking a position not much better than that of a certain Emperor of Rome who fiddled while his city was burning. We are playing in this regard a policy of equivocation. I do not want to be understood as opposing a policy

of immigration; I do not understand that any hon. gentleman in this section of the House opposes immigration; but what we do stress is the inadvisability of bringing people to Canada under false pretences. I remember some years ago reading in an English paper an article which told a story of a young English immigrant who had been lured to this country by the tale of high wages on the farm and of how easy it was to start farming. He came to Canada and wandered over the prairies and this eastern country looking for work which he was unable to obtain. Finally he worked his passage back to the Old Country, and almost his first act was to shy a brick through the window of a Canadian immigration office in the city of London. Taken before a magistrate, he told his story and he was allowed to go free, I think rightly. In the western prairies to-day there are thousands of people who are harbouring a sense of injustice, who will feel as long as they live that an injury has been done to them; that they were brought to this country under false pretences. This is a spirit that is poisoning their lives and something that they will pass on to their children. Some of them left much more comfortable homes in the Old Country than they will ever hope to obtain here. Some of them threw up good positions, the like of which they cannot obtain here. We should leave the door open for any good sound, healthy immigrant of a good type who wants to come to this country. Let us invite them here; let them come; but do not carry on a campaign in England, Europe, the United States or anywhere else, because then a distinct responsibility rests upon the government for bringing those people in, very often under false pretences. If we refuse to spend money in this way and let things take their natural course, a considerable number of immigrants will come to Canada and become absorbed without any particular difficulty.

Many hon. gentlemen have stressed the fact that in the period from 1900 to 1913, in which we enjoyed unprecedented prosperity, we were able to absorb a very large immigrant population, and they see no reason why that should not be repeated at the present time. Conditions obtaining at that time do not obtain to-day. We were constructing a third transcontinental railway which opened up millions of acres of good arable free land. The immigrant coming to the country was able to secure, without any particular measure of difficulty, a very good farm adjacent to the railway. He was able to establish his family there in a little cabin in which they lived in fair comfort; then he went out to work on the railway or in one of the many building gangs that were operating in the country and was able to come back in the fall with a very substantial bank account. In that way he was able to purchase some horses and the necessary machinery and in a short time he became fairly well established on the farm. During that period it is true he was keeping the farm; the farm was not keeping him. But to-day conditions are reversed. The immigrant coming to this country must purchase his land and he has not the privilege of going out and securing work at good wages as in those days. So far, thank Providence, we have had no breadlines in the country; but if a policy of immigration on a vigorous scale were prosecuted we might very easily have those conditions. It is pointed out regularly that by additions to our population we could reduce our debt. That, however, does not always hold good. I can indicate some concrete instances in the West where additions to population by the opening up of new districts have resulted in actually increasing the taxation per head. When a new district is opened up the first few settlers are able to find their way in by wagon trail and there is not much expense. In a little while some more people come in; the roads are fenced off and a highway must be built through a country that is partly timber and partly swamp. This is a very expensive undertaking. The provincial governments are appealed to and a large amount of money is expended on the work. Then a municipality is organized and large sums are borrowed. Later on, come schools, with a borrowing of more money, and still later a branch line, accompanied by the opening of new towns and the building of new elevators, involving further borrowing with increased indebtedness.

The member for North Waterloo (Mr. Euler), who, I am sorry, is not in his seat, has a suggestion to make by way of solving the troubles of the West. He advocated the bringing in of settlers and the building up of industries in the West that would absorb our agricultural products and build up home markets. Is the hon. gentleman aware that in the province of Saskatchewan alone this year we raised six times the amount of wheat that can be consumed by the whole population of Canada, and in the three prairie provinces ten times as much wheat as all the Canadian people would require? In these three provinces the total wheat produced was about 400,000,000 bushels, which would feed 80,000,000 people. Now, supposing that we got 80,000,000 people into the country and that we

started manufacturing industries on a large scale, I would ask my hon. friend where we would sell all those manufactured goods. As to the urgent needs of the country there can be no question. Our public debt is over four and a half billions of dollars, for the federal debt is only a part of the public debt.

One phase of the situation that appears serious to me is the fact that so much of our debt is owed in other countries. Of the Canadian Pacific Railway common stock alone only twenty per cent is held in Canada, and so far as my information goes practically none of their bonds, debentures or preferred stock. It simply means that we are taxing ourselves very heavily, to pay dividends to this corporation, while practically all that money goes out of the country. It is therefore patent that if we are ever going to get the country on a safe and solid foundation, its basic industry, agriculture, must be placed on a more prosperous footing than at present obtains. "There can be no prosperity", said Sir Wilfrid Laurier, "that does not have its genesis in the soil of our country." The hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Hoey) suggested the extension of the housing scheme to the farms, and the erection of $2,500 cottages for the use of farm labourers. One of the real difficulties of the farmer in the West, and the hon. gentleman pointed it out himself, is the fact that the farm is already unable to pay its way. I quite agree that the farm labourer is as much entitled to live in a $2.500 cottage as is the worker of the city. But, sir, the farming industry cannot afford to make this possible at the present time. If the government wish to undertake a real colonization policy I am not opposing it; but it will have to be on the basis of financial assistance to the settler. The farmer who comes in and buys land has to struggle against short payments and a high rate of interest, and thousands of these men are being foreclosed on to-day, or, seeing that it is impossible to meet their payments, are moving to the United States or to our cities. It appears to me that if some means were provided by which these men could liquidate the debts with which they are faced to-day, and could have their total indebtedness spread over a period of years at a low rate of interest, thousands of the settlers now leaving Canada could be saved to the country, while on the other hand a great many others could be induced to come in. We hear a great deal about the trek of the young men from the farms to the cities. I think the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) referred to this as the lure of the arc lights. I know hundreds of young men of that class, and in the great majority of cases they would be only too willing to remain on the farm could they but see any opportunity of owning a farm of their own. But anyone desiring to obtain a farm must pay down a considerable amount of money; and in addition he is faced with high taxation, a short term and a high rate of interest. So that it seems an utter impossibility for him to establish himself. I know that thousands of young men would come back to the farm to-day were they offered an opportunity to purchase farms at reasonably low rates in districts already settled, and provided their payments were spread over a long term of years at a low rate of interest.

The extension of the Soldier Settlement Board system was advocated by my hon. friend the member for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Marler) and I heartily agree with him. I think that is the only policy which is possible to-day. It is not a new policy; it has been successfully carried out in New Zealand, and it is the policy that has made Denmark what she is to-day, one of the most prosperous agricultural countries in the world. This policy was tried out with unqualified success in the province of Prince Edward Island. Between the years 1866 and 1875 the province bought out most of the land in the island and re-sold it to the tenant farmers, giving them a long period of years in which to pay and fixing the interest at a low rate, and the history of that policy shows that it re-established the whole agricultural industry in Prince Edward Island.

In conclusion, I want to say that I am not an alarmist, neither am I a pessimist. I have an abiding faith and abounding confidence in the future of western Canada. We have the richest of soil, and in the north we have an abundance of fuel and timber and as well a bountiful rainfall. Nature, indeed, has been most lavish in her gifts. So that with some economic readjustment, with the fiscal changes that must come about if we are to get upon a proper basis of prosperity, and with a sane colonization policy such as has been advocated by the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George, I have no fear for the future. But, Mr. Chairman, we must shun this false optimism as we would avoid the plague. It was a spirit of this kind that left not only over western Canada, but some years ago also over eastern Canada a path of ruin and destruction in its wake such as we find in the track of a cyclone. Real estate oil and mining booms brought ruin in their train. The people have had enough of them. Ill-founded optimism is

a wily, elusive will-o'-the-wisp that leads not to the high road of prosperity but beckons us further and deeper into the bog and the morass. Let us rather face the future with courage, tempered with caution, taking due note of the handwriting on the wall, paying due heed to conditions around about us, and I have no doubt we shall see a way through.

Mr. COOTE: Mr. Chairman, this has been to me the most interesting discussion which I have heard since I became a member of this House. I think no speaker has taken part without adding at least something new. I suppose some members would think that nothing new can be added at this late stage of the debate, but I think I have something which is at least a little bit original.

It is always interesting to me to hear hon. members, particularly ministers and lawyers, discuss the problems of the farm and attempt to explain why people leave the country for the city. It is especially interesting if you know the study such gentlemen have devoted to the problem has been, as the last speaker (Mr. Campbell) said, from an arm-chair. I do not know that I am very well qualified to discuss the question of why people leave the farm, as I have only been on the farm for about ten years.

It is impossible to refer to all the statements made during the course of this debate with which one may have disagreed, but one statement which struck me as needing some discussion was that made by the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Forke). It is given at page 1153 of Hansard, where he says:

> The one depressing fact in the prairie provinces is that farmers are loaded down with debt. Were it not so, there would be nothing disheartening in the situation, but that is in reality the position.

Now, Mr. Chairman, with the first sentence I do not disagree, but the second I cannot allow to go unchallenged, namely, "Were it not so"—this debt—"there would be nothing disheartening in the situation." I think there is something very disheartening in the situation, and I shall endeavour to prove it. I do not wish the committee to take my word for it, and I shall quote first the opinion of the hon. minister himself (Mr. Stewart). Speaking at Ottawa, recently, he said:

> The market at home is overstocked with produce, which cannot be sold profitably because of the high overhead of those doing business. This is the result of deflation in some lines, and not in others. Particularly affected by these conditions is the farmer.

As I want to be as brief as possible I shall leave the quotation right there, and quote very shortly from the annual report of the Bank of Commerce, in which Sir John Aird, the general manager, states:

> It is said that if we are to secure outside assistance it must be in the form of selected immigration of men who will go on the land and help to bring our large areas of unsettled, fertile lands under cultivation, thereby providing traffic for our railways and a home market for our manufactures. But of what avail will it be to place these newcomers on the land if those already settled there are unable to make farming pay?

If hon. gentlemen do not care to listen to farmer members, they might at least listen to the opinion of Sir John Aird and try to visualize the conditions that would cause him to make that statement. To bear out the correctness of his view, I propose to show the chances that an immigrant going on the land has to-day compared with the chances which we had ten years ago. I have here a statement containing the prices of four implements which any farmer must own if he is going to make a living on the land. The prices are for 1912 and 1922 respectively, and I want to tell hon. members how many bushels of wheat it took to buy these implements in 1912 as compared with 1922. First of all, comes a gang plow—

The CHAIRMAN: I would draw the hon. member's attention to the fact that the item under consideration is for salaries, and I am afraid he is getting dangerously near the point of his remarks becoming irrelevant to this particular vote. I do not wish to interrupt the hon. member in the midst of his address, but there is the danger to which I have referred.

Mr. COOTE: I am quite willing to bow to your ruling, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: I am not giving a ruling. I am making the suggestion that there may be some danger of irrelevancy.

Mr. COOTE: Well, Mr. Chairman, I notice that this item asks for an increase of $25,000 for outside salaries. I do not think there is any sense of our increasing this vote unless the committee is prepared to change the policy under which the country is retrogressing at the present time, and for that reason I think that anything which bears on the chances of success of an immigrant is relevant to the discussion. But I am quite willing to bow to your ruling, Mr. Chairman, if you will so rule.

The CHAIRMAN: I am not making any such ruling. I am merely suggesting that it is quite possible for the hon. member to go too far in the illustration he is about to give

in support of the position he takes in regard to the policy of the department. But if he wishes to make his illustration and draw an inference from it there can be no objection.

Mr. COOTE: The statement I have prepared is made up from prices of implements which I obtained last October from the manager of a wholesale implement warehouse in Calgary. The prices of grain which I have used in this calculation I secured from the United Grain Growers of Calgary. They are the prices which prevailed at Cayley where I happened to sell my own wheat. These are the average October prices. In 1912 a gang plow could have been purchased for 142 bushels of wheat; in 1922 it would take 210 bushels. A single disc drill, 20-run, could have been purchased in 1912 for 220 bushels; in 1922 it would take 301 bushels. An 8-foot binder could have been purchased in 1912 for 264 bushels; in 1922 it would take 386 bushels. A Moline wagon and triple box could have been purchased in 1912 for 158 bushels; in 1922 it would have cost 256 bushels. Taking the total number of bushels to purchase these implements, we find in 1912 it would require 784 bushels, whereas in 1922 the amount would be increased to 1,153 bushels.

I have also worked out in pounds of prime butcher steers the purchase price of these same four implements. I shall only give the totals because I do not want to unnecessarily take up the time of the committee. In 1913—I could not get the figures for 1912 in this case—taking the average November price on the stock yards in Calgary, 8,560 pounds would be required as against 19,831 pounds in 1922. If the price of cows were used, the comparison would be much more startling, as choice cows were quoted: November, 1913, at $5.35 per hundred pounds; in November, 1922, at from $2.25 to $2.50 per hundred pounds. I have another statement showing the number of bushels of rye it would have taken to purchase a threshing outfit in 1914 and in 1922. In this statement the price used for rye is the average price from 1910 to 1914. To purchase a separator with 40-inch cylinder, it took in 1914, 2,775 bushels of rye, and in 1922, 4,445 bushels. To purchase a 40-horsepower tractor in 1914 it took 7,017, bushels and in 1922, 9,181 bushels. To this 1922 price, sales tax of 2¼ per cent would have to be added; it is not included in this calculation.

A great many farmers, particularly in western Canada, make most of their purchases from mail-order house catalogues. I have made up a list of articles which the immigrant coming to this country might order from Eaton's or one of these houses. There is quite a list of articles, from implements to clothes and shoes.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. COOTE: Mr. Chairman, before the committee took recess I was warned by you that I was liable to get out of order by reading certain statements. I do not wish, of course, to have any disagreement with the Chair, and I will try to limit these statements as much as possible. I think, possibly, I did not explain sufficiently why I wish to present these statements. If I might refer again to the statement, which I think was made by the minister in Ottawa some time ago, in reference to the difficulty in which the farmer finds himself, I want to show why it is so difficult for the farmer to exist, and to argue from that that the immigrant coming to this country would have a hard job to exist. The reason for that, Mr. Chairman, is this: The farmer is in a class by himself to this extent; he can only purchase what he needs for his living by the products which he raises on his farm, and I was endeavouring, through the statements I was presenting to show that the produce of the farmer had lost in purchasing power compared with ten years ago. One reason why I do that is because the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Manion) said here a few days ago that:

> Before the war tariffs were not ruining the West, the West was getting along fairly well; and as soon as the conditions respecting prices, particularly of eastern products, get back where they should be the farmers of the West will prosper, there will be no ruining of the East to help out the West or vice versa.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to refer hon. members to a statement made in 1911 by the right hon. the leader of the Opposition who was then the member for Portage la Prairie. As reported at page 1931 of Hansard for that year he said:

> I do not say that a reduction will, to any very enormous extent, affect the price—

That is the price of agricultural implements.

> —I believe it will materially, and I think it will render some relief to, particularly, the farmers of the West, many of whom, notwithstanding any statements that have been made here, are struggling between success and failure every hour.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if many of the farmers of the West were struggling between success and failure some ten years ago I want to try and give this House an idea of the position those farmers must be in to-day. I think

I will be in a position to show that the man who was struggling ten years ago is in such a position that he will almost have to cease to struggle. I will not read the list which I referred to before recess, except to say that this list covers quite a lot of articles that are required by every immigrant and by every farmer. In making this list I have taken from the catalogue to which I referred a similar article in almost every case or if not similar, one as nearly similar as it was possible to find, and I will give you very briefly the purchasing power of a farmer's produce in buying this list of goods in 1912 as compared with 1922. To purchase this list in 1912 would have taken 795 bushels of wheat; to-day it would take 1,132 bushels. If he purchased this list with the proceeds of his barley it would have taken 1,386 bushels in 1912 and in 1922 it would have taken 2,075 bushels. If he purchased this list with oats it would have required 1,816 bushels in 1912, and to-day 2,490 bushels. If he purchased it with the proceeds of his steers it would have taken 8,430 pounds in 1912 and in 1922 it would have taken 20,511 pounds. If he purchased it with the proceeds of his fat heifers it would have taken 9,580 pounds in 1912 whereas to-day it would take 29,058 pounds. There is one bright spot in the farmer's market to-day and that is the price of hogs compared with ten years ago. Hogs are now about $2 per hundred pounds higher than they were when I made this list out. Nevertheless it would have taken but 7,520 pounds of hogs in 1912 to purchase this list of goods whereas in 1922 the amount required would be 9,686 pounds.

I could give some more statements along that line but I do not want to occupy the time of the committee unduly; I simply want to impress upon hon. members the position that the agricultural immigrant is going to be in when he comes here as compared with the position which we homesteaders were in ten years ago. If the position is as I have tried to describe it, through the medium of these statements it seems to me that it is economic folly to spend money to bring farmers here under present conditions. Surely no intelligent class of people can be induced to invest their money in agriculture until such times as there is a possibility of securing at least some small return on the investment made. Nevertheless I do not wish to give the committee the impression that the situation is hopeless. We can still produce as much as we ever did and we are willing to do it if we can in turn get our living out of farming. Even if we were producing without a profit, but simply not making a loss, I would be willing, for my part to go on producing. I do not think it is wise at this time to spend a lot of money trying to bring immigrants into this country, particularly if it is imperative that they shall be agriculturists. We already have settlers from every country from which we can hope to secure these immigrants; and if you make the people who are now here satisfied, and provide for them better conditions than in the countries from which they came, they will send word back to their friends and we will have a satisfactory flow of emigration from other lands into this country. But we cannot get immigration unless we make conditions better.

The next question which would naturally arise is, how is this to be done? How is the cost of living going to be brought down to where the agriculturist of this country can purchase his living with the produce of his labour? Let me give one example to show how we are suffering from high prices as compared with the price of our own produce. I sold my wheat this year for less than a cent-and-a-half a pound. A few months later I had occasion to buy some rolled wheat and was charged eighteen cents a pound for it. That is a serious condition of affairs surely, when the price for rolled wheat is twelve times higher than the price of the whole wheat itself. Surely it is time for the manufacturers of this country to take some notice of that fact. If I might again quote from Sir John Aird's speech at the annual meeting of the Bank of Commerce:

> The cost of our manufactures cannot indefinitely continue to be higher than the farmer and the majority of the consumers in the home market can afford to pay. Not even a revival in foreign trade, unlikely as this appears to be on a large scale in the near future can avail to benefit us if the cost of what we have to sell is higher than in other countries as well or better situated with regard to foreign markets than we are.

He goes on to say that both capital and labour must co-operate in seeing that costs are reduced. It seems to me there is no body of people in Canada who could bring about a reduction in the cost of living so soon as the bankers themselves if they would do it. If they would mete out to the manufacturers of this country the same treatment they mete out to the farmers, we would soon have a reduction in the price of manufactured goods. The banks say to the farmer when he has his wheat produced: You had better sell your wheat and pay off your loan. If the banks would say that to the manufacturer, tell him to sell off his stock of manufactured goods for whatever the market would stand, we would be able to get the goods at a price we could afford to pay. I do not suppose the

banks will do this because in this country the banks are controlled by the same class of people that control our manufacturing establishments. I am rather afraid that the same set of men are controlling this government, and if that is the case, we shall not get much relief. Possibly I am mistaken: I hope I am. I hope that the government before this session closes will by the legislation it brings down, and particularly the budget, show that it is going to secure for the people of this country a lower cost of living. You will find in the 1919 platform of the Liberal party that they believed a lower cost of living can be secured in this way, because that platform contains this plank:

> That the best interests of Canada demand that substantial reductions of the burdens of customs taxation be made with a view to the accomplishing of two purposes of the highest importance: first, diminishing the very high cost of living which presses so severely on the masses of the people; second, reducing the cost of the instruments of production in the industries based on the natural resources of the Dominion, the vigorous development of which is essential to the progress and prosperity of our country.

I would suggest to the minister that he might very well postpone the consideration of these estimates for the Immigration department until after the budget has been brought down. Then we would know whether there was any use spending money trying to get immigrants into this country or not. I am glad he has allowed the second item to stand for some time, and I hope he will see his way clear to postponing consideration of the Immigration estimates until after the budget is down.

There have been so many remarks made during this debate as to the necessity or desirability of filling up the vacant lands in this country that I want to refer briefly to that. I think it is only fair to ask those hon. members who are so anxious to have those vacant lands settled, why they want these vacant lands occupied. Have not the farmers who are here now done pretty well? Is it because we have not produced enough? I have a table here which I would like to present, but I am very much afraid of the Chairman so I will just point out that the production of the farms of Canada last year in grains, field crops, cattle, hogs, sheep and milk totalled $1,399,241,527. You will notice that this does not include fruit and a great many other small items produced on the farms. The value of this production gives no adequate idea of the amount of our production. Let me give just one instance which I have taken from the report of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. It shows that for the year ending March 31, 1921, we exported to the United States cattle to the number of 295,000 odd, at a total value of $21,000,000 odd, or an average of $73 per head, and for the year ending March 31, 1922, we exported 172,981 head of cattle to the United States, valued at $3,980,801, making an average of $23 per head. I hope hon. gentlemen will consider what that drop in the value of cattle in one year from $73 to $23 means to the farmers of Canada. Yet hon. gentlemen get up in this House and ask why our farms are mortgaged. What is the reason for that big drop in values? It is because the farmers of Canada are dependent on a foreign market for the price of their products. The hon. member for Fort William dwelt at some length on the value of the home market. I wish to assure the House that we would like very much to have a home market, but we have not got it. We have glutted it so often that no one can blame us for being very skeptical of the ability of the home market to absorb our products. In spite of the fact that we have not got this home market some hon. gentlemen are anxious to fill up our vacant lands. When that is done, what are you going to do with the produce from those lands? That is the question we want answered, and no one in this House has answered it so far in this debate. I have the opinion of an experienced grain man to the effect, that if we had had this year the same average yield of wheat that we had in 1915 the price of our wheat would be 20 cents a bushel less than it is to-day. Some hon. gentlemen will say that that is a very unlikely thing to happen, but let me tell you, on my own farm this year—I happen to live in Alberta—I had a crop of wheat averaging 34 bushels to the acre. I do not believe any hon. member in this House had a better crop. I have no objection to the Acting-Minister of Immigration putting that statement in the literature which he sends out to the countries from which he hopes to get immigrants. I am ready to back it up with my affidavit.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): What will the hon. member for Bow River say to that?

Mr. COOTE: I will be very glad if the minister will see that he is made acquainted with that fact. But the sorry part of it is that if we all had a crop of 34 bushels to the acre the price of wheat, almost as sure as we are here, would drop down to the price of stock feed. There would be nothing to stop it till it got down to that point. I think it is only a fair proposition that if we are to have our vacant lands filled up with agriculturists, you should at least open to us on

free terms every market that is available. The only foreign market that amounts to much to-day as regards our wheat and cattle is the market in Great Britain. I do not think I need remind the committee that Great Britain to-day is in fairly hard circumstances, because she has an immense debt to pay to the United States; she is largely dependent for her prosperity upon foreign markets, and the markets to which she usually exports much of her goods have had their purchasing power very seriously curtailed on account of the trouble in Europe. I do not wish to stress this point too far, because I think it is an unpopular one. There are in this House many who seem to believe that all we need to do to get prosperity back to Canada is to produce; but we do not have that example set to us by the manufacturers of this country. When they have produced a little surplus of goods, they lock the door; they tell their workmen to stay away until they get some of those goods sold. The farmer has not done that. The farmer has produced to the very limit of his credit, without any guarantee of even seven per cent dividends, and I do not know of any other class in Canada which has done that. In spite of that fact, the only solution that is offered for our difficulties in Canada seems to be to bring in more farmers to compete with us who are already here, because if you can bring in enough to increase our production of wheat and cattle by 30 per cent, you will succeed only in lowering the price. A gentleman whom I met in my constituency who was a member of the former parliament and who is generally credited with being a hard-headed business man, said to me two years ago: "I do not see why farmers complain so much about so many people leaving the land." He said: "The more that leave the land, the better for the rest of you who are left on it." Hon. gentlemen can easily understand his line of reasoning, and that is the line of reasoning adopted by almost every other class in Canada. That is, they want their own numbers limited, but they want the farmers' numbers unlimited. We have heard a great deal in this country, particularly in the last year and a half, about class legislation; but I think this proposal is getting very near class legislation.

I have no objection whatever to immigration. I think every man who is a good, moral, physically sound and decent citizen, should be allowed to come into this country; but I do not think people should be brought in here under false representations, and I do not think the efforts of this country should be limited to securing immigrants of one particular class. That is most unfair. If I were looking at the matter from a strictly farmer's standpoint—and I hope I am not—I would say that what we need in this country is, not immigration of farmers, but immigration of people who will eat what the farmers are now producing. We can produce; I think we are producing almost enough now in this country to feed 20,000,000 people, and we can produce enough to feed an almost unlimited number. We produced in Alberta this year, although Alberta has a bad name, more wheat than the people of Canada can eat. You must find some place to put that produce, and until you do that, why lay the stress on immigration of farmers? I really cannot see the fairness of this, and more than that I cannot see where much profit is going to come from it.

Mr. MacLAREN: Is there nothing but wheat that the farmers can grow? Do they not grow other products as well as wheat?

Mr. COOTE: Yes, they do; but I have given the committee to-night the purchasing power of many things that the farmers produce, and in none of those that I quoted have we got back within even a reaching distance of 1911. I would refer the hon. gentleman to the statement of his leader which I quoted a little while ago, that in 1911 many farmers, particularly in the West, were struggling between success and failure every hour. I would also refer him to the fact that the cattle market is worse than the wheat market, and as regards cattle production, I will guarantee that Alberta, if you give us two or three years' notice, can furnish all the cattle that all the people in Canada can eat. I am not one whit afraid to make that statement. I am going to anticipate another question at this point. I presume some hon. member will tell me that we should make butter; but if all the farmers of Alberta go into the dairy business, they can supply Canada with all the butter that she can eat. I do not think the proposition is a hopeless one. I believe, if every other class in Canada would do as well as the farmers who are now here are doing and have done for the last five or six years, we would soon return to prosperity in this country. But as I said before, the farmer is the only man who has produced to the limit, put his produce on the market and taken what he could get for it. He has hoarded up no farm produce, and very few farmers have hoarded up any money.

The immigration policy of this country has always been, so far as I have any recollection, directed to bringing into Canada more farmers. We had the soldier settlement scheme

in this country to put soldiers on the land. I always thought that was a little bit unfair to the rest of the soldiers, and I am not going to enlarge on that now. But I want to point out that in Canada we have always laid great stress on production in agriculture. We have spent millions of dollars every year on experimental farms and the promotion of agriculture generally, and the emphasis has always been on production. Practically all our efforts have been directed to greater production, with apparently no effort being made to get us a market.

To keep strictly in order, I want to say just a word or two about retaining people in this country. That has been gone over pretty thoroughly; but one question has not, so far as I know, been touched on, and I want to deal with it very briefly. It is in regard to the people who are leaving this country to get rid of their debts. I know I am on dangerous ground as regards this; but you will find, I think, in the minister's own speech, some reference to a certain percentage of farmers who are bankrupt. Quite a number of our people are leaving this country with the idea that that is the only way in which they can get away from their debts. They know they are bankrupt and that if they stay here and should be able to make some money, it is liable to be garnisheed by their creditors. Under present conditions many men, when they go to a trustee in bankruptcy are advised something to this effect by the trustee:

> Before we could undertake to handle an assignment in bankruptcy in this matter, we would have to be advanced the sum of fifty dollars for the payment of preparation of documents, registration and advertising of notices, mailing of notices to creditors and the drawing of statutory declarations. If you are prepared to forward us this amount we shall, upon hearing from you, send you the papers duly prepared for signature.

The only difference is that some trustees will not accept fifty dollars; they ask seventy-five dollars, or maybe more. The unfortunate part of it is that a great many of these people have not even the $50 to hand to the trustee in bankruptcy in order to have their assignment taken over by him. I would appeal to the government to appoint trustees for certain districts, to be paid by the government and to whom a man might make an assignment in bankruptcy if he so desired. I believe that money could be better spent that way than by paying or assisting to pay the passage of some immigrant to this country, because many people who are here already would be glad to remain in the country if they could get some relief from their debts, debts which in many cases have been contracted not through any lack of industry on the part of these people but more by reason of poor crops, drought and so forth. The minister I think will realize the necessity for something of this kind. I do not know whether he will agree with me that this trustee should be paid by the government, but in any case I would invite him to consider the point whether it would not be better to spend money in the way I have suggested than in trying to bring new people to the country. I would call attention to a statement that appeared in the Ottawa Journal last night to the effect that this year's quota of 77,000 immigrants from the British Isles will be exhausted by next month, according to Harry Landis assistant commissioner of immigration at the port of New York. Perhaps it would not be out of place for me to suggest that the minister might arrange with the United States to have all immigrants whom they cannot take in sent here for examination and admittance if they should prove desirable. This article goes on to say that a number of Russian immigrants to the United States have been refused admission, and it might be possible for some of these people to come here if they should prove desirable citizens.

In closing, I would make a suggestion to the government, particularly to the Minister of Finance, (Mr. Fielding) because I think the matter of success or failure of the farmer immigrant lies very largely in his hands. I think his success depends upon his having a lower cost of living and access to a larger market than we have at present. The only large market outside our own to which we have free access is that of Great Britain, and I believe that my hon. friend, if he would do his duty, should give Great Britain free access to our market in exchange. That would help the farming industry in this country more than all the other legislation I can think of that could be brought down at the present time. If the Minister of Finance does anything less than this he will not be doing his duty to this country.

Mr. STANSELL: Somewhere, Mr. Chairman, I have heard the remark "I had not intended to speak on this subject, but it does seem to me that an item of this kind should not be rushed through the House without discussion." I have no desire to embarrass the minister, because I think he deserves sympathy. It has been suggested that no man in Canada to-day could administer his department with entire satisfaction to this House and to the country. I believe that is correct. I do think, however, that it could be administered with a little more satisfaction to the House and the

country than we have promise of so far. I have a recollection that a wish has been expressed by the minister himself during the progress of the debate that he had some of the qualifications of a noted leader mentioned in Scripture. Most of us will readily recall that when Moses was surrounded by difficulties, amounting in some cases almost to rebellion on the part of his followers, it was a common thing for him to take counsel of his brother Aaron; and when I saw the serious and prolonged conference this afternoon between the minister and the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Forke) I wondered whether history was repeating itself. I sincerely hope that this conference between the minister and his political relative once removed, will provide him with that necessary information to enable him to deal with this question with finality next Tuesday.

There is no question that the matter of immigration is of the greatest importance to-day. This is well demonstrated by the interest that has been evinced in the subject during the course of this debate. I must admit at once that it is a question of such importance that had I the ability, I could not deal with it in the limited time at my disposal to-night. However, there are one or two phases of it upon which I wish to touch briefly. Undoubtedly, there is a feeling of nervousness on the part of some interests, and individuals in this country, who take the view that at the present juncture immigration is not desirable in the best national interest. Some have said that owing to Canada's financial situation immigration is not desirable now. This may or may not be true, but I can say without hesitation that, unpleasant as circumstances may be in regard to many lines of endeavour, in regard to many interests and professions in Canada, I still believe that conditions in this country are very much better than they are in any other country in the world, notwithstanding all that has been said to the contrary. There is some apprehension on the part of labour, I believe, that immigration would produce more unemployment, while agriculturists fear that it might result in over-production. The suggestion has also been made to-day that the cause of the trouble is to be found in the tariff. This opens up a large question with which I do not propose to deal. It is possible that my views would not accord with those of some hon. gentlemen in this House, yet I fancy that if we could wipe out our tariff at one stroke conditions in Canada still would not be anything approaching the millenium. While there have been some objections to immigration, I believe myself that in the national interest we do need more people to-day, although I am not prepared to say that immigration should be directed entirely toward the farm. I believe Canada is, or is destined to become, a country almost entirely self-supporting. Therefore we need a balanced immigration. Immigration of this kind would be less likely to disturb conditions and lead to the results that some hon. members evidently fear.

In advancing a few reasons why I personally am not apprehensive in respect to immigration at the present time, may I be pardoned if I mention a few immigrants with whom I have become more or less familiar? During recent years twenty-four immigrants, mostly from the United Kingdom, came here to seek their fortune in a country which they believed provided greater oportunity for their ambition than the Old Land offered. Most of them came without means and without having friends here—practically strangers in a strange land. Yet they have not only made a living, they have prospered to a considerable extent and to-day are in comfortable circumstances, if not in affluence. In adition to that they have been honoured by the constituencies in which they have made their homes, and now ocupy seats in the House of Commons. I should like to know if any one of these twenty-four gentlemen, most of whom are members of the party seated to my left, will get up to-day and say that the country that has so welcomed and honoured them should now put up the bars and say to the world: No one else need apply; conditions are so bad that we do not recommend anyone else to come here.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Does the hon. member suggest that anyone in this quarter of the House has advocated putting up the bars and keeping immigrants out?

An hon. MEMBER: Certainly.

Mr. STANSELL: I did not say so. I asked if any of those twenty-four gentlemen would advocate such a policy. However in attempting to answer the question of my hon. friend, I would say that some of the speeches made on this subject sounded dangerously like the advocacy of such a policy. I am willing to admit that conditions are not as bright in Canada to-day with our farmers as we would like to have them. I am willing to go further: I submit that if we in this House attempt to deal with the question of immigration, or with any other question affecting our national interest, it is of the highest importance that we first try to understand, as far as may be possible, the difficulties under

which each section of the country labours. There can be no satisfactory solution of the problem so long as we each feel that the other party in interest does not know what he is talking about. This question must be approached in the same spirit as all other national questions—a spirit of compromise and sympathy.

I have heard during the course of this debate and in other debates too, a great deal about the wonderful natural resources possessed by this country. Undoubtedly we are greatly blessed in this respect. But, Sir, is there any possible way in which we can even approach the proper development of these vast natural resources without a greater population than we have at present? As this question affects our farmers, let me say there are two opportunities open to men engaged in any line of production, and particularly to farmers. In order to make farming profitable we must secure wider and better markets, or else lessen our cost of production. I believe that the prospects for higher prices in the near future are not very bright. Therefore it is up to us by all means possible to reduce our production costs. I know that in my own section—and surely the same condition must apply to the West—if we had more men on the land wages should be a little lower, resulting in a little lower cost of production than has obtained during the last three or four years. So viewed from any angle a properly balanced immigration should be beneficial to Canada.

There may be a difference of opinion as to how we should proceed to secure such immigration. Personally I believe an immigration policy to be effective should not be spasmodic but should be a steadily continued policy conducted along sound lines. I think the Acting Minister of Immigration (Mr. Stewart) stated in answer to a question that about $269,000 was to be expended this year in advertising. At the moment I do not propose to question the wisdom of this expenditure, but I want to point out a factor that I think is vitally necessary and supplemental to advertising, and that is to see that the quality of our goods is such that our customers will continue to purchase. In other words, no government should attempt to deal with this important question of immigration without bearing in mind these two aspects, each complementary to the other, namely, the desirability of attracting immigration; and the retention of the immigrants so attracted. To attempt to deal with immigration from the one angle alone is in my judgment simply an admission of incompetence. I have a high opinion of the energy of a man who attempts to fill a bottomless pail with water, but a mighty poor opinion of his judgment. Therefore, I believe it is the duty of the government before attempting to stimulate immigration to study first the conditions which cause the loss of immigrants after they reach our shores. No doubt in all countries immigration is accompanied by a certain amount of emigration; and while Canada has suffered from emigration in the past, still I believe lately we have been losing in greater proportion than is consonant with our national welfare. Therefore, while I do not wish to depreciate the value of advertising, no money spent upon it at the present time can compare in results with the money spent on a stamp that carries to the Old Land a letter from a satisfied immigrant. A satisfied customer in this, as in all other businesses, is the best advertisement.

Now, in my judgment this question should be handled entirely by the minister and his department, and not by private enterprise. I have not a great deal of faith in a combination of the two. I have seen the results of immigration to this country due to private enterprise. Circulars depicting conditions in the most glowing colours were distributed in Great Britain and other countries and a very desirable class of immigrants was attracted here, but they were settled in localities where success was practically an impossibility, and the main welcome extended to them was a scramble to relieve them of surplus cash under the guise of supplying them with necessary equipment. They were, in short, bled white by the very speculators who brought them here. The advertising that that class of settler distributes from this country is of the most damaging kind.

There is another class of advertising, of which I speak, perhaps, with some reluctance. We have had during last session and this, a kind of advertising distributed throughout this House and the country by the representatives of the people. I do not for a moment doubt the truth but I do very much question the wisdom of it. I do not know how any country or any business could make a success if in connection with it the kind of advertising was carried on that we have distributed in the last year and a half. If I were engaged in a business, which, as it likely would be at this time, was labouring under financial difficulty, I would not send out salesmen at a salary of $4,000 a year to proclaim everywhere my financial condition, and then have any hope of surviving. I am in sympathy with those who are subject to the conditions that I believe exist in the West, but I am not

in favour of publishing our family troubles to the world, because I believe, as I said at the beginning, that conditions in other countries are worse than they are in Canada. The vital need of the Canadian people to-day is a little more faith in themselves and their country, and an inclination to dwell a little more on the bright spots than is the case at present.

We have heard some very doleful tales with respect to conditions in the West and also in other parts of Canada, but I am sure that we could at the same time make public accounts of outstanding successes on the part of farmers in all sections of the country. I am willing to admit that conditions may not be as good now as they were formerly, but surely in this great country, with all the resources it has, it is not the part of wisdom, it is not the part of good business or good judgment, to advertise to the world that we are in the deplorable condition that some hon. members feel impelled to portray to the committee. There are certain conditions which may accelerate this movement of people from our borders, and it should be the duty of the government to study the whole question from every angle and attempt to apply a remedy. I venture to suggest that if by the exercise of stringent economy there could be a slight lessening of the burden of taxation resting upon the people to-day; if there could be even a small surplus reported by the hon. the Minister of Finance, it would be a hopeful sign that would do a great deal to attract attention to us and bring us a most desirable class of immigrants.

I am not, Sir, a believer in immigration attracted by over-coloured advertising, because that kind of inducement appeals to a class of people—unfortunately, to be found in almost every country—who wish to get rich quickly, who wish to get something for nothing. The class of people we want in this country, the ones who will do the most good, are those who come without capital, if you wish, or better still, with capital, but with plenty of ambition and a determination to work and to succeed. There is room in this Dominion for thousands, yes, for millions of that class of people. Many of them have come to our shores in the past and have succeeded here and contributed a great deal to the building up of our nation, and still more could be accommodated. We need therefore a policy of immigration not based on financial exploitation—or corporationist greed—but rather do we need a national policy based on sound business principles and having in view the best interests and requirements of Canadian citizenship.

Mr. HALBERT: My first word—and you, Sir, and practically all the rest of the members of this committee will be glad, I know, to hear it—is that I shall not detain the committee for more than ten minutes. I had not intended to enter into this dis-
9 p.m. cussion, but I do so now for two reasons. The first is that I thought the minister might become convinced, from the speeches he has heard, that all the hardships among the farmers exist in the West, and observing the yearning and pathetic look on the face of the minister I was afraid he might decide to spend the money asked for in his immigration estimates on the prairie provinces before I could tell him that there were a few farmers in Ontario who were not making ends meet.

The hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Stansell) said that the immigrants who came to this country a few years ago had been bled white. A few days ago I happened upon a Canadian government report giving information on immigration for the year 1881. One paragraph interested me, and it might be of interest to the committee. Speaking about immigrants, it states:

> The sum of £125 sterling, which is in round numbers about $600 of Canadian currency, would enable a farmer to begin on a moderate scale of comfort. That sum would be divided, perhaps, in some cases, with a little variation, as follows.

This is what the immigrant would require:

> One yoke of oxen, $120; one wagon, $80; plow and harrow, $25; chains, axes, shovels, etc., $30; stoves, bedsteads, etc., $60; house and stable, $150; provisions for the year, $135.

A total of $600 to set him up in business on a farm in Canada. To start on a farm to-day requires a great deal larger investment than that. However, those of you who have read the evidence given before the Agriculture committee no doubt noted the reference to the experiments conducted on seventeen farms in my home county—not my constituency, but that of the member who has the honour to sit beside the lady member of this House, the member for Dufferin (Mr. Woods). As a result of the experiments carried on on these seventeen farms it was shown that the farmer in raising beef cattle got 26 cents per hour working 10½ hours a day the year round, Sunday included. Out of that 26 cents an hour he had to pay the rent of his house and meet the cost of all the supplies for his table and the general upkeep of his family. Under those conditions the farmers, of course, did not make any money; at the end of the year,

according to that experiment, he had to draw $460 out of his capital to break even.

I am not going to say that the farmers of Ontario are doing a great deal of grumbling about immigration, but a certain amount of immigration can be used to advantage in that province. They need help on the farm. In some cases it would not be necessary to build houses for the help because on a great many farms in Ontario that are being pastured there already exist empty houses and good houses at that. There is no question about it that the farmers in Ontario to-day cannot get help. On the Toronto train recently I met a neighbour of mine who was going down to the city to hunt for a man. I saw him in town afterwards and asked him how he had made out. "Well," he said, "I got one man who promised to meet me at the station; I am not sure whether he will be there or not. The rest all told me that they would go to the farm just when they could get nothing else to do. They were going to stay in the city a while longer and see if they could not get something there before they would go to the farm."

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am going to say something with which I do not think the committee will agree to the extent they agreed with my first statement. I concur in a great many things that have been said as to what is wrong with agriculture—that is high freight rates, the tariff, and a lot more things are responsible for present conditions. But I am going to mention one thing, which has not yet been mentioned and which may not be popular in this House; nevertheless I think it is time that somebody said it and I am going to be the one. That is one of my reasons for taking part in this debate. Along with other things that are wrong my opinion is that we have too many people in Canada to-day who think that Canada owes them a living. I believe that Canada owes a living to the returned men who are disabled and their dependents; that is one of the responsibilities the war has brought upon us. But I claim that outside of that class Canada owes no man a living who is able to work; it does owe every man a chance to make an honest living. The trouble is we have a class of people in this country who want to work shorter hours for more pay. If a farmer goes to work with his team on the roads he can get $5 a day for himself and his team. He supplies the team, the wagon and the harness. He furnishes the grease for that wagon, boards the team, repairs his harness, and furnishes the whole outfit for $5. He also has to board himself as well as the team. Now, if the chimney blows off his house in a storm and it is necessary for him to get a bricklayer to rebuild that chimney he or his man will have to work with the team, and he will have to board that team and himself, and perhaps his help, for two days in order to pay the bricklayer for a day's work in rebuilding that chimney.

I believe in every person getting a chance to make an honest living. I do not believe, as some do in bringing in immigrants to compete with the farmers in order to produce more potatoes and thus make potatoes cheaper and at the same time keep out artisans for fear they may bring down the wages of plasterers, bricklayers, or other mechanics in this country. I believe it was the hon. member for Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth), who said there were 6,000 unemployed in Winnipeg and therefore we should not bring in any more immigrants. If the present conditions continue we will always have unemployed in Winnipeg and other large centres. If the present Acting Minister of Immigration and Colonization is going to wait until we have no unemployment in Winnipeg, or other cities, before he makes a move he will have to wait until our population is only one-half of what it is at the present time, and perhaps longer. I think the government can change the existing conditions, although I will not dwell on that point at the present moment. The people themselves can change the conditions if they are willing to go to work, but we do not want immigrants who want to live without working. I was surprised to hear even some of the hon. members on this side complaining. When I look at the hon. members from the western provinces in whose ranks I sit I observe practically that one-half of them were immigrants. I think we can also put in that category three premiers of the western provinces. Now, if a carefully selected immigration policy has provided Canada with men of that type, I think that policy has done a great work for this country.

Now as to the class of people that we want, a case was brought to my attention not long ago. A young American came over to a town near the border, between here and Toronto, and rented a garage shop. He paid three months' rent in advance in order to secure the shop and then returned to the other side in order to make his arrangements. This happened last winter. He went back home and packed up his belongings and started with his wife for Canada. But when he got to the border he found that he could not be ad-

mitted unless he would sign a statement that he was a farmer. This he absolutely refused to do because he was an honest man; he declared he knew nothing about farming. The matter was discussed for two weeks, from December 28 until January 10, and then the Immigration department decided to let him enter the country. By that time, however, he had gone back home and started a garage shop there. I think that man would have made a good citizen. In my opinion we might have admitted him to Canada; his entrance into the business might have brought down the price we have to pay for getting our cars fixed.

What do we need to-day in order to boost our cities and towns? We have heard a great deal about the value of the home market; it has been mentioned several times in this debate. It reminds me of a story I heard about a woman who had six boys. She said her boys all made money on a wet day trading in old clothes with each other. The old clothes were all in the family in the morning and they were all in the same family at night. If we consume all we produce how are we going to pay our liabilities abroad and keep out of debt? What is necessary in order to make our towns prosperous—and I think the business people in the cities and towns have not yet realized it—is this: You want a contented industrious Canadian citizen on every one hundred acres around each town in the province of Ontario. As the result of such a policy the business men in those towns will do better, and the manufacturers, the wholesale men in the large cities will ship more goods to those towns, and the whole country will be benefited thereby.

A great deal has been said about our natural resources. We have those resources and we are very proud of them. But if you take a ton of coal from a coal mine you have reduced your natural resources to that extent; if you cut down a tree our forest resources have been reduced by that much; if you take a fish from the ocean, lake or stream, our fishery resources are to that degree lessened; but when you produce from the land, provided your farming is properly conducted, you have not diminished nature's storehouse to any appreciable extent. Therefore what is necessary, as I said before, is to get farmers on every one hundred acres, or you might make it one hundred and sixty acres in the West.

The farmers have not much to do. They only have to clothe and feed and shelter the people of the world—that is all. I said I would not speak for more than ten minutes and my time is about up. How can we help in these conditions? I would say first, that we should relieve the agriculturist of the heavy burden he is carrying at the present time by taking off his back the plutocrat and the profiteer. Mr. Chairman, this is not the wail of an infant industry for protection which we have heard so often in this House. This is an appeal, and an appeal from the mother of industries, that she may be relieved of those whining infants that are clinging to her skirts and have grown bloated. Remove them, and you will help her to recover. I have faith in agriculture. I have faith that she will soon recover, and more than that, I have faith that she will assist the Finance Minister in paying not only the interest on our national debt, but in paying off that debt.

Another thing about which we should think very seriously is this: The time has come, yea, I might say it has passed when the people of this country should live within their revenue. I would go a step further and say that the time has come when the government of this country should live within its revenue. I am a believer in this country. I believe in Canada. I have not lost faith yet.

It has been said that the minister might tell the immigrants whom he hopes to induce to come to this country what they are coming to. I would not like him to tell them all. He might tell the immigrant that he wants to have come out here from the Old Country that we have a heavy debt and want him to help pay it. But do not tell the immigrant's wife that if her husband happens to die she will have to pay a tax on the rough lumber that goes into his coffin. Do not tell her that she will have to pay a tax on his shroud. Do not tell her that she will have to pay a tax on the screw nails that fasten down the coffin lid, and that the man who digs the grave will also have to pay a tax on the shovel he uses for that purpose. Do not tell the immigrant that if his wife should have to make a living by sewing, before she can earn five cents to buy a loaf of bread with, she will have to pay a tax of $13.05 on her sewing machine. Do not tell her that if she has to earn her living by washing she will have to pay a tax in Canada on the washing machine she uses. The minister had better keep these things from them. But he might incidentally let them know that in a few years we may have a Progressive government in this House that will take that tariff off.

Mr. LADNER: I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he has not conceived of this answer from the wife, that she has far worse things to do in the Old Country.

Mr. HALBERT: There is one thing the minister might tell the wife, and that is that when the immigrant passes to the Great Beyond, where no doubt he will be sure to go if he has been on the farm in Canada, there will be no tax on his royal robe up there because the Dominion Textile Company did not make it.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I should just like to quote these few words from Earl Grey:

If Canada will only keep her judiciary pure, her politics clean—

Mark that well.

An hon. MEMBER: What about Moose Jaw?

Mr. HALBERT:

—her administration honest, nothing can prevent her one day becoming the controlling factor in the empire of self-governing nations.

Mr. Chairman, what Canadian would shrink from such a destiny as that?

Mr. HOCKEN: Mr. Chairman, may I first tender my profound sympathy to the Acting Minister of Immigration. I have been somewhat surprised as I have sat here this evening to see how cheerfully he accepts all the objections to his policy. In the first place, he must not bring out any artisans; too many artisans here already. He must not bring out any farmers; too many farmers in the country. If he attempts to bring out any lawyers or doctors or artists or preachers I would not be surprised if the same objections were raised. Nobody wants competition. Everybody seems to be afraid of it, and yet our whole life has to be lived in competition, and the man who is afraid of it, whether he be a farmer, artisan, business man or manufacturer—

Mr. IRVINE: What about magazines?

Mr. HOCKEN: I can say this, Mr. Chairman, in reply, that if there is any one set of people in this country that have shown they are not afraid of competition it is the publishers of magazines. No weaker illustration could have been chosen. Is it not a fact that everybody in this country wants to get away from competition? But if you allow that sentiment to prevail, you will never get any immigration at all. There is not any class of people working in Canada that does not think there are already too many of that class here, and that sentiment has prevailed in this country for forty years. I can go back that far, and a little farther if necessary, but I can remember the complaints that were made forty years ago against bringing immigrants to Canada. Yet every man that comes to Canada, with or without a family, creates a demand for something else that Canadians are making.

I was surprised at the mortuary allusions of the hon. member for North Ontario. You know one can go over the tariff and pick out a whole lot of striking allusions of that kind, but they do not mean anything.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. SALES: Don't they, just!

Mr. HOCKEN: They do not mean anything more than that other striking statement he made that we should take the plutocrat and the profiteer off the back of the farmer. I presume that that was meant to refer to the manufacturers. It it was, I can tell him that the manufacturers are not upon the backs of the farmers to-day. They are on their knees praying for some relief from their difficulties

Mr. GOULD: On the farmer's knees or their own?

Mr. HOCKEN: On their own. They do not get on the farmer's knees to pray. I sometimes think that if the farmers would get on their knees and do a little praying it might do them good. It might at least inspire them to endeavour to acquire that feeling of contentment to which the hon. member for North Ontario referred when he said "What we want is a contented and industrious man on every hundred acres!" He is anticipating the millennium. There is not and there never will be in any part of the world a contented man on every hundred acres in a township. Contentment does not come because a man has so much goods; contentment comes from work largely and from some internal qualities that are not supplied by government. If the men who come out here learn to take what comes to them until they find their feet, they will be an asset to this country just as our fathers were. As regards everybody on this side and most hon. members over there, if they are not immigrants themselves their fathers were. My father was an immigrant; he came out here when he was a young man of nineteen, and nearly everybody in Canada has sprung from stock that came out here as young men to seek their fortunes and to establish themselves in Canada. They have established themselves in Canada. But this everlasting protest against competition is something that we must take account of only to disregard it, and that is the position I take about the matter. There is room in this country for every industrious man with right ideals. He will make a place for himself, and if he crowds some other fellow out, the latter is a man who does not want

to work, or who will not work. It goes without saying that he is not a good, industrious, vigorous man, or he would not be crowded out. We have so many protests from the farmers. I sympathize with the farmers; I sympathize with the artisans; but whom shall we class in comparison with the farmers? The business man or the artisan? Perhaps both. I can tell my hon. friends to my left that if they were artisans working in any big city in this country in a period of unemployment, they would suffer a good deal more than they are suffering on the prairies to-day. The artisans of this country are not half as well off as the farmers who are struggling in this country. They have to go and live on charity if they get out of work too long.

An hon. MEMBER: They do not mind that.

Mr. HOCKEN: The men who do not mind that are no good. There may be some who do not mind that; but if a man has any tittle of self respect in him, he will mind it. The point I am trying to make is this: If the farmer classifies himself in comparison with the artisan, then I say he is a long way better off than an artisan. If he classifies himself with a business man, he is better off than most business men. Farmers think it is an easy thing to go into business and succeed, and they try it sometimes. I have known many men who have sold their farms, worth ten or twenty thousand dollars, and have gone into business where they would have a nice time, just buying and selling. It is so easy to buy so much at such a price and to sell it at so much more, and the record of failures contains the names of hundreds and thousands of men just like those. It is not every man who is fit for business, and even those who are fit for business have difficulties to overcome and problems to solve. They keep those to themselves for the sake of their credit, as the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Stansell) said, but many sleepless nights are caused thereby. The business men of this country have just as much to contend with as our farmers have.

Mr. SPENCER: Does the hon. member know of any business men who have made a success of business, who have gone on to a farm and made a failure?

Mr. HOCKEN: If the hon. member will come to the neighbourhood of the city where I live, I can show him many business men who have undertaken to do farming. Some of them have succeeded and some have not. This depends altogether on the man, and it depends altogether on the man whether he is a good or a bad farmer. If he is a good farmer, he will be successful, and if he is not, he will not. A few years ago, we had a very interesting committee on the cost of living. We had many distinguished men giving evidence, and that committee had a series of stock questions which they submitted. Dealing with agriculture particularly, the witnesses were asked in every case: "Now what is the principal factor in making a success of dairying, stockraising?" and so on. The invariable answer was: "The man." That is the principal factor. We had in the town of Belleville a man running a dairy and making so much money that he asked us not to make him expose the fact. He was taking his cream from Renfrew where a co-operative dairy was running which had never paid a dividend in its lifetime. The man is the factor, and my hon. friends to my left and their friends in Ontario, who think it is an easy thing to go into business and to make a great deal of money, have had their experience in Ontario. If my information is correct, they are gaining some experience purchasing it at somewhat higher prices. Even out on the prairies, some of the co-operative schemes have not panned out because of the fact that the men who are trying to run them are not good business men. To be a good business man one must have capacities that are not found on every farm or in the mind of every artisan.

I was interested and somewhat amused at the speech delivered by the hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Coote). He painted a very gloomy picture. Things were bad because the crop was not big, and even if the crop was big, things would not be any better! Even if all the farmers got 34 bushels of wheat to the acre, that would not make any difference to them; they would not be any better off! That is not the kind of talk we should hear in parliament, and to my mind that is somewhat stupid. Anyone who argues that a man with a good crop cannot make any more than a man with a poor crop, has no basis at all upon which to stand; but that is the argument the hon. member put up.

My hon. friends do not want farmers to come out. The Trades and Labour Council do not want artisans to come out. I believe we ought to have more artisans come to Canada. I believe every man who comes out here creates a demand for the goods that are made by other people, and if hon. members want proof of that, let us take the experience and the prosperity of Ontario farmers adjacent to good-sized towns. Some of my hon. friends flouted the home market. The home market is the most valuable thing an agricul-

turist can have. I was down recently in the county of Prince Edward, and there is not a poor man in the whole county. They have only a few towns but they grow stuff for canning, and that makes them all prosperous. Without the canning factories established there,—those Dominion Canners' factories, about which my hon. friends complain so much at times—the farmers of that county would not have the prosperity they are enjoying. I could take my hon. friends to counties in western Ontario in which are situated good-sized towns or small cities, and there they will find men, with ordinary degrees of intelligence, not only making a splendid living, but putting away a competence through their work on the farm. Farming is hard work, I admit, but it is not as hard as working in a factory. The farmer can work twelve hours outdoors more easily than an artisan can work eight or ten hours indoors and without so much loss of health and strength.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): Are you speaking from experience?

Mr. HOCKEN: Yes, I am. I worked until I was thirty-four years of age indoors and then I got another job and worked outdoors. So I know exactly what I am talking about.

Mr. KELLNER: I would ask the hon. gentleman if he is prepared to submit evidence to the special committee sitting with regard to those prosperous farmers?

Mr. HOCKEN: I have not a catalogue of those farmers but if it is the wish of the committee I can get them the names of men in western Ontario that have made a large amount of money out of farming and who are making good money to-day. And I say that the tariff which is denounced so much by my hon. friends is the reason why they are making money in Ontario. The farmers of Ontario believe in protection.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. HOCKEN: Yes, they do.

An hon. MEMBER: Never.

Mr. HOCKEN: Well, we had that voted on in 1911 when 72 seats were carried by protectionists. That I think is pretty good evidence.

Mr. LEADER: Then how do you account for so many members in this group having come from Ontario, although this party has a low tariff plank in its platform?

Mr. HOCKEN: I will tell you all about it. In the last election in Ontario the farmers were not voting on any public issue.

An hon. MEMBER: How do you know?

Mr. HOCKEN: What they were voting on was whether a farmer would represent them or someone else. The issue of the tariff did not appear in the last election in Ontario; that is not what the farmers of Ontario voted on.

Mr. ROSS (Simcoe): What was the issue? So far as I can remember, the leader of the government of that day made the statement that the tariff would be the issue.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman is quite right. I made that statement, but every other party ran away from the issue.

Mr. ROSS (Simcoe): That was the issue in my riding.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Michaud): Order. The hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Hocken) has the floor, and hon. members have not the right to interrupt him.

Mr. HOCKEN: I still venture to assert, Mr. Chairman, that in the rural constituencies in Ontario it was the occupation of the man and not the tariff that was the issue in the last election.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, no.

Mr. HOCKEN: That is my declaration and you can dispute it if you wish; but I am satisfied from the evidence I have that that is so.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. The subject under discussion is immigration.

Mr. HOCKEN: I will come back to the subject, Mr. Chairman, but I hope you will not accuse me of being the chief offender. I have been forced to step aside from the question under discussion. Now, dealing with the subject of immigration, I might say that our friends to our left have had in power for four years in the province of Ontario a Farmers' government. Are they satisfied with the immigration policy of that government?

Mr. McMASTER: What has that to do with the immigration policy of this government?

Mr. HOCKEN: I am asking the question by way of analogy. I say they have had a Farmers' government in Ontario for four years.

Mr. GOULD: And it will stick.

Mr. HOCKEN: I am sorry to dissappoint my hon. friend, but I can assure him upon the most positive evidence that it will not stick. But, Sir, if this Dominion were ruled to-day

by agriculturists, if the treasury benches were filled by farmers, the government might present a very distinguished appearance, but I doubt very much whether anything more would be done for the farming industry than is done to-day or that was done by the previous government. These hon. gentlemen talk about the necessity for reducing the tariff, in order to encourage immigration. But they know very well that if they sat on the opposite side they could not reduce the tariff, and would not, because they could not get the revenues necessary to run the country. So that all this play on the tariff is purely for home consumption, just as it was two sessions ago. At that time free trade was promised by my hon. friends across the floor; they went out into the West and spoke of how they would give free trade. But my hon. friends to my left know how they gave it to them, and if those hon. gentlemen were over the way they would do no better.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: Give us a chance.

Mr. HOCKEN: I will give you a chance if my hon. friends opposite are willing. In my judgment the best thing that can be done is to encourage the immigration of farmers. I think that farmers ought to be encouraged to come to Canada because there are millions of opportunities for farmers here as compared with any other class of the community. There are millions upon millions of acres of unoccupied lands in the country, and what other class of people could we induce to come who would have such an opportunity of making a living and a competence as those men whom we could put on the farms? I think therefore that this is the right class. I believe, however, that a substantial number of artisans should also be induced to come into the country and that this could be done to the general advantage of the people. One of the ways of doing that is in my judgment to improve every possible means of transportation. I can tell my hon. friends that the immigrants who come in to take up land in competition with them will obtain a greater advantage from the improvement of the transportation system than they will in any other direction. I should like to see the Vancouver and the St. Lawrence routes improved and the Hudson Bay railway built, not because I think it would be a good thing, but because I think it is necessary, to allay the dissatisfaction that exists in the West, to spend that money and demonstrate that the thing cannot be done.

By every other conceivable means we ought to make it possible for the men who come here as immigrants to have that much better chance of making not only a living but a competence within a reasonable period of time. Half the members here already have a competence. There are men sitting on this side of the House who have made a competence in a few years. My hon. friend from North Ontario is a retired farmer. You can go into towns all over Canada and find retired farmers by the dozen. But you do not find many retired business men, you do not find retired artisans. The farming industry is the only one that enables a man to retire unless he has a bee in his bonnet and starts into business, in which event he would soon have to retire to the poorhouse. But so long as he takes care of the money he made in agriculture to keep him in his old age he will be happy and contented and go down honoured and mourned into that wooden box which my hon. friend from North Ontario spoke of—and it will be the last tax he will ever have to pay!

Mr. WARNER: Mr. Chairman, I have been waiting for four days for an opportunity to speak, and have been getting hoarser and hoarser listening until now I can scarcely articulate. Therefore I feel quite gratified that I have the opportunity before I become any worse. I feel that I should almost offer an apology to the committee for attempting to speak to-night, but I shall do my best to make every one hear me, although I do not know whether I shall succeed.

During the course of this debate I have listened to a great deal that I approve of and a great deal that I doubt whether it was wise to have uttered. But at the same time I do not feel that as a member of parliament I should be restrained in saying what I conscientiously believe, so I am not going to question what any hon. member has already said on the subject of immigration. I am an immigrant myself, Mr. Chairman.

An hon. MEMBER: A good one too.

Mr. WARNER: I did not come to this country until I was forty-one years old. I had a family growing up and did not feel that where I lived I was getting ahead sufficiently to provide the kind of home that I wanted my children to enjoy, and I found that year by year it was becoming more difficult to realize my ambition. Therefore I looked around for some place where with energy and the exercise of what common sense I possessed I could get ahead and lay up sufficient to guarantee my children a home. I have done that in Canada, and I do not feel that Canada has treated me so badly, although be-

fore this House last year I expressed the opinion that after living twenty-five years in my constituency it was amazing to me to see some people in the deplorable condition they were in at that time. Now, last year was the poorest I ever saw in that district, although we had enough for the people to eat and enough for our stock. But a country with a record like that for twenty-five years, harvests year after year that provided plenty for man and beast, is not a very bad country to live in. However, we must make conditions that will enable the average man and woman to make good and secure a living on the land, for after all the dearest thing to every man or woman is a home. I think every industrious person should be entitled to acquire a home free from encumbrances—a home that is actually his or her own. All people in my district, I am sorry to say, have not been able to accomplish that. It is only fair to say that they have been handicapped by artificial conditions, which should have been and could have been altered for their amelioration, to some extent by the government, and to a greater extent by the people themselves if they had only seen it that way. And it may be added that during the war we learned to live so expensively that we are not willing to return to the old way again, but I think we have got to do so whether we like it or not.

I do not believe there is a man or woman anywhere in the world who is more entitled to possess a good home than the farmer and his wife. I do not believe there is any more useful couple in this world and a couple more needed at the present time than the farmer and his wife. Consequently I should like to see it made possible for them to be prosperous, and thus bring prosperity to Canada. In my opinion the government could go a long way towards helping along this line. Many opinions have been pronounced on this point, and I expressed my own pretty fully last year, so I shall not repeat them tonight, but I want the government to understand that the people are holding them responsible to do all that it is humanly possible for a government to do to help make the country prosperous at this time.

I have tried to learn to be practical. Now, I know that we are a party to debts that we must pay or repudiate. Once we understand that, then we must act with reason and with common sense. We have natural resources that we are unable to use because there are not enough people here to develop them. Members all over this House say they are not opposing immigration, that they are willing that people should come in. I go further and say that I want to see a reasonable and forceful immigration policy brought into effect. I say that because I believe all our troubles can be better solved with more people here than they can be with the number we have now. The bringing in of more people and the ameliorating of our difficulties through the application of remedies must go hand in hand.

I say to my hon. friends, with the best intentions, that I believe they have gone too far in telling of the difficulties in the West. There is no doubt that these difficulties exist, but they are not to be overcome in a day, in a year, or perhaps even in my lifetime. I want to do what I can to assist in overcoming them, but I do not go so far as to say what some hon. members have said, namely, that we must fix things up here before we can bring people into the country. I believe that to bring people here will help us fix things up. I would not go at that work, however, without a conscience. I claim to have a conscience in this matter, and I submit that we can invite people to come to Canada in the full knowledge that there are undeveloped resources here for them to work with and that they will not need to take those resources out of our possession in order to make good.

There are many hon. members who are afraid of the competition that will be created by those who are brought into the country. Well, I am in favour of having people brought here who are likely to become good Canadian citizens so that they may co-operate with us and help us pay our debts and become a prosperous nation. I would rather do that than say that would-be immigrants must stay out until we get rid of all our difficulties. If I thought that people who come here would not have an opportunity to make good I would not like to ask them to come. When I first came here I was offered so much per head—I did not know very well what it involved at that time—to bring people into the country. I was not willing to do it, because I ddi not know whether or not the people who came in would be able to make good. But having been this long in the country I know something about the natural conditions and I know they are good enough to enable people to be successful. We have problems to solve, and those who come in can help us solve them. I know what the conditions are both in Canada and in the United States. I spent a good many years in the United States; I have relations living there, and I am in close touch with what is going on. It is my opinion that many people who are going to the United States will be glad to come

back here if we do what we can to alleviate our present difficulties. They will find out that Canada is the best place on this earth for anyone who wants to have a home of his own; that he can get it more easily and more quickly here than he can anywhere else in the world. Many people are going to the United States, I know, but they are not going on farms; in fact, they could hardly buy farms there, considering the prices that lands are being held for. Our land in Canada is just as good as the land in the United States; at least, it is in the part of the country in which I live—and I know of the conditions in the United States because I have been from east to west and as far south as Mexico. Hon. members will agree, therefore, that I know what I am talking about.

10 p.m.

It will take a lot of money in salaries for immigration agents to offset what we have heard in this House during the last few days. If hon. members want to make those statements, if they want to deliver speeches of that kind, I am willing that they should do so; I am not trying to control them. But so far as their statements go about the conditions that prevail, I am not going to rest easily until I tell you, Sir, that the conditions are not as bad as that in the constituency that I represent. They may be bad artificially, but the natural conditions, the soil and the climate in the district where I live, are equal to those in the country in which I used to live a thousand miles to the south. Most people are afraid of the winters out in that country. Well, it is my experience that the winter at Edmonton is easier to stand than the winter in Nebraska or Iowa where I lived most of the time before I came here.

Mr. FORKE: Why did you not say Ottawa?

Mr. WARNER: I am not talking about Ottawa just now. I do not intend to talk about any part of the country that I am so little conversant with that I do not know what I am talking about.

I repeat Mr. Chairman, that I have faith in Canada. Canada is going to come out all right, but we may have to put Progressives on the other side of the House before we get things right. I hope our men will agree and work together until we can impress upon Canada the need of the changes that we have been asking for. There are several things that the farmers in the West need, and I judge they are needed in the East as well. One thing we must do is to live cheaper. We must be able to buy cheaply what we need to buy. But before going further I want to say this. I know of farmers living in the West who are buying practically all they need for their subsistence. They do not even cultivate a garden; they do not have a cow or pigs to furnish them with meat. And when a farmer is trying to carry on farming without a garden, or a cow, or pigs it does not look very good to me.

Mr. SHAW: May I ask the hon. gentleman a question?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Michaud): Order.

Mr. SHAW: I merely want to ask my hon. friend a question.

Mr. WARNER: If the hon. gentleman wants to ask me a question that is all right; but if he desires to bother me he is not going to get very far.

Mr. SHAW: I do not want to bother the hon. gentleman I would simply ask him if, under the circumstances, he would suggest the use of oleomargarine instead of butter?

Mr. WARNER: I expect to discuss the oleomargarine question when it comes up later and I would like very much if my hon. friend would lend me his assistance when that time comes.

I was saying that farming without a garden, without a cow, without pigs does not look very good to me. Yet that is what is going on in some districts and it is not the right way to farm. My parents lived in Ohio a long time ago and raised wheat until the soil was so impoverished that wheat growing could no longer be successfully carried on; then they raised a crop of a different character. Later the family went into Iowa and grew wheat there until they could no longer make a success of it and had to turn their attention to raising something else. When I was ten years old I went with my father into Nebraska and we did the same thing there; we raised wheat as long as we could do so successfully, and then had to turn our attention to other crops. I do not think the raising of wheat can be regarded as a permanent agricultural operation, nor do I think that a man engaging in farming as a mere business proposition without any idea of making a home for himself, is a very good farmer. I think that to be considered a good farmer a man needs to go on to a piece of land with the intention of making a home there, of establishing there a place to live in and enjoy life. This argument of mine may sound rather strange to some of you who heard me last year; but

if my hon. friends to my right would only get off our necks and give us a chance, we farmers would certainly make good.

I think the tariff has interfered with the prosperity of the West; and the price of agricultural implements has been a mighty serious thing. It takes too large a proportion of the crop to buy these implements. Then the cost of transporting that crop has also been a very serious factor; and the rate of interest we pay for money is more than the country can stand. I want to tell you another thing, although perhaps some of our members may not agree with me, and it is this: If the labourer is not willing to take what the farmer is able to stand he will have to go without a job and the farmer will have to do without help. That is what has been happening. Last fall I wanted help to do some brushing in order that I myself might do some breaking. I do not like to stand idle. I cannot do as much work on the farm as I used to do; but I want to tell you I have got the necessary courage, and if I can get labour at a price at which I can afford to use it, I will continue to break up the land; I want to keep on breaking the land in order to help to improve the country. Well, I felt that I could not afford to pay the price that the men who were out of work at Edmonton wanted. Now, I do not want anyone to form the impression that I want the labourer to have a poorer opportunity than he is entitled to, or that I want to treat him unfairly; but those men asked me $3.50 a day to cut brush, and I want to tell you gentlemen I did not think I could afford to pay that price. I hired one man at $30 a month and gave him his bed and board and I felt that was a pretty good average winter wage. That man is working for me yet as far as I know. Now, if the labour unions are going to control the labour bureaus—as they are evidently doing to my mind—the farmer is not going to get help out in the West at a price he can afford to pay. The labour man can do as he likes; he can go without a job or he can work, if he is willing to work, for the price the farmer is able to pay him. The farmer, however, cannot pay for labour beyond what his means will permit. I do not know whether the Dominion or provincial government is responsible for these labour bureaus because I have heard that the Dominion and the provincial bureaus overlap, but it is the opinion of the farmers in our part of the country that those fellows who are running the bureaus are more interested in getting higher wages for the men they want to put out than they are in getting labour for the farmer at a price possible for him to pay.

[Mr. Warner.]

Now I am not hostile to labour. I want labour to have a fair chance; but if the labourers are asking the impossible they are just following the example of other people. The banker is to-day asking the impossible thing; the transportation companies are asking the impossible thing from the farmer and the implement men are asking the impossible thing. To tell you the truth the farmer is in a corner and if you ever want to secure a return of prosperity in Canada you have to help him; you have to give him a chance to get out of the corner, pay his debts and possibly make a living. Whenever that time comes, whenever the man on the farm gets a square deal things will improve; because the country is good enough, the climate is good enough, and the soil is good enough; and granted what I have stated the courage of the farmer will be renewed so that he will help to put Canada in the position which she ought to occupy. But everybody else must assume his part of the burden. The farmer has already taken his share—not because he wanted to but because he had to. The farmer sells his produce on the world's market and he cannot raise the prices in that market whenever he wants to; the only thing he can do is to try and keep down the cost of getting it to that market to as low a point as possible.

Now, if our government will spend some money in seeing that the farmers get proper freight rates, a proper rate of interest on the money they need, reasonable charges for what they have to buy all along the line—including suitable tariff reductions,—then I think we will go ahead and prosper. I believe Canada will then come back to her old position; I do not think there is any doubt about it. But all of us must work toward that end. If we do that we shall come out on the right side of the balance sheet. I am ready to support a reasonably aggressive immigration policy. I do not know that I am prepared to back up this bargain with a Canada Colonization Association because I do not know enough about the company's affairs. I never offer criticism when I am not fully conversant with the facts. When I was approached in regard to the matter, however, I had a certain amount of suspicion. Any means that I have accumulated I have had to work for myself; nobody gave them to me. I was simply suspicious about the matter and did not go in. Still the association may be all right. I know of some good men that are in it. Still, that is not the reason I would oppose the government hitching up with this association.

When I came to this country twenty-five years ago the immigration policy in force

under Sir Wilfrid Laurier was one that commanded my respect. I was looking for more land, so as to make it possible for my children to have a better opportunity than I had. When I heard the story of Mr. Bennett in Omaha, under the immigration policy as it was then, I rather doubted, but he persuaded me to come to Canada and investigate for myself. I came and looked over the opportunities, and I want to tell hon. gentlemen that I have always had confidence in that immigration policy since. They did not even tell me all the good things they might have. They told me I would have to work and would not find it a bed of roses, and I came prepared to work. I would rather see the government take full responsibility for an immigration policy. I should like to ask the minister right now if any part of this money that we are voting for outside salaries is to be paid to the Colonization Company's agents in the Old Country or the United States?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No.

Mr. WARNER: Then I am ready to support the government in passing this item if they can prove to the House that they are going to pay competent agents with the money. I know we have to have these immigrants. I know the resources are here for them to develop. I know that we need them. Our debts are already made and we are a party to them. I know that we can compete with the rest of the world in the products we have if we are only given a chance to have the lowest possible rates to the markets of the world. I would rather compete with my neighbour and have him at the same time help me to pay the debts we have made in this country, than compete with him when he lives in some other country and competes in the same market that I do. If, on the other hand, part of the proceeds from the sale of his produce is turned in to help pay our debts, it seems to me that is an important matter to us. If he goes to the United States, perhaps in time they will get enough people over there to use all their own products of the kind we are raising, and we may have an opportunity to sell to them, but that time is not yet. As it is now we have to compete with them, and we are competing with them in the world's markets. I say that I would rather compete with them here at home than compete with them living in some other country.

I do not know that I have thrown very much light on this subject, but I have taken a different view from what some of our members have. I repeat, I want to hold the government responsible for ameliorating conditions as far as is humanly possible, so that we may be in the best possible position to help Canada get back on her feet again.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I may say that I do not feel as keen to speak on this question now as I did about a week ago when the matter was first brought before the House. After listening to the many speeches which have been delivered I am very glad indeed, as I am sure are the majority of the members of this House, that the hon. member for Strathcona (Mr. Warner) in spite of the difficulty under which he labours at the moment has endured until the end almost, and delivered the speech which he did here tonight. I think that it is much to his credit that he has spoken in the way he has. I have wondered often as I listened to the remarks which were delivered in this debate if the speakers appreciated the effect of the words which fell from their lips, and the thought flashed on my mind that we were inclined to forget in this parliament sometimes that we were the representatives, not of a particular constituency or of a particular class, but that every member of the House of Commons was here representing the Dominion of Canada.

As I listened to some of the objections which were raised against the bringing in of immigrants to this country, that it was going to encroach on someone's prerogatives, I thought as I viewed in my mind this vast expanse of territory which we have here with only a few millions of people endeavouring to occupy and develop it, what claim can we advance to justify our monopolizing all these broad acres and all the undoubted resources which this country possesses if there is a congestion in some other part of the world? Surely this is not in keeping with the policy that some of those who objected so strenuously to immigration have been advocating.

I shall not attempt to cover the whole range of subjects that have been touched on in this debate, but there are some features which did appeal to me as requiring some further explanation from the minister and the government. I was not at all surprised that considerable opposition to this policy came from the government benches, and some also from both groups on this side of the House. The question of immigration under present conditions is a very serious and a very vital one to the future welfare of this Dominion. It is, as I think has already been acknowledged by some members of the government, perhaps the most important and vital question that can engage the attention of the government

and of parliament at the present time. I appreciate the difficulties which the minister and the government have to contend with in this matter, and the pressure that is being brought to bear from so many different sources. I believe that any hon. member of this House, if he was left free to act according to his best judgment, would adopt a very different policy from the one that has been placed before us for bringing immigration to this country. I think the policy is narrow and sectional, but it is possibly in keeping with the age in which we are living and the times through which we are passing. I sometimes wonder if the whole world has not gone mad, if something is not necessary to bring people to their senses. It is just possible that the best thing we could experience at this time would be a period of very severe depression in order to bring people back to their senses.

Surprise is expressed in some quarters that the youth of our country are not remaining where they were born and brought up. I do not think any surprise should be exhibited at this at all, because they are the sons of a colonizing race. This is evidently bred in the bone, and one can hardly expect that people of this disposition are going to remain in the place where they were born and brought up, notwithstanding how ideal conditions there may be. We have in Canada the descendants of two great races, and we all believe that we have in this Dominion a great country and that we are going to become a great people. I often wonder if the fact that people of French descent are more inclined to remain at home and not to wander so far abroad is not due to the circumstance that they are not the descendants of a race that has been so historically noted for its colonising proclivities. The Anglo-Saxon has wandered all over the world, and wherever there was a vacant place, you could rest assured he was there, establishing the Union Jack. This is going on to-day, and notwithstanding the fact that many of our young men are going to the United States at the present time, I am sure, as the hon. member for Strathcona has already said, that you will find them trooping back again in the course of a few years, if we only do our duty by ourselves under present circumstances. It is an easy matter at any time to find fault with a government which has to carry on, and it is very easy to find fault with the present government. I am inclined sometimes to wonder why many of the things which we heard about during the general election which took place a couple of years ago, have evidently been forgotten and why no effort has been made to put those policies into effect, if they were going to prove to be such a benefit for our country. I am not, however, going to blame the government for that, because I believe it is in the public interest that they should forget those old platforms of theirs, which they did not take very much stock in themselves, as the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) has several times intimated to the House.

To my mind, the one outstanding matter which is affecting those particularly engaged in agriculture to-day is the enormous quantity of imported produce that is being disposed of in the Canadian market. I noticed the ex-president of the Ontario Agricultural College, Dr. George Creelman, in a speech which he delivered in Toronto a few months ago, stated that last year $168,000,000 worth of farm produce was imported into this country. I am referring to this matter for the benefit of some of my hon. friends to the left who think that some remedy different from the one I propose, should be applied to our difficulties.

But there are other matters that I should like to touch upon, and I am going to point out very briefly the greatest difficulty which we have to encounter at the present time and the one which possibly, above all others, is responsible for our present condition. The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken) referred to the need of competition in order to have proper development. I believe that is the case; when you eliminate competition, you are going to injure somebody in the process and you are going to remove the incentive which is necessary to bring out the best there is in anyone. That rule applies, it does not matter where you go, and one of the most serious things that we have had to face during the past few years is the fact that we have, not only in this Dominion, but in practically every other country, what is known now as organized labour. They have in several instances dictated to the rest of the people of this country who might be termed as labourers more than they in several respects. The effect during the present winter of the attitude of organized labour in connection with the mining of coal has been almost a calamity to this country. It has indeed, been so serious that it has overreached any temporary benefit which they have received, and those who have suffered most have been the wage-earners of Canada. The same thing, I believe, applies with regard to our transportation facilities. The unions took control of the railways of this country during the war period, and they

absolutely made it impossible for the railways to be operated so that the best interests of the country could be served. I point to those as two illustrations to show what happens when competition is eliminated and matters are regulated in that way. This means simply that you have to organize every class upon a similar basis if you are going to put them on an equal footing, and if you do that you are right back again where you started.

As regards the idea that by having the people of this country divided into sections and classes, if you are going to reap a temporary advantage, that can be done only by injuring some other class which is not so well organized as the class which is receiving a temporary benefit. The effect of this is that eventually you get back exactly to where you started. I hope, before we have to go through that whole process, something will be done to stop that course and to make the people realize that the government are going to act on behalf of all the people of this country, regardless of whether they are an organized body or not and able to bring influence to bear upon the government.

A year ago, as I listened to the Minister of Finance during the budget debate, when he was pointing out how he had made certain reductions on some things, I wondered if that was because of the pressure which had been brought to bear, and if no reductions had been made on other items because no pressure had been brought to bear. I merely mention that to show the effect an organized body will have in bringing influence to bear upon the government. I am afraid this is the very thing the Acting Minister of Immigration (Mr. Stewart) encountered in endeavouring to bring about an immigration policy to serve the interests of this country. As I listened to the statements he made on several occasions during the debate which is taking place, he virtually admitted that he was not attempting to do much; in fact, several of his supporters charged him with not having a policy at all. He scarcely claimed that this was a policy; but he was following the line of least resistance, and he hoped to get through in that way. I am afraid such a course will not suit present conditions in this country. I know, as regards the province from which I come, we do not want to steer a middle course by which we shall be subject to the least criticism. What should and what must be done is to meet the demands of this country, and anyone who says that there is no need of more labour in this country; that we have many people out of employment and that until they are absorbed, more people must not be brought into this country, is losing sight of the fact that there are thousands and tens of thousands of opportunities in Canada, works that ought to be carried on that are standing still to-day because there are not enough people here to carry them on. The farmers of Ontario are only half farming; they are not doing anything like what they could or would like to do, owing to the fact that there is no labour available.

Why is there not labour available? It is simply because the labour from the farm goes into the towns where there are abundant opportunities and where wages are much higher than they are in the rural districts. Someone may ask why that is the case. Well, let me tell you what happened a short time ago. Mr. Tom Moore, president of the Trades and Labour Congress, went to Toronto and insisted that the provincial government adopt an eight-hour day for certain classes who were working on government contracts, and that they should pay a minimum wage. This was to apply to all classes of labour except farmers. When he was asked why he did not extend this provision to farm labour he said that this class of labour was in the nature of a family affair and should not come under these regulations. Now, we as a parliament are responsible for fixing the hours of labour for the servants of the people. We were the guilty parties in the first instance in fixing the hours of labour of those engaged in the Civil Service much below the standard of people engaged in any other walk of life. Is it any wonder that others look to us as setting an example of what might be accomplished by organization and pressure? It is generally recognized that the farmer cannot carry on under these conditions, and this has been demonstrated on many occasions. When we adopted daylight saving in this country there was a vigorous protest from the farmers, because undoubtedly it hampered them and made it much more difficult for them to get the necessary labour on the farm. The very fact that agriculture is languishing as it is to-day, particularly in western Canada, owing to the many difficulties with which it has to cope, shows that an abundance of labour is the only thing that can solve the problem. I called the attention of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) during this session, to one article which I thought should be exempt from the sales tax for the reason that there is absolutely no labour to be had in the province of Ontario in connection with its production. And although we may not hear very much of an outcry, nevertheless there is

an insistent demand on the part of the farmers for something to be done in this direction.

The minister (Mr. Stewart) said that so far as Ontario was concerned, the province preferred to keep its office in London and engage in practically the same work as is carried on by the federal government in bringing immigrants to the country. Do the government and the House consider that it is fair to the province of Ontario that it should have to do work of this kind in this way? A number of years ago the federal government undertook to make a disposition of all the immigrants coming into Canada, and the Ontario government gave up the work in which they had been engaged. Ontario was practically neglected because nearly all, in fact one might say all, the literature published and circulated by the Department of Immigration for years back has been devoted to western Canada, while little or none has been published to serve the purposes of that province. The publications issued by the Department of Agriculture itself, which are in the greatest demand by well-informed people in the Old Country when they are seeking information in regard to this country, contain so little with regard to the province of Ontario that intending immigrants receive no encouragement from that source to come to that province. This is a matter I have endeavoured to press not only upon this government but upon the previous government on numerous occasions. I may observe that I am referring to the reports in connection with the experimental farms of this country, from which you will find that there is practically no effort being made to do justice to the wonderful possibilities we have in that province.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Let me inform the hon. gentleman that in conference with the provincial governments I offered, as I am prepared, to distribute literature of any sort, which any province thinks will be of value to it, through all the agencies of the federal government. I did not suggest that the Ontario government should close their office in London, but I do think that it would be a saving of expenditure if all the outside work were carried on by the federal government.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: The history of immigration work in Ontario is just as I have endeavoured to point out. The work was handed over to the federal government in 1902 and for a number of years they controlled it until the provincial government were finally forced to adopt the method to which I have referred and establish their own agencies in the Old Land again. At that time there was a conflict, because while the federal government were paying a bonus of $5 to the booking agents for every immigrant booked to Canada, no commission was given for any immigrant sent to the Ontario government's agency. This was the case until 1908 or 1909, when the Ontario government again entered upon this work in the Old Land. And if they do not see fit now to give up their office and agencies the reason I think is obvious. Now the minister says he is prepared to print literature for the province.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The hon. member has mistaken what I said. I said I would distribute literature for the provinces; and even if the government of Ontario cares to maintain its office, as I am quite willing that it should do, it may use every federal agent we have to advertise the province.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: The fact that immigration comes within the scope of the federal government and not of the provincial government would justify the Dominion in giving impartial treatment to all the provinces. I doubt whether there is in the whole Dominion a place which is so well adapted as Ontario for the bringing in of immigrants, particularly if they lack the experience to start on their own resources. They come into Ontario, however, and after they have obtained some degree of experience the fall excursions for farm labourers are advertised all over the province and these people go to the West and engage in harvesting. Many of them see great opportunities of obtaining cheap lands and they remain out there. I venture to say that tens of thousands of those who have come to Ontario have gone out in that way.

Now, the minister has entered into an arrangement with an organization known as the Canada Colonization Association. I remember seeing this matter featured in the press for a considerable time past, and it struck me as propaganda that was being carried on with an object. When I saw that it was to be purely for philanthropic purposes I became somewhat interested and wondered how it was that such an earnest effort was being put forth. I followed the proceedings as carefully as I could and noticed that the minister had announcements to make from time to time with regard to government policy. A year ago very little criticism was offered because the government had not been in office very long. But owing to the fact while the war was on there was practically no

immigration to Canada, and that during the past year immigration has fallen off by some 90,000 as compared with the previous year, it was undoubtedly a warning to the government that some effort should be made to meet the situation.

The minister has stated that the Canada Colonization Association has had a rather stormy career lately. In fact from his remarks I rather gathered that he himself was somewhat dubious as to the wisdom of continuing the arrangements entered into with the association. It was characterized by the Prime Minister as a welfare league composed largely of hon. members of a political persuasion opposed to his own, and I was wondering if that was one of the reasons which accounted for his apparent anxiety to favour the association. Certainly to do so would be something unusual. I may say that so far as I am concerned I do not know who are at the head of the Canada Colonization Association, nor am I aware what their political faith is, and I care much less; but I do say that when the government undertake to vote large sums of money to be handed over to land agents with a view to bringing immigrants to this country and placing them under the control of the Soldier Settlement Board, they are leading those people to believe that the government are to some degree at least officially responsible for the treatment which these immigrants are accorded. I shall not go into the history of this association at length because it was dealt with very fully before. When the minister (Mr. Stewart) first brought the matter up I put several questions to him, and it appears now that I was right in the conclusions I had arrived at on that occasion because what I said then has not been since contradicted.

When the Prime Minister pointed out that Sir John Willison had resigned from the presidency of the association owing to the criticisms which were being levelled at it, he asked to have some confirmation from the two groups on this side of the House as to their attitude towards the association. Letters were read by the Prime Minister, and he endeavoured to draw the conclusion that their writers were in favour of such a policy as had been advocated by the government. I do not think that conclusion could be reasonably drawn from those letters, for the very fact that the association had received them for that purpose would to my mind bring them under suspicion. If the association are in a position to do what they claim, if, as their papers indicate, they have been organized purely on a voluntary basis without any idea of making a profit then they ought not to resort to these methods.

Let me quote a few articles from the Toronto Globe of September last dealing with this matter. On September 2, 1922, the Globe contained this item copied from a Winnipeg paper:

> S. W. Jacobs, M.P., continued his criticisms of the King government's immigration policy and his advocacy of the private ownership of the government railways before the Winnipeg Liberal Association.

On the same date the Globe contained the following despatch from its Ottawa correspondent:

> Progress is also being made in formulating an aggressive and prudent immigration policy, and Honourable Charles Stewart, who has had this in charge, has his program about completed, and it was discussed to some extent at to-day's cabinet meeting. It will likely be dealt with again to-morrow by the cabinet, and it is understood that next week the plan for stimulating immigration of the better class of people to this country will be made public.

On the 11th September the Globe had this announcement on its front page, headed "Ministry discloses plan of importing needed citizens."

> Careful selection of agriculture workers. Canadian Colonization Association will work in conjunction with British overseas settlement officials, federal and provincial co-operation—

This was evidently the policy which the government decided to adopt on that date. On the following day the Globe contained an editorial headed, "The peopling of Canada", in the course of which the following appeared:

> The Canadian people will approve both the aim and method of the federal government's new immigration policy, etc. The services of the Canadian Colonization Association, an organization backed by private capital, which has been a long time mapping out the field for immigration to this country and will have the financial support of the Imperial government, will be employed in the location of settlers.

I should like the minister to inform the committee what financial support this association is receiving from the Imperial government.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I will give my hon. friend those particulars when the item comes up for discussion.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: The item, as I understand it, is for the outside immigration service?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: And this is a matter under the control of the outside service?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No, it comes under the next item, No. 53.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: The article in the Globe would make it clear that this association is receiving financial support from the British government. Now, it will be observed that not a word is said in these articles in regard to the bonus which was being paid to the association by the government. The people have been misled by the government not divulging the whole scheme. Let me ask why this information has been kept back until the item comes up in the estimates. The minister states that this is not the item. This item is for the outside service in connection with immigration, and therefore this business must of necessity come under those officials, or else it is being handed over holus bolus to this association without any control whatever by the department. I hope the minister does not imply that some control will not be exercised over this association?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I made a statement in the House this afternoon that I had not full information and that vote 53 would be delayed until that information was forthcoming. We are discussing vote 52 which deals entirely with the employees of the government.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Outside?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Outside. It has nothing to do with the organization my hon. friend is discussing.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: The outside employees must of necessity be the field officers, and consequently must come in touch with this work.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No, no. I have tried to make it clear to my hon. friend that those dealt with in the $700,000 vote are practically all civil servants. No activities of the association come under this particular vote; they are covered by the next vote, No. 53, which we propose to leave open.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Then there are evidently two systems: The machinery for carrying on under the old system is still being retained; and this is entirely aside from anything connected with the present system.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Mr. Chairman, it seems almost hopeless to get my hon. friend to understand. I made the statement the other day that we had been giving grants to the Salvation Army. But we do not interfere with the army in the handling of those grants, and that has been the practice of the department for years. They are working in the same fields in which our agents are working—employees of this government, and the same applies to the Canada Colonization Association. The money—I will deal with the matter when the item comes up—is given them by way of grant as well.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: The grant to the Salvation Army is in view of work which they are carrying on, well known services that they have been rendering. In the other case there are conditions attached that do not apply in the case of the Salvation Army. If, therefore, there is no check by the officials provided for under this item, I do not see how there can be otherwise.

On September 16 the Prime Minister is reported to have delivered a speech at Stouffville, in North York. The report says:

> Mr. King spoke at some length on the immigration policy. He said that Canada must get quality and not quantity in immigration, and the plan of co-operation between provincial and federal governments had been worked out. We are determined that we in Canada should say who would come and who should stay out. Conditions as they are discouraged many who would be good citizens in better times, he said, adding that there had been organized in Canada the Canada Western Colonization Association, which would sell lands on thirty-year terms and would look after settlers. The government would work in co-operation with the association, choosing and bringing out settlers, and having the association look after them.

This statement clearly indicates that the policy had already been shaped and that a contract had been entered into with this company. You will observe that these three statements were made in September. As late as November 17 the Globe reports:

> Hon. Charles Stewart will disclose immigration policy within ten days. A comprehensive plan of immigration will be recommended to the government of Canada within the next ten days by Hon. Charles Stewart, Minister of the Interior, according to an announcement he made at the Kiwanis Club luncheon to-day, following an address by Lord Shaughnessy.

The intimation is made that another policy is to be brought down. I direct attention to the fact that the Prime Minister, speaking months before, intimated that a policy had been formulated and was to be put into effect, and later the minister himself intimated at this luncheon, if he is correctly reported, that a new policy was to be brought down. On December 27 the Globe has another article, as follows:

> Light Immigration Canada's Prospect. No dearth of suitable persons agree to come, but they need assistance; expense too great. In the meantime the government is just doubling its activity in publicity in both the United States and the United Kingdom, including both advertising and lecture work.

Not a word about a subsidy or bonus being paid to anybody; but there is an intimation that the activities of the government are not to be nearly as extensive as the people were led to believe they would be from former

articles appearing in this government journal. On January 7 there is a fresh report from Winnipeg as follows:

Sir John Willison, in a letter addressed to all directors and made public here to-day, announces that his resignation as president of the Canada Colonization Association was due to the fact that he had no voice in settling the details of policy.

I wonder if the reference to "details of policy" involved a conflict between Sir John Willison and the government, or was it in regard to the directors of the company? Perhaps the minister can give the committee some information on that subject.

11 p.m. We were assured that it was largely owing to the fact that Sir John Willison was at the head of this organization that the government entered into the arrangement with them; yet here he states that he had practically no voice in settling the details of policy. The report quotes his letter as follows:

"A short experience of three months has forced me to realize that I cannot give adequate attention to the affairs of the Association." Sir John's letter states "Since I have had no active relations to the association when its funds were subscribed, and have no voice in settling the details of its policy, I am sure that my withdrawal should not affect its interests or prospects unfavourably. I desire that my resignation should take effect January 2nd, 1923.

This comment is made:

The new Canada Colonization Association, with a commendable programme and a useful future, is apparently suffering from internal dissension.

It is difficult to understand why the government, in view of these unexplained circumstances, should allow this company to benefit from the bonuses they are being paid and the commissions they are receiving from the land owners whose lands are placed with them. These lands are listed with the company for a period of five years, on the understanding that when a sale is made it shall cover a period of thirty-two years. If any hon. member was offering his lands under these circumstances, would he not fix the value at least 25 per cent in excess of what he would otherwise accept? Yet the settler is being brought in in this way, and the Canada Colonization Asociation is to receive ten per cent commission.

This matter may be dealt with more specifically under a subsequent item, but as the first item is the one upon which the general policy of the government is discussed, it is only fair that these things should be cleared up. Before any item is passed we should have a clear statement from the minister with regard to this company, particularly with reference to the points I have mentioned. The arrangement is unfair to the prospective purchaser. It will bring discredit on the people of this country if sales are made under these conditions. Land agents as a rule have not a very high reputation. They produce letters asked for by leaders of groups in this House, with a view to bolstering up their case and establishing their claims upon the government. Moreover, the very name of the organization is misleading; when the people know that the Soldier Settlement Board are co-operating in the matter, they will believe the whole thing is part of the machinery of the government for placing the people on the land. Much of this land is held by speculators. It is the first duty of the government, not to look after those who are holding these lands, but to protect the interests of those who have invested their money in lands for agricultural purposes and are endeavouring to carry on under very difficult conditions. Probably the best thing that could happen to this country would be for those people to be forced to relinquish their control of these lands at a reasonable price, so that settlers could obtain them. If this policy proposed by the government is dropped I am satisfied that these lands will be purchased much more cheaply than they will be through the means provided for under the proposal which the minister has announced to the House. I would again remind the House that the arrangement with this association is of such a character that the outside employees of the department must of necessity be allied, in some sense, with the association if any control at all is to be exercised over it. The statement has been made in the press that $40,000 have already been paid to the association. If such is the case I think the minister should fully inform the committee with regard to it.

I do not intend to take up any more time at this stage but I would like to point out what is happening in the far western end of the province of Ontario at the present time. In the Ottawa Journal this morning I read the following:

Young Canadians rushing to Detroit

Eighty families a day reported crossing Border

Windsor, March 21.—Lured by high wages, hundreds of young Canadians are emigrating to the United States. According to the railway and ferry companys no fewer than eighty families a day are entering the States at Detroit. On one train arriving here this afternoon from the East there were forty-five young men who said they were on their way to Michigan industrial centres. A majority of the men are between 25 and 40 years of age. Most of them came from Toronto, Hamilton and other cities of eastern Ontario. Lack of work and prospect of high wages, they explained, induced them to leave the Dominion, More than half of the 45 are mechanics connected in some way with the building trades.

If it is a fact that there is a reluctance on the part of anyone to undertake any building or construction work in Canada under present conditions, that is a serious matter which should receive some attention. There is a need for inspiring capital with confidence, a confidence which is lacking to-day. To such an extent is that the case that I believe it is absolutely imperative on the part of the government to adopt much more stringent regulations respecting those who endeavour to hamper and restrict people in legitimately carrying on their business in Canada. An effort is being made along that line. We have heard statements made here during the present debate which I am sorry to think should ever be made by members of the Canadian parliament. One can see what the tendency and the drift is, and I believe the responsibility resting upon the government is such that they cannot afford to follow along the line of least resistance. They must face the conditions with courage, and deal with the situation in a statesmanlike manner. Then those people with capital will be inspired by that feeling of confidence which is necessary in order to enable them to go ahead and develop the natural resources of this country.

Mr. McBRIDE: Mr. Chairman I do not think I will take up the time of the House by emitting a wail of distress such as we have become accustomed to hearing from this end of the chamber. I do not think that the people of Cariboo sent me here to brand Canada as an undesirable country for citizens of other countries to come to. Those who entertain such an opinion of Canada would do well to leave it. I do not think there is another country on the face of the earth which holds the opportunities that Canada does for a young man to make a start in life. Some people advocate increasing the population as a remedy for the situation complained of. Others say: Do not increase production. Twenty-seven years ago I was farming down at the mouth of the Fraser river. At that time we were selling hay, baled and loaded on the barges for $5 a ton, and selling potatoes for 25 cents a sack, and we were not complaining about hard times either. There were a few agitators going around the country and calling out for lower production, and saying we must not raise so much hay, and oats. To-day there is six times the amount of feed raised at the mouth of the Fraser river and the Delta, and in British Columbia generally, and we are getting $30 a ton for our hay and $20 to $25 a ton for our potatoes. This country will never be what nature intended it to be until we have a population of from twenty-five to thirty millions. There is no reason why Canada should not support that number of people. One hon. member made a statement about the "better element" in this corner of the chamber. That hon member is not here now but I would like him to inform us who is the better element in this section of the House.

There is one thing to which I would like to draw the attention of the minister. It has been stated that in all likelihood army officers would come and locate in Canada. I may be wrong in that impression; if so I stand corrected. What I am going to say has no reference to any of our Canadian army officers that served overseas. No person in this House entertains a greater respect for those men than I do. The army officers to whom I refer have spent the greater part of their lives in the Old Country and I think they are a very good class of people to steer clear of. I have known of a number of these officers who came out to Canada and settled on the land; and really it was pitiable to see their efforts to try and make a living. Through no fault of their own they were greatly handicapped from want of experience in trying to carry on farming. Indeed they are a class of people that we can ill afford to bring to this country, but if the minister has some easy and well paid jobs around Ottawa that he wants to fill by all means let him bring these men over and install them in the positions.

I am opposed to assisted immigration. If any young man, healthy and strong, comes to Canada and cannot make a start for himself we do not want him; I do not think Canada is the proper place for him. One hon. member during the debate spoke of a man who came from the Old Country without any money whatever and who is now sitting in this House as a representative of the people. There is another man who came to Canada without a dollar in his pocket and he is also a member of this House.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. McBRIDE: If a young man cannot come to this country, make a good start for himself and go ahead I say we are better off without him. Consequently, I would give no assistance to any immigrant that comes to Canada; I am opposed to it in every way.

An hon. member made the statement that it was a love of society and a desire to have a good time in the city that caused people to flock to the large centres of population. Well, if I want a good time I start for the country; you can have a better time there than you can anywhere else.

An hon. MEMBER: Out at the country club.

Mr. McBRIDE: The country club is a mighty good place to go to. Some hon. members have spoken during this debate for an hour or more and have concluded by saying they had no suggestions to make to the government. Well, I think I will make a suggestion or two to the government before I conclude. The first suggestion I have to make is in connection with advertising. I hold in my hand a book bearing the names of the Minister and Deputy Minister of the Interior and dated 1918. This is some of the advertising that the former government sent out, in connection with the Peace river country:

The Peace River district contains an area of over 115,000 square miles. Its charming climate and scenery, so long famed by legend and mystery, has been proven a reality. Our keen searching trials and tests have proven it to be all and more than it was ever represented to be.

The climate is excellent. The air is pure and bracing—in the winter clear and crisp, and in summer dry and balmy. Extremes of temperature, sudden changes, and severe storms are very rare, with little snowfall and few winds. Blizzards are unknown, but the mild chinook winds occasionally sweep through the mountain passes from the warm Pacific.

Seeding usually begins in April, sometimes in March. Most of the rainfall occurs in June and July. The average precipitation for the full year is about twelve to thirteen inches.

The summers are remarkable for their long days and short nights. For three months there is almost continual light. The days are warm, but the heat is not sultry or murky.

Harvest commences about the middle of August. September is an especially pleasant month.

The climate need not be feared. Taken the year round, it is healthy and pleasant.

The soil is rich and easy to till. Flowers and vegetables grow with wonderful energy, and spread cheer and profit alike.

There are many large islands along the Peace river, and these are all thickly wooded with fine straight spruce.

I am only giving a synopsis of the advertisement sent out. I might also state that the gentleman who handed me this advertisement said he got it down in Tennessee, and he is now up in the Peace river country:

Seams of coal are exposed in the Rocky Mountain Canyon above Hudson Hope, of excellent quality and higher grade than most of the western Canadian coals.

Now I want to draw the attention of the committee specially to this:

Railway construction is in progress. Location has been carried west as far as Pouce Coupé, and it is only a matter of time until the steel will be laid across the prairie and thence through the mountain passes to give an outlet to the Pacific coast.

That is what I consider a contract between this government and the people who went into that country. I can take it in no other light:

Much of the country is still unexplored, but many millions of acres of fertile lands are known to lie in its valleys, and untold mineral wealth beneath its hills. It holds out very alluring promises for the future. Railway surveys have been projected from the south and east, and railway construction is in progress.

Another promise on the part of the government to the people of the Peace river country:

Much water power is available. Fish and game are abundant. The scenery is magnificent, and the summer seasons very delightful.

Homesteads have been located about Fort St. John. On the flats wild grasses and peavine grow in great profusion. The land is excellent, and very heavy yields of grain and vegetables are harvested every year on the homesteads already taken up.

Then comes another promise from the Dominion government to these people:

The government of Canada offer all resonable inducements and assistance to encourage the development of this great Peace River district. Progressive steps have been taken to open it up by establishing lines of communication and transportation.

I may say that it is essential to the life of these people that they get railway transportation. Something over two thousand people have gone in on the strength of this advertisement. Will this government carry out its solemn pledge to them? I am not finding fault so much with the old government, nor indeed with this government so far. The old government had the aftermath of the war to deal with, and this government has practically only got settled down and got the Railway Board appointed. But I think it is the duty of this government to give these people the railway facilities they are entitled to, and the railway facilities which this government pledged to them when they went into that country and settled there.

During last session I was asked a number of times to take this question up with the government but I refused to do so. I said that I would first go into the country and see it for myself, and at the close of last session I spent the great part of the fall in the Peace River district, and I have not one word of fault to find with that advertisement. I think there is a country there second to none in Canada, and although I travelled through it day after day I did not meet one person during that time who felt that he had any fault to find with the climate or with the soil. All they asked for was railway transportation. I went from granary to granary all through that vast country and saw hundreds of them, with two and three years' crops of grain and no way of getting it out. Some of them had their grain in stacks, and could not get money enough to thresh it.

On the train coming out with me were seven men and a bank manager. I wanted to get all the information I could, and of course

I was interested in talking to these men and learning what I could from them. I asked the bank manager why he was leaving. I asked him if he had got a promotion. He said, "No I am leaving that country because I think I had better leave it than go crazy in it. How can I stay in that country seeing what these people are up against, and that I am expected by the bank to make collections? I believe I would be locked up at New Westminster if I stayed there much longer. I am going out without instructions," he added "and I expect to get discharged." He was taking his wife and family out with him.

Each of the other seven men was the head of a family, and had left his wife and family in there to look after the cattle and winter as best they could. They were going out to try and earn a little money to buy clothing for their families. Four of these men went down to Seattle, two of them to work in the coal mines there, one of them to drive a team, and the other to work on the wharf. They said they had some friends over there and thought that they could get a job. Now what is this government doing? These men will work there four or five months and make a little money to buy clothing for their children. They will buy the clothing over there, and on their way back this government will collect a tariff on that clothing. These men go down there to earn a few hundred dollars to clothe their families and if they buy the clothes over on the American side where they can get them cheaper they will have to pay this government about thirty per cent in the way of tariff on those clothes. Is that the way to encourage settlers in this country? Is that the way we are going to treat them? They came here on the strength of this advertisement issued by this government. They are making good. They are the best class of people I have ever had the privilege of meeting. Some two or three hundred of them went over and fought our battle overseas. They went in and settled in the Peace river country on the strength of this pledge made by a minister of this government to give them railway facilities. What is this government going to do about it?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: A minister of the previous government.

Mr. McBRIDE: He was a minister of the federal government, at the time he made this promise. I was talking to a minister of this government the other day and he said that the difference between this government and the government of the United States was that in the United States one government did not pretend to carry out the pledges of its predecessor, but he said in Canada they did. Under these conditions I say that this government is in honour bound to give these people railway facilities with the least possible delay. They went in there in good faith. They have carried out their share of the contract. What is this government going to do about it?

I do not want to take up too much time, but I have a petition here representing some two thousand settlers. They ask for a line to start from Prince George and to run into the Peace river country. This would be a matter of only about 200 miles, and it would open up that country. I venture to say from personal inspection of that country, if it had railway facilities, inside of ten years from 50,000,000 to 100,000,000 bushels of wheat would be raised there. That is something the government wants to look into. The government is talking about bringing in immigration. There is a district in which not one person, all the time I was there, had one complaint to make about the climate, crop conditions or anything else. One man to whom I spoke said that a crop failure was unknown. He had been there for thirteen years, he said, and this year came the nearest to being a failure of any year since he had been there. He had as fine a crop of wheat, oats and barley as I want to see grown anywhere. The country is a splendid one, an empire within itself, and yet those people, after they have gone in there in good faith, are tied up and cannot get transportation. Now, it is up to this government to furnish them with transportation. If this government sends a commission there to investigate conditions, and if it is found that any word in that advertisement and the statement I have made to-night is not correct, I do not ask them to do anything; but I think they will find what I have said more than verified on investigation. Therefore, it is up to the government to build a line, in my judgment, from Prince George into that district. This would put those people within 667 miles of Prince Rupert, which is undoubtedly one of the coming cities on the Pacific coast, and it is up to the government to do everything it can to develop freight for its lines going there. It would also bring that country within 892 miles of Vancouver, and all the government has to do is to build about 200 or, at the outside, 250, miles of line. I have had a railway expert go and investigate the situation, and he says that such a line could be built for $35,000 a mile. I would ask the government to investigate the matter and try and make a start at the earliest possible date.

Mr. JELLIFF: It is not my purpose to take up very much of the time of the committee in entering into this debate. I have been sitting here for almost a week now in the gloom and shadows of this chamber and I felt that it was up to me to bring in a little gleam of sunshine from sunny, southern Alberta. We have heard a good many complaints from this side of the House in reference to conditions surrounding the farmers of this country, and I regret to say that most of those complaints are well founded. They are true; they are absolutely true from investigations which I have been able to make. But at the same time, we must ask ourselves the question, as fair-minded and reasonable men, members of this House of Commons, a great deliberative assembly: Where in the world can we go and not find similar or even worse conditions? We have come through a great war, and the situation in which we are placed, to my mind, is to a large extent the result of the losses of men and of treasure which we sustained during that great conflict and its inevitable reaction. I doubt whether any one of my farmer friends sitting to my left to-day, for whom I entertain the utmost respect and affection, could, at this time, plant themselves down in any other agricultural country in the world and find better conditions than exist right here in Canada, bad as these conditions are. We are here to try to help correct those conditions; and when I review the whole situation as best I can, looking the world over, I must conclude, when considering the matter of immigration to this country, that there is not another country on earth where incoming men who are honest, who are industrious, and who possess a fair share of intelligence, stand a better show of making a livelihood than in Canada.

I am going further than that, and I am going to say here to-night that, looking Canada over as a whole, I know of no province in this country which can offer better opportunities than the province of Alberta from which I come. I came into Alberta as an immigrant twenty years ago There was not a railroad in my neighbourhood; I journeyed part way to the land which I had selected, on what we called a narrow-track or turkey trail railway, and in those twenty years I have seen that country fenced up all around me. Those lands which formerly were the exclusive home of the ground squirrel, the coyote and a few straggling herds of cattle are now the homes of hundreds and thousands, I am going to say, of prosperous and successful farmers. I have seen school districts blocked out, schoolhouses built, churches built, towns and cities grow up, all the institutions of civilization placed in our midst, and the building in the three western provinces of one of the greatest empires on earth.

I am going to give the committee something from the records of our own provincial government—I am not going into it very far—just to indicate what Alberta is, what it has been doing during the last ten or fifteen years, to show it is a proper place for bringing in new settlers who have an honest intention to earn a fair living for themselves and their families. In the matter of grain, according to records which I have from the Alberta government, we produced in that province in 1909, 8,467,799 bushels of wheat, and in 1920, 83,526,901 bushels of wheat, or nearly ten times as much. As regards oats, we produced in 1909, over 24,000,000 bushels; in 1920, over 115,000,000 bushels, and in 1921, 92,000,000 bushels.

As regards barley, we produced in 1909, over 3,000,000 bushels, and in 1921, over 12,000,000 bushels. Passing from that to the cattle industry, let us see what took place. In 1910, the figures given as to cattle in Alberta are 672,709 head, and in 1921, 1,854,202, a tremendous growth and development. Our dairy products sprang from $7,855,751 in 1910 to $34,000,000 in 1920; our creamery butter rose from $2,315,000 in 1910 to $11,821,291 in 1920, and so on. The number of dairy cows in the province increased from 94,671 in 1910 to 423,838 in 1921; while the number of horses increased from 254,197 in 1910 to 916,510 in 1921, and swine from 237,510 to 574,318.

Now, these are some real facts in reference to what we have produced. True it is that in late years, with these great productions and with the market conditions such as they have been in the world at large, we have not been able to obtain a fair reward for the money invested and the labour put forth in agriculture in that province, and in the other western provinces. But I do not believe that that is a reason for us in Canada to stand by and let matters drift. I do not believe that the people in this country outside of this House of Commons would approve in any measure whatever of our taking an attitude of that kind. I believe that people are looking for an immigration policy; I think they are fully sensible of the great extent of our territory and the immeasurable richness of our resources, agricultural, mineral, fisheries and timber. They are looking to us to inaugurate policies in regard to immigration and otherwise which will result in such a development of these immense resources that Canada, within a reasonable period, will attain that position of

influence and power and usefulness among the nations of the world which Nature and destiny intended she should fill. I thoroughly believe that and I feel that it is our business to promote that end. And it all has a relationship to this immigration policy.

I am heartily in favour of immigration. I do not believe there is a member in this House who is not in favour of it; I do not believe there is a member here who does not want to see this great heritage of ours, this magnificent land with its resources developed to the utmost. I believe we all are anxious to see steps taken that will bring about that result. Speaking for myself and for the district in which I live I must say that we are very anxious to have immigrants. Nothing would please me better than to see the Acting Minister of Immigration (Mr. Stewart) set down 2,000 good reliable farmers in my district of Lethbridge to-morrow. We have passed through as difficult times as any district in Canada, and I believe worse. But outside certain localities in connection with which a mistake was made in earlier immigration policies, and where we had no business to place settlers without having made proper preparations, I believe that we can give every man who wants to come in and farm a good opportunity to make a fair, square living for himself and his family. Our people are persevering and gritty and they are determined to win. They have set aside and hypothecated great areas of land in my district to the extent of eight or nine million dollars, to be devoted to irrigation projects, and I am quite sure they will win. When they get these projects settled up and in operation there will be few failures in that part of the province, nor, I trust, any further misery or suffering. Now, it is sometimes well for us to see ourselves as other see us. I hold in my hand a letter I received two or three weeks ago from a young man who settled a few years ago in my immediate neighbourhood. Before coming out into our part of the country he was a book-keeper with T. Eaton and Company, his wife having been a stenographer with the same company. He had been brought up on a farm in Ireland. He came and settled down in that neighbourhood and made a success of farming in every way. This letter, which is written in beautiful handwriting, is dated February 23rd, and reads:

Dear Mr. JELLIFF,

In view of the discussion on immigration in the country, in the press and in parliament I am sending you a clipping from my home paper in Belfast, Ireland. It is the concluding article of a series in which this clergyman describes his trip from Belfast to Pennant, Saskatchewan and return. He is a man of considerable standing in his community,—the minister of probably the largest Presbyterian church in Ireland,— and if you will read his concluding remarks you will see he is very favourably impressed with this country. I understand it was the custom of the Immigration department some years ago when they were going after immigrants seriously to send over to the Old Country Canadian farmers during the winter season to tell them over there the actual conditions on the farm in Canada; and knowing your intimacy with the Hon. C. Stewart—this is complimentary to myself—I thought possibly you would use your influence on my behalf in that direction.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. JELLIFF: You can "oh, oh," at this all you please, gentlemen, but here is a man who is as honest, as honourable, as conscientious, and as successful a farmer as any that sits in this House to-night.

Of course, all the world knows the unsettled condition of Ireland, and lots of young farmers are at the present time anxiously considering the question of going overseas. As you know, I am familiar with conditions in each of the prairie provinces, both city and country, as I have been in Canada fifteen years, coming direct from the Old Country to Winnipeg in 1908. I can address public meetings if necessary and point out in a convincing manner the advantages the country offers to the settler, and have no doubt I could secure a considerable number of immigrants from the farms under present conditions in Ireland.

My people are farmers over there and have occupied the same farm for ninety-eight years, so that I am thoroughly familiar with farming conditions on both sides of the Atlantic.

This is a man from my own district who changed from a clerical occupation and is making a marked success of farming. He wants to go over to his native country to spend the winter time there and bring over men in the spring to settle on farms in Canada.

Now I am going to read the concluding paragraph of the clipping to which he refers, written by the pastor of one of the largest churches in Ireland. This is from the eleventh of a series of articles he has written with reference to Canada. He came over here to investigate conditions in order to satisfy himself. He had heard a lot about Canada, his people were looking this way, and he wanted them to know the truth about the situation. He says in conclusion:

At the moment there are a good many of our young people turning their thoughts anxiously and inquiringly to the Dominion of Canada. The present industrial depression and the uncertainty about the future of our country have made many wonder if emigration would solve for them the problem of the coming years. If my articles will have helped anyone to decide the question of whether or not they should seek a new home in Canada, then one of the purposes for which they have been written will be served. For my own part, I would say that if they decide to go they will find a land of hardly touched wealth and of many opportunities, a land that is producing men and women of industry, intelligence, and resource, a land in which they will be proud to dwell.

I know what hard knocks are on the farm. I came to Canada twenty years ago knowing little or nothing about farming. I presume I have had harder knocks on that account than the man who comes here even with a limited amount of experience in that occupation. I have seen hard times, and I doubt if there is a man in this chamber who has had more and harder financial burdens to bear during those twenty years than I have. But all through that period I never lost one iota of my faith in the future greatness and destiny of Canada. I am determined to make a win yet on my farming venture, and I believe other men are equally determined. I have seen the wonderful growth and development of agriculture in western Canada—a development such as has never been seen in any other country in the world within the same limited time. We should have hope and we should take courage from that fact.

Now as to this immigration policy. I do not like it. I want to see immigration, I want to see this country filled up. I want to see our great national debt paid, I want to see a stop put to these great railway deficits; but I am doubtful, sincerely doubtful, even if this Canada Colonization Association should be all right, whether it is going to obtain the results that we have in view. I do not think the immigration policy of the minister goes far enough. I do not think it is comprehensive enough. What does he propose? He is going to bring in, I take it from the plans that have been outlined, farmers, farm labourers, domestics and children—very commendable so far as it goes, but it is doubtful indeed if that is going to answer the purpose which I have no doubt the minister has sincerely in view.

The bringing in of children as a philanthropic enterprise is commendable, but it will be years and years before such immigrants will be able to give any appreciable help in the payment of our national debt or in decreasing our railway deficits. Then take the next class, the domestics. I cannot see with any stretch of my imagination that they are going to contribute materially towards paying off our national debt. If what I have seen of them in my life is still charactertistic of this class, most of their resources will be spent in mimicking their mistresses and possibly in a rivalry as to which can wear the shortest dresses both at the top and the bottom. But, I repeat, I do not believe they will contribute materially towards the payment of our national debt. And the same with the farm labourers. They will help somewhat on the farms to increase the amount of grain produced, but when it comes to the income tax and to furnishing freight for our railroads they are not going to be a very important factor. Then the last class, the farmers themselves. As I have stated, there are great burdens on our farmers and we want to give them the best possible outlook. This plan of bringing in farmers is a marked admission on the part of the minister as to the relationship of agriculture to the general welfare of the country and to the dependence that we must place on it. But he is proposing to increase the number of farmers. He admits that the farmer is the backbone of the country. But we are not going to carry our debt any easier by lengthening the backbone, for the longer you make it the weaker it will be unless adequate props are provided to sustain it, unless it is strengthened, unless it is energized, unless it is rendered more effective—and there is nothing proposed here to this end.

What I should like to have announced here in this connection is the general policy of the government, which should be dovetailed and fitted in with the immigration policy, whatever it may be, to ensure its success and to accomplish the purposes we have in view. As it is now, we are looking to immigration to lift this load by increasing the number of farmers. In other words, we are asking the tail to wag the dog, instead of relying on the more natural action of the dog wagging the tail.

Now, there are certain things that must go concurrently with this policy to render it effective and successful. The first is that we must lower the cost of living and the cost of production. Remove that burden from the farmer and you will remove much of the cause of his complaint. I know of nothing better this administration could do than to dovetail the policy outlined in the platform on which it was elected in with its immigration policy. Let them come out with the courage of their convictions upon which they secured their present place in this parliament, and they will do more to contribute to the success of immigration than anything else they could attempt. Take the burdens off the necessaries of life and the implements of farm production. Go further and take the tariff burden off the implements necessary for the development of our natural resources.

Another matter that should be taken up with a view to rendering the work of the farmers effective is the equalization of freight rates. In my own province we have a rate of 15 cents a bushel on wheat from Lethbridge to Fort William, a distance of 1,177 miles, while the

rate to Vancouver, only 774 miles, is 15.8 cents a bushel. It is costing us $1.95 a ton more, on an equal ton mile basis of rates, to get to the coast than to Fort William. When I went into Alberta my friends said to me: "The trouble is that you are too far from your market." I said, "Well, I expect the day soon to come when I shall be able to ship my grain to the western coast," and I have been waiting for that all these years, hoping and praying that it would come, not only for my own benefit but for the benefit of the farmers generally in my province. In my district we raised 22,000,000 bushels of wheat last year—63,000,000 bushels in the whole province. If we had had an equitable rate to the West the farmers of Alberta would have saved $3,500,000 on their wheat alone. In my own district we would have saved a million and a quarter. That means something to the intending settler; to bring about an equitable condition in freight rates would give added strength and sinew to the men who are already toiling in the fields out in that country. The government has it within its power to remedy that defect.

Another difficulty we are labouring under is connected with our system of financing. We need a system of financing adapted to the requirements of agriculture, a system that will provide us with money on the terms necessary to enable us to mature our products and put them on the market in an orderly way. It has got to come. Some such system prevails in every agricultural country that we are competing with. It is but a few years ago that a farm loan mortgage system was introduced in the United States. During the war the United States had to back up its farmers by advancing them millions of dollars through their War Finance Corporation. Then came the slump of 1920 and 1921; the War Finance Corporation was reinstated and there was distributed within a few months through that corporation $470,000,000 for the relief of cotton growers, corn growers, live stock producers and the sugar beet industry of the United States—in fact, only that could have saved them from utter collapse, Europe not being able to take her supplies as she had taken them in former years. By holding back their surplus and letting it go on the market as its absorption became possible they raised the price of cotton from 8 to 20 cents a pound and the price of corn from 20 to 45 or 50 cents a bushel. That increase was not an undue burden upon anybody; it was the fair average value of the product. In this country it should be part of our policy to bring about some orderly method of marketing our farm products so that we may avoid slumps and frequent losses by putting the products on the market as they can be readily absorbed. Europe cannot take larger quantities than she requires for short periods; they are not in a position to buy in advance, because of the demoralized condition of their finance and exchanges. The right hon. leader of the Opposition, for whom I have so much respect, would, I am sure, pretty nearly agree with me in regard to some of these things, and I am confident that if the government took action along these lines they would have his hearty support and the support of hon. gentlemen to my right as well as of my hon. friends to my left. It is not simply a question of dollars and cents; we have to spend money here to make money. I doubt whether we can get our country back into shape without going further even into debt than we are today. We must put our producers in such a position that they shall be able to pull the load.

I believe from the bottom of my heart that the future of this government depends on the prosperity of the agricultural industry. If agriculture succeeds, prosperity will permeate to the very top of our industrial and commercial structure. As I sat here to-night thinking, my mind went back to that good old first Psalm that I learned at my father's knee. It presents to my mind a picture that I would like to look upon as a vision of our own country in the future. The words I have in mind are these:

> And he shall be like a tree planted by the rivers of water, that bringeth forth his fruit in his season; his leaf also shall not wither; and whatsoever he doeth shall prosper.

I like to think of Canada as a great oak with its roots buried deep in the soil, developing into a magnificent tree under whose branches the war-weary of the world, the industrious, the ambitious, the worthy from all lands can find opportunity, peace, comfort and plenty.

Mr. SPENCER: Mr. Chairman, at this late hour I do not intend to take up the time of the House any longer than I possibly can. The reason I am speaking now is that my hon. friend from Lethbridge (Mr. Jelliff) informed me that he would not occupy any more than ten minutes. I have enjoyed his speech very much, although I cannot agree with a great deal of it; and I must say that if the hon. member has no better idea of the conditions in Alberta than he has of the lapse of time I think he must be astray in some of the statements which he made. I, too, am an Alberta

12 m.

man and very proud indeed of the fact. I realize that Alberta is one of the coming provinces of this Dominion. I realize that probably in fifty years she will be the banner province of Canada; I have not the slightest doubt that in time that will be her happy position. I do not come from one of those districts we have heard so much about where only wheat growing is carried on. My constituency is located in what is almost entirely a mixed farming country so that I am in a position to speak from no extreme point of view.

We have heard a good deal this evening as to the number of hon. members on this side who came over as immigrants and are now occupying seats in this chamber. All I can say is, that a few years ago they must have been particularly careful as to the kind of immigrants they admitted into this country! A black picture has been painted from this side of the House in regard to agricultural conditions. In those instances where hon. members who have taken part in this debate have spoken enthusiastically of agriculture and have painted a rosy picture; I notice that in nearly every case the hon. member is not a farmer. As to the few hon. members on this side who have painted a more or less rosy picture, I know full well that if they dared they would use much blacker colors. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe in painting too black a picture of anything, neither do I believe in painting a rosy picture when there is no cause for doing so; I believe in stating facts. I want to approach the consideration of this question entirely from a business point of view. I wish to lay a few facts before the House and see whether it is in the best interests of the country that we should spend large sums of money in trying to bring people to Canada. The hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Stansell) speaking a little while ago said that if he described conditions as some of the members to his left had described them, he would be afraid to go back to his constituents for re-election. I want to say that those hon. members who have given a true picture of the conditions have a far greater chance of returning to this House at the next election.

Let us see for a moment what the population of this country was in 1871. I am not going to bother the House with a lot of figures but those figures I am going to quote have been very carefully checked and I need them for the purpose of proving my argument. In 1871 we had a population of 3,689,257. The immigration to date has been 5,099,692, and the natural increase 3,931,125, making a grand total of 12,720,074. Now according to the census of 1921 we have a total population of 8,788,483 which shows a loss to Canada in the intervening time of 3,931,591. During that period we have spent no less a sum than $30,000,000 and yet have lost nearly 4,000,000 people from this country. Now, the question is one of horse sense: Is it worth while going on and spending money in trying to increase the population? Or, should we first of all try and find out why we are losing population so rapidly. This year the immigration estimates call for an expenditure of $3,386,190, or an increase over last year of $1,316,490. I do not want the House to think for a moment that I am opposed to immigration of a proper sort; I do not believe that a single member on this side has taken the stand that they do not want any kind of immigration. Personally, I am very much in favour of an immigration of the right sort, which should be entirely voluntary but selected. There is an old saying in the army that one volunteer is worth five pressed men. In my humble opinion one volunteer immigrant is worth five pressed immigrants who are attracted to this country by highly coloured literature and spoon fed for two or three years after they get here. What would we think of a farmer who is a horse dealer as well, who buys horses in great numbers and turns them into a large paddock and, as time goes on finds he is losing his horses, and instead of trying to discover the gate that happened to be left open, simply buys more and more horses to keep up the number? We would think he was a fit inmate for the asylum. And yet Canada has been losing her immigrants by the thousand, she is losing them to-day at the rate of ten thousand a month; and at the same time she is leaving the gate open and spending more and more money to buy fresh horses to put into the paddock.

I am not going to take up any time criticizing the business connection of the government with the Canada Colonization Association; I think that phase of the subject was very fully dealt with by the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens). However, I would like to consider a few reasons why people are leaving this country. You do not find people that are contented with their lot leaving a country; you do not find men leaving jobs if they are satisfied. We cannot get away from the fact that the people are going from Canada. You may talk all you like about looking on the hopeful side of things, and about Canada being a great country; but as long as people are leaving the country in a continuous stream it must be evident that something is wrong.

There are several reasons why that exodus is taking place, and I am going to give some reasons why people are leaving western Canada. Then you will know that something is wrong. The people are leaving this country for several reasons. I am not going to give the reasons why they are leaving the eastern part of Canada. I will leave that to the eastern members who are quite capable of looking after that part of the country, but I am going to give some of the reasons why they are leaving the West.

They are leaving western Canada, for one reason, because of the unjust indirect taxation they have to bear. Western Canada is paying the full price of an artificial tariff and is not getting any benefit from it. Furthermore, we are taxing through that indirect way the family man. We are making it more difficult for families to be brought up in this country because of the high cost of living. At the same time, on the other hand, we are doing all we can to spend money to bring children into the country!

Another source of criticism that we have in the new Canada is that for many years past, from fifteen to twenty years, railway construction has been promised in various parts of the West, and those railways have not been built, with the result that you have thousands of settlers who went into western Canada, just like the settlers we were told about this evening who went into the Peace river country, who to-day after years and years of waiting at a distance from the railway are getting disheartened, are getting tired of the governments not keeping their promises, and they are pulling out in great numbers.

Another reason why they are leaving is because of the great overhead, particularly in freight rates, and very much so in the province from which I come, because we have an unjust freight rate against us in getting to our nearest seaport. They are leaving also because of the unjust system we have had in regard to the financial monopoly they have had to do business with.

If the government will relieve us of a little of the indirect taxation, will carry out the railway construction they have promised us for so many years, if they will give us a reasonable freight to the coast, as is our due, if we can get financial institutions that will not hold up the western people for nearly double the rate of interest those institutions charge in other parts of Canada, I think there is some chance of keeping the people in western Canada.

We have heard a good deal of the need of bringing people into this country. I am going to read just one or two resolutions from the people of western Canada who are on the soil where you want to place these new settlers who are coming in. The following resolution passed through a large convention in Alberta:

> Resolved that the United Farmers of Alberta in convention assembled go on record as being opposed to any Canadian moneys being spent for the bringing into Canada more farmers (under present conditions).

Here is another resolution:

> That this convention very much disapproves of the whole Western Canada Colonization scheme, and calls on our government not to give it any financial support.

Here is a resolution I had from a municipality in the West:

> That the Minister of Immigration use his influence to obtain finance for operating a long term loan for farmers now in residence; making it possible for those now engaged in agriculture to remain on the land, in preference to bringing in new immigration.

Here is a letter I received the other day from a district that, as the writer says, is not the worst part of Alberta. He says:

> This is not the worst part of the country by any means, but there are a great many families through here that are nearly destitute of the bare necessities, and I saw children at the meeting in our school house the night of the 26th February who are really suffering from lack of food and clothing. Hope the government can be made to see the wisdom of looking after the people we have before aiding immigration.

Some hon. members may think this is rather a light subject, but I assure hon. members of this House that this is a very serious one, and if some relief is not given to that western country we are going to hear a great deal more from them.

Before I close I would just like to sum up the views of some members of the cabinet with regard to agriculture. We find the Minister of Immigration (Mr. Stewart), for whom personally I have the greatest sympathy in his arduous task, turning to a real estate agency, more or less, for the policy he is trying to carry out.

We find the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Robb) allowing the farmers of western Canada to be held up for millions through unjust freight rates on the Great Lakes, and then possibly on account of the indignation arising throughout that western country, deciding to get out of the way by taking a trip around the world.

We find the Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock) has no more sympathy for Labour than my hon. friend the member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken) has for the Knights of Columbus.

We find the Minister of Agriculture last year making the statement on the floor of

this House that in his opinion farming could not be put on a commercial basis.

We find the Postmaster General refusing to give any help or support in providing rural mail delivery routes in western Canada. I do not know what action has been taken in the East, but an entirely deaf ear has been turned to the demands of the settlers in the West in that respect.

I sometimes wonder if the Premier himself has any idea of the feeling in western Canada. I thought that the very fact of western Canada sending down a group of members entirely separate from the old parties would at least show that there was something doing in the West. If that was not enough, I would have thought that when he tried to get a cabinet minister a position in western Canada, he would have wondered what was wrong when he was not successful. He probably did the wisest thing. He chose a man who was very popular indeed, who had held a very high position in the province, and yet in spite of those advantages we find that he ran up against a water-tight combination. He ran up against that because the people of western Canada have made up their minds that they must have some relief, and if the same thing had been asked of the other provinces I have not the slightest doubt he would have had the same answer. The opposition was not against a personality. It was because the people there have made up their minds they want justice. They have simply got to have relief. If that is not sufficient handwriting on the wall the near future will give us more.

I cannot, therefore, Mr. Chairman, support the estimates as they are presented. I cannot even support the item that we are now discussing. I cannot do so for this reason; I think it is far more important to Canada to alter the economic conditions of the West, and also of agriculture in the East to enable us to keep our own experienced men, who have been with us ten or fifteen or twenty years on the farm, than to let them go out and fill their places with green and untried settlers. I therefore beg to move the following amendment to the motion before the Chair:

That item 52 of the Immigration and Colonization estimates be reduced to the sum of $675,000.

The same as it was last year.

Amendment negatived.

Item agreed to.

Chinese immigration—salaries and contingencies, $60,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I suggest to the minister that considering the success he has had in getting over a really serious hurdle, he do not ask the House to wait longer to-night. This is an important appropriation, and I know there are quite a number who would like to discuss it, some of whom are not present. No progress will be made by going on with that item. The minister has asked himself that the second item, No. 53, stand, and I do not see what he hopes to gain by going on.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King, the House adjourned at 12.25 a.m. Friday.

Friday, March 23, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

LIVE STOCK ACTS AMENDMENT

Mr. KAY presented the fourth report of the select standing committee on Agriculture and Colonization, as follows:

Your committee have had under consideration Bill No. 10, to amend and consolidate the Acts Respecting Live Stock and have agreed to report the same with amendments.

INTERNATIONAL LABOUR CONFERENCE

Hon. JAMES MURDOCK (Minister of Labour): I beg to lay on the Table of the House the authentic texts of the Draft Conventions and Recommendations adopted by the International Labour Conference (League of Nations) at its third session held in Geneva, Switzerland, October 25-November 19, 1921.

Under paragraph 5 of article 405 of the Treaties of Peace.

Each of the members undertakes that it will, within the period of one year at most from the closing of the session of the conference, or if it is impossible owing to exceptional circumstances to do so within the period of one year, then at the earliest practicable moment and in no case later than eighteen months from the closing of the session of the conference, bring the recommendation or draft convention before the authority or authorities within whose competence the matter lies, for the enactment of legislation or other action.

When the authentic texts of the Draft Conventions and Recommendations of the 1921 conference were received from the Secretary-General of the League of Nations they were referred to the Department of Justice for

consideration of the question whether the proposals involved were to be regarded as within Dominion or provincial legislative competence. The report of the Minister of Justice on this subject was approved by order in council on June 27, 1922, and a copy of the order in council is attached to the texts of the Draft Conventions and Recommendations for the information of the House. It will be observed that most of the proposals were found to be within provincial jurisdiction. Copies of the order in council of June 27, 1922, and of the authentic texts of the Draft Conventions and Recommendations were transmitted subsequently to the different lieutenant-governors for the consideration of their respective governments with a view to such legislative or other action in line with the proposals involved as each provincial government might be advised to take. The obligations of the government of Canada under the Peace Treaties have thus been fulfilled in respect of the individual measures of the 1921 conference which were found to be within the provincial sphere.

With respect to those Draft Conventions and Recommendations which were found to be within federal legislative competence, the authentic texts are being brought before parliament in conformity with the requirements of paragraph 5 of article 405 of the Treaties of Peace and are being laid on the Table of the House. The questions involved in these latter Draft Conventions and Recommendations are also receiving the attention of the government. The Dominion government has proposed to the several provincial governments that a Dominion-provincial conference should be held for the purpose of considering certain aspects of matters arising out of the relations between Canada and the International Labour Organization. Most of the provinces have already expressed their acquiescence in this suggestion and it is expected that the meeting will be held in the early part of next summer.

Referring to the inquiry which was made in the House yesterday by the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen), as to "when the House may expect the report of the last meeting of the International Labour Conference," I find that the government has not as yet received either the printed report of the discussions of the conference or the authentic texts of the recommendations which were adopted by the conference.

As I mentioned yesterday, a report of the 1922 session of the International Labour Conference appeared in the December issue of the Labour Gazette, the official monthly Journal of the Department of Labour of Canada. I have pleasure in laying a copy of a re-print of this article from the Labour Gazette on the Table of the House for the purposes of information.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): My information is that the report in the Gazette to which the hon. member referred yesterday and again to-day is not a complete report. It is only in part a report of the conference. Is that correct? I may not have caught what the hon. gentleman said, but I did not come to any clear understanding myself of his remarks as to why the report could be in the Gazette of December and the government not yet in receipt of the full report to lay on the Table of the House.

Mr. MURDOCK: My hon. friend will note that I have only laid on the Table of the House the authentic text of the draft conventions adopted at the 1921 conference. The authentic text of what was done at the 1922 conference has not yet been received by the Department of Labour. It has not yet come to Canada. We hope to have it within the next few months; but there is always, I understand, great delay in sending forward the authentic text. The report that appeared in the issue of December last of the Labour Gazette was, it is believed, as full and complete as was necessary. I am going to send across the floor to my right hon. friend a copy so that he can peruse it.

On the Orders of the Day:

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): I observe in the press to-day an announcement that Mrs. James Carruthers of England, who formerly was Miss Violet Markham, has been selected to represent this government on the governing body of the International Labour Conference at its meeting in April. Is this correct, and if it is, what superior qualifications has she over Canadians to represent us on that body?

Hon. JAMES MURDOCK (Minister of Labour): The report is correct, although I do not think it would be at all proper to intimate that Mrs. James Carruthers would have any superior qualifications over very many of our Canadian women. The circumstances are, however, that we received notice only very recently, as to the date of the next meeting of the governing body of the International Labour Office to be held on April 10 at Geneva, and with that notice a copy of the agenda of the matters to be dealt with. For the January meeting of the governing body, we received notice so late that it was regarded as inadvisable, under the circumstances,

to endeavour to arrange for a substitute for the representative for Canada on the governing board for the January meeting. On this occasion, we undertook to secure representation hurriedly and by cable, endeavouring to secure a gentleman who, it was thought, would very ably represent Canada. That was found impossible; so Mrs. James Carruthers was asked to represent Canada and she very kindly consented to act. Mrs. Carruthers, although resident in England, has visited all parts of Canada, and is the author of a handbook on the Factory and Shop Acts of the British dominions, which was issued by the industrial sub-committee of the Victoria League. She is a member of the executive committee of the British National Relief Fund and of the Central Committee of Women's Employment, and was Deputy Director of the Women's section of the National Service Department in 1917, and was appointed a member of the British Industrial Court in 1920.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Just to save time, will the hon. gentleman lay on the Table of the House to-morrow, if possible, the notification, with notification of its receipt, and the other correspondence to which he has just referred? I may mention that there was one qualification which he forgot, namely that this lady was a Liberal candidate for Parliament at the last election; running against the Labour candidate.

Mr. MURDOCK: I was uninformed as to that fact, if it is a fact.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST READINGS

Bill No. 86 (from the Senate), for the relief of Frederick Wesley Graham.—Mr. Hunt.

Bill No. 87 (from the Senate), for the relief of Catherine Gunyo Chatterson Odell.—Mr. Macdonald (Pictou).

Bill No. 88 (from the Senate), for the relief of Marietta Isabel Wilson.—Mr. Church.

Bill No. 89 (from the Senate), for the relief of Marian Eugenie MacCordick.—Mr. Jacobs.

Bill No. 90 (from the Senate), for the relief of Elizabeth Frankland.—Mr. Church.

Bill No. 91 (from the Senate), for the relief of Arnold Carrington Burke.—Mr. Church.

SUPPLY

IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION.

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the chair:

Immigration—Chinese immigration—salaries and contingencies, $60,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister certainly should explain this item, especially the increase of $25,000. He should also make clear to the committee just what this money is devoted to and how it fits in with the policy as to Chinese immigration, whatever policy it is that the government purposes adopting.

Hon. CHARLES STEWART (Argenteuil, Acting Minister of Imigration and Colonization): One reason for the increase in this item is that now there are 28 employees charged to this appropriation, whereas, only 19 were charged to the appropriation last year, the other nine being charged to the general appropriation.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is the general appropriation?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Their salaries were charged to the vote for the outside service. They are now taken into the Immigration staff, and their salaries charged to the Immigration appropriation. I will give the list of names, as that is possibly the quickest way.

S. N. Reid, maximum	$2,160
J. W. Speed, immigration inspector	1,560
A. H. Jones, immigration inspector	1,320
Miss H. G. Parkinson	1,116
A. F. Youngs, immigration inspector	1,335
Lee S. Yen, immigration interpreter	1,200
Peter Coney, caretaker	1,080
John Earnshaw	1,065
J. C. Kirk, clerk	2,280
G. A. Stevens, departmental accountant general	1,980
W. C. Taylor, engineer stationary heating	1,800
H. S. Ferguson, filing clerk	1,080
A. E. Allen, clerk stenographer	1,065
C. E. Wilson, immigration inspector	1,560
Harold Crump, immigration inspector	1,320
Paul Lung, immigration interpreter	1,260
Yip Sing	1,200
H. W. Wilson, inspector	1,260
Edmund Wilson, guard	960
A. J. Williams, guard	960
W. J. Lowe, caretaker	1,080
A. C. Green, elevator operator	885
H. Glover, immigration inspector Union Bay	900
R. H. Banham	900
R. H. Halhed	900
Lee Frank Hong, interpreter, Winnipeg, Man.	200
Wong Ham, Montreal, interpreter	200
A. Regimbal, immigration agent general, Montreal	1,920

This gives a total of $34,540, the number of employees being 28 as against 19 last year. Included in this are the ordinary statutory increases which with the salaries of these extra nine amount to $12,555 over last year's vote. There is also an additional expenditure that has come up since the inception of the Narcotic Drugs Act. The Immigration department are virtually acting as policemen

after convictions, and their work in this regard has added to the expenses of the Immigration Act. I shall have more to say in regard to these points later. There is a provision in the Immigration Act for registration, but I would prefer to discuss that later. These are items that make up the $25,000 additional.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The salary list read by the minister totalled $34,000; then he says that there is $12,000 in the way of statutory increases this year to be added to that.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No; my hon. friend misunderstood me. The $12,555 is taken from the general immigration salaries—from the outside salaries—to pay these employees. In other words, this amount of $12,000 odd is included in the $34,000. The increase in the number of employees is nine and the $12,000 goes to pay their salaries.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Then $34,000 is the total, inclusive of statutory increases?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: And that $34,000 includes the salaries of nine persons who were not taken into account before. They were previously in the general vote which we discussed for some five days. I would call the minister's attention to the fact that the general vote was itself $25,000 over that of the year before. So that if the increase in this vote is caused by taking something out of the general vote as it stood last year, the actual increase in the general vote must be regarded as $50,000. Is that correct?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No, it would be the $25,000 of an increase as voted last night, plus the salaries of these nine men, amounting to $12,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The increase of the two votes, the $25,000 increase voted last night, together with this $12,000 and the other items to which the minister has just referred, amounts to $50,000. It makes no difference how you distribute it.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I beg my hon. friend's pardon; I had not followed him.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The increase therefore is $50,000 all around. I do not understand what the money is to be applied to. These men are used in connection with Chinese immigration, chiefly I presume to prevent it, or at least to see that it complies with the minister's regulations. I should like him to tell us what those regulations are, and just what is the nature of this service as distinguished from the rest of his immigration service; and as well to explain why the Chinese need an elevator man when they get to Canada. Where are they elevated to?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I take it that he has always been in the building; there is an elevator in the building.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What building?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): At Vancouver.

Mr. MEIGHEN: A special Chinese immigration building?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I do not know that it is a special Chinese immigration building. I am not very familiar with it, but my recollection is that it was used largely in handling the Chinese at Vancouver. There are about ten persons engaged in the general immigration inspectional work in Vancouver and the ordinary port work, in addition to those whose names I have read as being engaged exclusively in Chinese work.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Who are these people?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): They are: Mr. Joliffe, Commissioner of Immigration; F. W. Taylor, immigration investigating officer; H. W. Pickles, Miss B. Jeffers, clerk-stenographer; J. W. Randall, clerk; Miss E. Cooper, clerk-stenographer; D. E. Hyndman, immigration inspector; Thomas Elliott, immigation inspector; Miss D. N. MacLean, and Luen Song.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What are the duties of these gentlemen?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): They are engaged on inspectional work, checking out any Chinese leaving the country, investigating each newcomer, taking care of deports, and a thousand and one other things in connection with the fairly numerous Chinese population of British Columbia. Frequent trips have to be taken inland in search of Chinese who have entered illegally, and this involves a considerable expenditure. My hon. friends from the coast are continually complaining of laxity on the part of our officials in prosecuting these cases, and I am free to say that I get a great many complaints. I do not think the staff is overmanned for the work that has to be done. True, if the bill which we will be discussing in a day or two is enacted into law practically only merchants and students will be allowed to enter. The work of our officials will then be confined to protecting the population against any

Chinese who come in illegally. Of course, I do not want to imply that that will be the sole business of the staff.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Perhaps the minister can tell us how many men he has on this work altogether.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Twenty-five.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: How many Chinese came in last year?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I have not the figures before me.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: So I see.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I did not expect to be asked that question.

Mr. MARTELL: What alteration has been made in the old regulations as a matter of fact?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): At the moment we are admitting only merchants and students. Labourers will not be admitted. The bill proposes the abolition of the head tax. But that does not mean very much as no labourers will be coming in. Students come in simply for educational purposes.

Mr. MARTELL: What meaning does my hon. friend attach to the word "merchant"?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): We have found it very difficult to define who is a merchant, but I have a proposal to make when the bill comes down that I hope will meet with the approval of the House.

Mr. LUCAS: How many Chinese came into Canada during the past year as compared with the year before?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): For the fiscal year 1921-22 there were 1,459 admissions subject to and 287 admissions exempt from head tax. For the eleven months of this fiscal year there were 617 admissions.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Including children?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Children coming to join their parents here?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Those figures give the total admissions in both cases.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Does the minister know whether the figures are correct?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I am giving the figures as they are given to me.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Of course, I do not doubt the minister's statement at all, but I understand that every boat reaching Vancouver from China carries quite a large number of Chinese children. This is another way in which the Chinese evade the regulations. We all know that the greater proportion of Chinese who seek admission claim to be merchants, and I think the minister will have a great deal of difficulty in defining a merchant in his bill, because the wily Chinese always finds a way to get around any restrictive regulations. The minister should be very careful in framing his definition. It will be a mistake if under his proposed bill merchants are allowed to enter to carry on business here permanently. Chinese merchants might be given permits to come in and carry on business temporarily, but we shall be faced with a very grave danger if we allow them to remain here permanently. I would suggest to the minister that Chinese merchants who desire to live here permanently should be excluded, for if you allow a Chinaman to enter as a merchant you at once lose control over him and he can engage in any occupation that appeals to him. I think also the minister should insert a provision in his bill to deport students who remain in the country after they have finished their university courses. As the law now stands it appears that once a Chinese is admitted as a student he can engage in any occupation he chooses to take up and it is impossible to deport him. A Chinaman is supposed to have several wives, and we can readily believe this when we see so many Chinese children sent to this country to join their supposed parents here. I should like to hear from the minister what investigation is made in reference to such children and whether the department is able to ascertain beyond question that the large number who are now entering Canada are really the children of Chinese already resident here.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I think perhaps my hon. friend knows more about the difficulties of controlling Chinese immigration than I do. I had a very bright Chinese boy in my office the other night, in fact as bright a Chinese lad as I have ever seen. He is here on permit, and his case has been under investigation for four weeks. A Chinaman here swears that he is the boy's father; and the boy swears that he is the son of the Chinaman.

An hon. MEMBER: How can he swear that?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Well, the boy is under twelve years of age, so perhaps it is not proper to say that he swears to the fact. But he alleges that he is the son of a Chinaman in Toronto. A number of Chi-

nese people in Toronto say they were in China at the date of the birth of this boy, and that he is really the son of the Chinaman referred to. We do not think he is. There is certain contradictory evidence which would indicate that perhaps this is a case where the complaint of my hon. friend is justified. I merely mention this incident to show the difficulties we are confronted with. Taking it by and large my hon. friend is right as to the large number of Chinese children being sent to this country. Once it became known that the bill I have referred to would be introduced a lot of Chinese nationals resident in Canada attempted to bring in their children from China before the bill became law, and frankly we are suspicious that many of these children are not really the offspring of the men who are endeavouring to get them into this country.

Mr. STANSELL: Has the minister investigated the merits of the blood test in this connection?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): We have not resorted to any blood tests.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Do you take evidence on oath?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Oh, yes.

Mr. McQUARRIE: How are these Chinese sworn? The Chinese take two or three kinds of oaths in our courts. One is by breaking a saucer, another by burning a paper. The Chinaman writes his name on a piece of paper, sets fire to it, and then asks that his soul may burn up in hell as this paper is burning if he is not telling the truth. But neither of these oaths seems to tie the Chinaman down strictly to the truth. When you wish to be pretty certain that a Chinaman is coming very nearly to telling the truth, you insist that he be sworn by cutting off a chicken's head. What manner of oath is required by the department?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): We use them all.

Mr. MICHAUD: The chicken's head oath might be tried on members who ask too many questions!

Mr. McQUARRIE: I am not joking at all.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): When the proposed bill is under consideration all phases of examination and everything else connected with Chinese immigration will be discussed.

[Mr. Chas. Stewart.]

Mr. McBRIDE: If the Chinese were completely stopped from entering Canada, could not this item be struck out altogether?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): With the Chinese population we already have in British Columbia we shall always have investigations and other work to attend to, otherwise the allegations of many hon. members from British Columbia cannot be well-founded. These allegations are mainly to the effect that more Chinese enter British Columbia without permission than with permission.

Mr. McBRIDE: Is not the greater portion of this item to cover expenditure in connection with Chinese immigration?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes, but a very considerable portion of this expenditure has to do with looking after Chinese leaving Canada either temporarily or for good.

Mr. McQUARRIE: What precautions are taken by the department to see that Chinese do not enter illegally?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Whenever a complaint is made our officers are prepared to make an investigation to see whether the Chinaman complained of is here illegally or not.

Mr. McQUARRIE: But there is no one in the department charged with the duty of investigating before any complaint is made of illegal entries?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I would not say that that is true in all cases, but I cannot tell what is the percentage. Our officials are maintained at the ports of entry, and naturally if a Chinaman gets in he will move back into the country without delay and we would not be likely to keep track of him. However, the bill provides for registration.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Does the department also take care of deportations of drug addicts?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Mr. McQUARRIE: How many drug addicts were deported last year?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The accountant tells me he thinks the figure is somewhere in the neighbourhood of twenty.

Mr. McQUARRIE: How many other deportations were there?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): They do not come under this item. You mean deportations for being illegally in the country?

Mr. McQUARRIE: Yes.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I have not the figures.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I notice that in 1921 this service cost $32,000; there was an increase last year, and a substantial increase this year. What is the reason?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I covered this item. I will give it to my hon. friend again.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: You gave us $12,550. Where is the balance?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): We have the balance for the purpose of looking after registration under the proposed legislation, supposing we cannot make a better arrangement.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: This is to look after registration under the new act.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Has the minister had the complaints of the Chinese Consul regarding the condition of the immigration sheds at Vancouver brought to his attention?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Nothing beyond what I have seen in the press reports of the speeches of Dr. Tsur. I visited the immigration shed at Vancouver, and although it is not by any means a palatial hotel, I think a man could be comfortable there provided he had his own bedding, which nearly all these immigrants carry.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Are the Chinese and Japanese kept in this same shed?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I suppose the minister has seen the accounts of the Japanese breaking out of the shed.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): My answer was not quite correct. They are not kept in the same quarters, but their quarters are in the same building.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Have any precautions been taken to prevent similar escapes in the future?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Mr. MARTELL: I understand there is some sort of international agreement between Great Britain and Japan. Would the minister consent to bringing that down so that we may have an opportunity of perusing it? I understand that the agreement allows certain concessions to Japan, and I should like to know what are the special considerations in regard to that country. I understand that it is not on account of any arrangement that we make, but on account of an arrangement made between the Mother Country and the Japanese Empire.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: With respect to the arrangement with Japan, it was arrived at by a representative of this country in conference with Japanese representatives, but I think the formal signatures were by ministers of the Departments of Foreign Affairs. The negotiation of the agreement, however, was entirely in the hands of the Honourable the Speaker of this House in conference with the Foreign Office of Japan. The agreement has been considered a secret agreement, and I doubt very much if the government could undertake to bring down the agreement without altering the understanding between the two governments. The understanding was that it would be kept secret. I might further say that negotiations have been continued within the last year and this year between the Japanese government and our own with a view of modifying the terms of that agreement. These negotiations are not yet finally consummated, and until they are, it would be inadvisable to make any public statement regarding them.

Mr. MARTELL: I have every confidence in my right hon. leader, but I should like to know what can be brought down for public guidance in the matter. I am not asking for any confidential information at all, but can we have what has been reduced in writing and has been signed, and what is permitted to be made public.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think that is all printed in the form of a state paper.

Mr. McQUARRIE: There is no particular secret about that. If my hon. friend wants the information I can give it to him.

Mr. MARTELL: I wish you would.

Mr. McQUARRIE: The Japanese Consul General was kind enough to send me a memorandum of the Japanese views, and I suppose copies have been sent to other members of the House. In that memorandum the details of this alleged gentlemen's agreement are set out. It is stated in the memorandum that the arrangement was to the effect that no more than four hundred Japanese labourers should be admitted in any one year. That is the effect of the famous Lemieux agreement as set out in the memorandum.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): Four hundred coming direct from Japan, was it not?

Mr. McQUARRIE: Yes.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): It did not cover Japanese coming from other countries.

Mr. McQUARRIE: There is no secret about it. I do not see why we should have any secret arrangements of this kind. Surely if we are going to have an agreement with any foreign government as to the number of its citizens that should be admitted to Canada the public are entitled to know what the agreement is. I personally am very much opposed to that kind of secret agreement. I am opposed in the first place, to the agreement itself, and I am opposed also to any secrecy regarding it. There should not be any secrecy about it. We have received the memorandum from the Japanese Consul General as to what the arrangement is with Japan, and further, while the matter is still secret here so far as the minister is concerned, we have received a statement from the Chinese Consul General as to the treaty with China. They do not seem to treat these matters as secret, and I do not see why there should be so much secrecy on the part of this government.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: With regard to what my hon. friend has said about secrecy, probably the best answer to that are the figures themselves. Our government has kept a record year by year of the number of Japanese that have come into the country for the last fifteen or twenty years. These figures are all published, and I think for the last ten years or more they will show that the number of Japanese labourers entering in one year was under four hundred, with the possible exception of one year.

In regard to what my hon. friend from Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) has said as to the agreement not applying to Japanese coming from other countries than Japan, my impression is, and I think I am right in it, that our government will not permit any Japanese to enter unless he comes with a passport from Japan, signed by the Japanese Foreign Office. These passports are not given to Japanese who come other than direct from Japan, so under the present arrangement the Japanese of the restricted class who does not come direct from Japan is excluded.

4 p.m.

Mr. McQUARRIE: But the trouble is this. It may be quite true, as the Prime Minister says, that the Japanese government officially has kept the terms of this agreement, but the Japanese people themselves have not done so. I think the Minister of Immigration will agree with me when I make the statement that more Japanese have come into this country illegally than have come in legally. I asked the minister just a moment ago what precautions had been taken to prevent illegal entry of Chinese, and that would apply equally well to Japanese. I was thinking of the case that occurred the other day in Vancouver. A Japanese freighter came in with twenty-nine Japanese stowaways on board. The reason we heard anything about that was that the crew of the Japanese freighter had mutinied and taken possession of the ship, and the captain had wirelessed to the police at Vancouver to meet the boat. When she arrived at Vancouver the captain of the ship said that there were eighteen Japanese stowaways on board. The police endeavoured to locate them, and after a great deal of difficulty eventually found not eighteen, but twenty-nine Japanese in the coal bunkers. There you have the case of a Japanese freighter that is not supposed to carry passengers at all bringing in twenty-nine Japanese. If the crew had not mutinied, no doubt these men would have come into the country and later on have become citizens.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: There is one point that I think in all fairness my hon. friend ought to state in regard to this situation. The Canadian authorities, if I am rightly informed, were told about these Japanese in virtue of a wireless that was sent by the captain of the ship, who was himself a Japanese. It was the Japanese that brought the matter to the attention of the authorities in this country.

Mr. McQUARRIE: That was after the mutiny. According to the press despatches, these Japanese stowaways stated that they had come on board ship under an arrangement with certain people in Japan, that they had paid for the privilege of coming to Canada, and they complained bitterly of their treatment in this country, and of the fact that they were not allowed to land. There is no doubt in the world that that has been going on for years, and that incident illustrates what has been happening, and explains why we have so many Japanese in this country.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The point I wish to make is that what my hon. friend says in regard to Japanese coming in surreptitiously does not affect the agreement, or in

any way what is accomplished or prevented under the agreement. That would take place, I assume, regardless of any arrangement. All I want to have clearly understood is that, as far as the agreement itself is concerned, the government has every reason to believe that the Japanese government has lived faithfully up to its letter. The agreement has been carried out in good faith by both parties.

Mr. McQUARRIE: But if this kind of thing is allowed to go on, should not the Japanese—

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Does my hon. friend suggest that no Japanese ship shall be allowed to land in Canada.

Mr. McQUARRIE: No that is not what I am arguing. The Prime Minister has said that the Japanese have carried out the gentlemen's agreement and lived up to it ever since it was entered into. The important point is that the Japanese government is not preventing Japanese leaving Japan to come to Canada.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Does the hon. member mean to say that the Japanese government is responsible for the Japanese who came in surreptitiously?

Mr. McQUARRIE: I say they are not taking any precautions to stop the emigration of Japanese citizens to Canada.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am informed exactly the opposite—that they are doing all in their power to see that the agreement is lived up to. Cases may arise which are beyond the control of the government. Japanese may come in surreptitiously. That is beyond the control of the Japanese government. I think it is due to the government of Japan to say that it has been made very clear, so far as this government is concerned, that the government of Japan is doing its utmost to keep faith in the matter of the agreement. The right hon. the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) who is present, and who had to do with immigration previously, will agree with what I say, that during his term of office he had every reason to believe that the Japanese government were living up to the agreement in good faith.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I was never in charge of immigration.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: But the right hon. member was Prime Minister.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, but never in charge of immigration. That was a separate matter and I was not in charge of that. Under the terms of that contract, each government undertook to limit immigration to Canada. Did the contract by the Japanese government say that not more than so many—referred to yesterday as 400—Japanese labourers should land in Canada? Was that a covenant on the part of the Japanese government? Or does the contract read in this way, that Canada is justified in preventing more than 400 Japanese landing in this country?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I might answer by saying that the first agreement that was made was in the nature of a treaty in regard to trade matters between Japan and Great Britain, to which this country became a party. One of the terms of that treaty, to which this parliament was a party or of which it approved, was that the subjects of Japan were to have free entrance into Canada. The treaty guaranteed—

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is the Anglo-Japanese treaty?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes. Full right was given to the Japanese to come into this country under that treaty. It is open to parliament, if its members so desire, to denounce that treaty, to cease to be a party to it, and to lose the benefit to this country in trade matters which the treaty has helped us to secure. That conceivably might be the effect of eliminating the clause giving to the Japanese as citizens of Japan the right to come freely into this country. It was pointed out at the time that this right of entry would not be satisfactory to the people of Canada, that possibly the treaty might have to be denounced if that right was to be maintained. The Japanese government offered itself to restrict the number of persons coming into the country in accordance with arrangements which might be made between the government of Canada and the government of Japan. It was a matter, I think, mostly of national pride with the Japanese. They desired to preserve, in the face of the world at all events, the right of their citizens to go anywhere, and I say quite frankly to hon. gentlemen opposite that if this parliament, and particularly our friends from British Columbia, prefer to end any agreement, so far as trade is concerned, between Japan and Canada, which may affect immigration, they have only to say so, they have only to insist that such rights as are secured by treaty shall be ended, and we can very soon settle in that way, if that way will settle it, the whole question of Japanese immigration to Canada. If, on the other hand, this country wishes to preserve trade with the Orient, we shall have to have some regard

for matters which with respect to their citizens the governments of the Orient regard as all important. If the government of Japan is agreeable to making an arrangement with this country which will preserve to the government of Japan such rights as it regards as essential to its citizens, and at the same time avoid as effectively as any other method possibly can, the immigration of labour from Japan to this country, I think it will be infinitely better for all to adopt the latter course.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I now wish to say a word or two on the matter of the covenants of the government. I want to say that while in office it was never represented to me, nor have I any reason to say now, that the Japanese government have not complied with, or endeavoured faithfully to comply with, the covenant. I never saw the terms of it, and never had occasion to review the terms, but if the terms are such as the Prime Minister states, that the Japanese government undertook to prevent more than 400 coming to this country, and then if more than 400 come, it means the government has not complied with the treaty, although Japan may have endeavoured to comply with it. It may be that in regard to a binding contract with Japan, that country has found itself unable to comply with it. If that is the case, is not the government in a position to charge against the 400, or whatever the number is, any number that come in surreptitiously or in any way whatever? So that no more than 400 can come in, and no more will be allowed to enter, no matter how they come in.

The other matter is before the House to-day but I do not subscribe to the belief for a minute that we must abandon all trade with Japan, if we assert control over our own immigration and assert it to whatever extent we desire. The matter of trade is not a one-sided matter. It is a matter that is important to Canada and important to Japan. The Japanese are just as wise as we are. The Japanese control their immigration and we can control ours, and I am one of those who believe that we can control it just as absolutely as we desire, and whatever the consequences may be, they will not be any more disastrous to us than to the other country. In a word, they will not come in.

Mr. NEILL: I think if the Premier is alluding to the trade treaty of 1913, he will recall that in that treaty, which was ratified by Canada there was this stipulation:

> This treaty shall be subject to all the terms of the Immigration Act.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

A division of opinion has arisen since then, as to whether the words "Immigration Act" in that treaty refer to the immigration act of that day or also cover any immigration act that might be subsequently passed, but it is abundantly plain that it did cover the immigation act of that day.

Now that trade treaty between Japan and Canada was made or passed in 1913, and the revised or consolidated Immigration Act of 1912 contained provisions dating back some years, which gives the Minister of Immigration absolute power to exclude Asiatics under a general provision, something like that in the bill I endeavoured to bring down the other day. It says:

> The Minister of Immigration can reject the nationals of a people or a race whose national conditions—

Or some words to that effect.

> —and whose habits and whose climatic conditions, where they come from, render them unsuitable to assimilate with the people of Canada.

The provision is quite broad, and under it, in the year 1912, or prior to that, the Minister of Immigration had that power. Then, this trade treaty of 1913 undoubtedly reserved the provisions of that Immigration Act, so that, I submit, it will be possible to do away with the gentlemen's agreement to-day and totally to exclude Japanese or other Asiatics under the provisions of the Immigration Act as it was subsequently re-enacted more forcibly, without interfering with the right and privilege of trading with Japan. Trading with Japan is a matter in which we are vitally interested, and it is of as vital interest to Japan as it is to us. But under the terms of the provision which I have mentioned, it is not necessary to do away with the trade treaty if we wish to do away with the gentlemen's agreement.

Another matter in connection with the gentlemen's agreement has not been mentioned in this House. In addition to the 400 who are allowed into Canada every year, there is also what is called some land settlement scheme by which every Japanese owning a hundred acres of land can bring in ten Japs. Apparently, however, there is no restriction as to time; if he has 100 acres of land, he can bring in ten Japs to-day and ten next month. There is no provision as to how often he can bring in those ten Japs.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Under what?

Mr. NEILL: Under the gentlemen's agreement.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think the hon. gentleman is misinformed as to that. Any

restriction as to numbers of labourers coming in will apply to such labourers as may be brought in for the very purpose to which he refers.

Mr. NEILL: It may be that I am unable to read the gentlemen's agreement correctly, for I must say that the gentlemen's agreement, as I have seen it, is one of the most abstruse documents I have ever put my eyes on, and I may have interpreted it incorrectly. According to my understanding, the number was limited to 400 labourers per annum, plus the number allowed in as labourers on Jap farms. I will, however, accept the Prime Minister's interpretation.

Another thing that we might well notice under the gentlemen's agreement in connection with this matter is this, and it actually occurred three years ago. The Minister of Immigration in times of unusual unemployment has the power—and he exercised it three years ago—to prohibit any immigration into Canada of British subjects whatever, of unskilled or skilled labour, and he did so exercise that power. But he was unable under this gentlemen's agreement to prohibit the entry of those 400 Japanese. Thus, we had the wonderful situation of these orientals coming in at the rate of 400 a year, whereas, owing to unusual labour conditions in this country, our own British subjects were unable to enter Canada.

As regards the shipment of Japanese to which the hon. member for New Westminister (Mr. McQuarrie) referred, I think he stated the case correctly; but he omitted one feature of it as it was worked out in the press. It is much more difficult, I might say in passing, to prohibit the entry of Japanese than Chinamen. The Chinese come in our own Canadian Pacific boats, owned and manned by white men and these boats tie up at our wharf. The immigration officers visit and search the ship and keep a watchman on the wharf, whilst the ship is in port, so that it is practically very difficult for Chinamen to enter in that way illegally. But the Jap has his own line of steamships with not one white man on board. He pulls into the wharf and goes through the customs inspection. Then there is only a guard on the wharf at night, perhaps a sleepy old man, walking up and down. What is to prevent, with the full connivance of the officers, all of whom are Japanese, a boat or a launch coming on the other side of the ship, away from this sleepy watchman and taking off a small or moderate number, for a Jap never overplays his hand; he will only bring in twenty or thirty every ship-load.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: How would an exclusion law prevent that sort of thing?

Mr. NEILL: I will come to that in a minute. I suggest that that is a way in which they are put ashore, and in some measure that accounts for the extraordinary difference between the number of those coming in legally and those who are now here. As regards this particular case, it would appear that these 29 stowaways had paid a sum of money to be taken over to Canada, and on the way over, through some misapprehension or misunderstanding, they found they were going, not as they thought, to San Francisco, for which they had apparently paid their good money, but to Vancouver. It was not altogether a mutiny of the crew that took place; it was a mutiny of those stowaways, backed by some of the crew. They swarmed up on board and practically took possession of the ship, saying: "We will not go to Vancouver; we will sail to where we paid our money to go," and it was that that led the captain of the boat to wireless in for assistance when he came into the harbour. The boat did not pull into the wharf; it anchored out in the harbour. The police came aboard and arrested, I think, one or two of the crew. There were no stowaways visible; but as soon as the police boat went away—there were just one or two immigration officers in it,—those stowaways came up again, and they compelled that boat to get up steam and come into the wharf. They appeared to be ignorant of the fact that there was a wireless apparatus aboard or how it was used, and the captain again sent a wireless message for assistance. When the boat docked, a swarm of policemen rushed aboard and arrested those who were making the trouble. Then they began to look for the Japanese stowaways, and they could not find any. The hon. member for New Westminister said that they were in the coal bunkers. That apparently would be a simple place to find them. The men found that apparently there was nothing but coal in the bunkers, and they could not get at the stowaways without removing three or four hundred tons of coal. They knew that the men were there, but they did not know how to get at them. Some man, with more than usual ingenuity—and the minister should promote him—conceived the idea of boring holes through the deck; they put down long rods until they came to a place where there was no coal, and presently they came to what apparently was Asiatic flesh. The Japs were lying in a heap in a concealed chamber in the coal, and they removed enough coal to get at them. This

was a cunningly concealed place that the average man would not find at all. This was not done, and could not be done, without the full knowledge and consent of the Japanese line of boats. I have no doubt the Japanese government kept its agreement; but these are the nationals, and this is the way in which they act. As the hon. member for New Westminster says, had it not been for this untoward incident of their being scheduled to the wrong port, nothing would have been heard about the matter. That goes on, more or less, all the time.

To come to the Prime Minister's query as to how this can be prevented, I would say that a total exclusion act would not prevent that in any degree whatever; it would still go on. The remedy is to have a measure of exclusion, coupled with what, I think, the minister provides for as regards Chinamen to some extent, namely, a system of registration. When Mr. Jap or Mr. Chinaman—this is the case at present as regards Chinamen—comes in, he has a registration certificate given him, practically as we had in the war. In years to come, when any of those men get into trouble or travel, they can be asked by an official to produce their registration cards, and if they cannot produce them or give some explanation of their loss or so on, then they are liable to deportation. That is the case under the new act as regards Chinamen, and that is the remedy for evasions of the act.

I made it my business to have a talk with some of the prominent officials of the Department of Immigration as regards Chinamen. What they told me was this, that there was no definition, no rule, no formula, yet devised by their department—and they had been very strenuous in the matter—which had yet worked successfully, because the minute the Chinamen understood the rule, they sat down and evaded it. They told me how they evaded the rule in regard to Chinamen coming in as sons. Men who had not been out of Canada for thirty years would bring in boys of eighteen as their sons. The way the thing was worked was this. These would have to be the sons of a merchant. What was a merchant? A merchant was one actively engaged in some city of Canada with a certain sum invested. They got up bogus companies. Supposing I am a Chinese parent, and working at tailoring in Montreal, for some of this occurred in Montreal. I go down to a regular firm which makes a business of this. Supposing this is a firm of exporters or importers; I put $500 cash into the business; I get a job there as porter or some job I am fitted for, for a month or two. I then claim that the boy coming in is my son, and the immigration officials, who appear to have been very zealous on the job, make inquiries and even send a man down to ascertain whether I am really working there busy. They find that I am at work and they look up the books and discover that everything is straight, and that as a matter of fact I did put $500 into the business. After a great deal of consideration they may grant my claim or they may not; and when they go back to the same firm a month afterwards and inquire about another man they find that I have taken my $500 out of the business and gone back to my tailoring or laundering in the next street. Now, these are not hypothetical cases; they are actual occurrences as these officials told them to me.

As regards the suggestion of my hon. friend (Mr. McQuarrie) that we should be cautious in defining a merchant—I believe he said we should be very definite—I may inform the committee that the officials of the department are of the opinion that we should leave this matter to their discretion, and I am inclined to support them in this view. So that instead of having a clear-cut definition of what constitutes a merchant, it is my opinion that it should be left as flexible as possible and within the judgment of the officials; because the moment you make the definition rigid these people will find some way of getting round it. On the other hand, if you made the definition broad, and left some room for the exercise of judgment on the part of the officials, they would be in a better position to see that the provision was not evaded. Last year eight merchants came in under that category, and my informant told me of a case where a merchant wanted to bring a boy in who was really his son. He was a wealthy man in the ladies' tailoring business out West, but they refused to let this immigrant in because they claimed that the father was not a merchant according to their interpretation of the act. The Chinaman asked them what they considered a merchant to be, and they replied, "We regard as a merchant only anyone who is dealing in Chinese goods, importing or exporting direct, and carrying on a traffic with China." So that this man, although he has two or three stores and is wealthy, could not prove that he was a merchant and his son was rejected. For that reason therefore it is advisable not to define too strictly the term "merchant". The hon. member suggested that we should exclude merchants; not, I suggest, however, if the matter is left in that broad way; because I

think we do want to do trade with China and Japan, and so long as they are genuine bona fide merchants trading with the East I do not think there can be any objection to them.

Mr. McQUARRIE: In the previous part of the discussion something was said about Chinese children coming into the country, and I might make a further statement in regard to Japanese. Not only do the Japanese bring their children in, but in some cases they furnish them with Canadian naturalization papers as soon as they land. That may appear to be a rash statement, but it is one that I can prove, because at one of the sittings of the British Columbia Fisheries Commission last year we had a witness who was the assistant secretary of the Japanese Fisheries Association of No. 2 District. I believe he gave evidence at Port Essington. That gentleman appeared before us and spoke English very well. He was well educated, and we found that he had attended the Columbian College in New Westminster. I asked him whether he was naturalized and he said he was. I inquired as to when he had got naturalized and ascertained that at the time of his naturalization he was eight years of age. I believe he was twenty-two when he gave evidence. I asked him how he had managed to get naturalization when only eight years of age and he replied, "My father arranged that for me." I asked him when that had been done and he said it had been arranged the year his father brought him from Japan. That evidence was given before the Fisheries Commission on oath, and of course it is available to any hon. gentleman who cares to see it.

I might refer to the last remarks of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) in reference to the trade treaty. The right hon. gentleman said that if the members from British Columbia so desired that treaty could be abrogated, and he seemed to hold this out as somewhat of a threat to us. Now, my stand in regard to that treaty was made plain when I submitted my resolution in regard to the exclusion of oriental immigrants, and one of the things I sugested was that this government should request the Imperial government to give notice of the abrogation of the treaty so far as Canada was concerned. I am not afraid of the loss of trade at all; I am not afraid that the Japanese will not do business with us if we keep them out of this country. The Japanese is a man who does business along business lines and buys his goods where it profits him most to buy them. He will buy our goods just so long as he thinks he is getting value for his money, and when he realizes that he is not he will deal with someone else. If he does not come to us for the goods which he at present gets from us, where is he going to get them? He is not going to go to the United States, because the same reasons would apply there as apply in this country to the Japanese. The United States certainly does not wish the Japanese to go there, so where will he go to get the goods he receives from us? This trade treaty is a trade bogey and I am not at all afraid of it. So far as this particular member from British Columbia is concerned you can abrogate the treaty right away.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Let me make it clear to my hon. friend that I was not attempting to utter any threats; nothing would be further from my mind than to do anything of that kind. I merely desired to inform the House of the possible consequences that might ensue from certain acts as represented to me.

Mr. McQUARRIE: There is something else of significance I would draw to the attention of the committee in connection with this treaty. It is provided that the citizens of Japan shall not be discriminated against in any way in this country. That has led to a restriction of the rights of the legislatures of the provinces. It is well known that in British Columbia we have from year to year, I do not know on how many different occasions, passed legislation which might be said to come within this class, and all that legislation has been disallowed as discriminating against the Japanese. We had an example of this last year when the British Columbia government passed an order in council providing that no orientals should be employed on timber lands leased from the Crown in the right of the province. Afterwards an act was passed validating that order in council, and the order in council and the act having been taken before the courts of our province, and the Supreme Court of Canada those courts held them to be invalid as conflicting with the Japanese treaty. What did this government do? I must take exception to the course that was followed on that occasion. This government disallowed the provincial enactment. It seems to me that that disallowance was unnecessary if the courts were right. But this government went out of its way to disallow that provincial enactment, as Liberal governments had been doing on a great many occasions. It seemed to be the policy of Conservative governments in British Columbia to pass legislation along these lines and of Liberal governments to disallow it. Anyway, this government went

out of its way to disallow this provincial enactment. British Columbia took the case to the Privy Council, and the Privy Council, as I am advised by the press despatches, has held that the province was right in passing the act. So that this government disallowed an act which the government of British Columbia had a perfect right to pass.

I would like to ask the minister what investigation has been made in regard to the incident of the Japanese freighter? If the Japanese government are sincere they will investigate the matter over there, and if the statements made by the stowaways are correct they should be able to put their finger on the gang who are carrying on this illegitimate business. Here is something that should be investigated, and I would like to know what has been done in the matter.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I may say that after that occurrence the Japanese consul called upon me of his own volition and referred to the matter. He intimated that the Japanese government were having it looked into.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Mr. Joliffe has gone to investigate, but we have not had a report from him up to the moment.

Item agreed to.

Exhibitions—salaries and expenses, $140,000.

Mr. TOLMIE: What exhibitions is this money for, and is it the intention that Canada shall participate in the Empire exhibition to be held in 1924?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): It is our intention to participate in that event. Mr. Tolmie has just returned from the Old Country, but we have not yet had a report from him. For the collection of exhibits we have an appropriation of $35,000. For exhibitions in Great Britain and the United States the amount appropriated is $70,000 and for permanent exhibitions in those countries another $8,000 is provided. The appropriations for exhibitions are heavier this year on account of the advertising, which we are extending; we hope to increase our participation in exhibitions because of the resulting advantage to Canada in the way of advertising. We have been represented at Tampa last year and this year, at considerable expense, but we think it pays thus to display our products.

Mr. TOLMIE: I would like to point out the necessity of making a showing in those countries from which we hope to get immigrants. When I was in England I attended the big Royal Show, and I found that the Canadian exhibit there was not nearly equal to that of South Africa. South African products and the capabilities of that country were all well represented and their corner was crowded, while Canada's exhibit attracted very little attention. I have no doubt the minister was trying to economize, but it struck me as a very poor kind of economy. If any important effect is to be produced we must make a showing at least as good as that put up by other countries.

Mr. GARDINER: How much does it cost to collect exhibits for the purposes of these exhibitions? How many men are employed? What are their names, and are they employed the year round?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I have not the names of the persons employed, or the number. The item of $35,000 is to cover the purchase price of samples of grains, grasses, fruits, vegetables and mineral specimens, together with the expenses of the field men.

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry): I understand that these are special Canadian exhibits made at state fairs. What kind of exhibits are shown—natural products, manufactured articles, food stuffs, or what?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I have not seen any of these exhibitions, but I get very glowing reports concerning them. For example, I have a letter from the Exhibition Association at Tampa asking that our space there be doubled. I do not think, however, that it would be wise to do that, because the cost would be considerable; I would rather try to cover a larger area and enable more people to see the exhibits. We are trying to attract agricultural people to our country; therefore our exhibits are largely of agricultural products.

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry): They are under the supervision of some government official?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes, of Mr. Tolmie.

Mr. GARDINER: I got a report from a person whom I can vouch for that there was an official in Winnipeg—I do not know whether he was employed temporarily or permanently—gathering samples of grain at the end of July. We all realize that in western Canada you cannot at that time of the year collect samples of grain that will be of any value for exhibition purposes. I see no reason why money should be wasted in that way.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I did see one of our exhibits at Chicago, and one of the difficulties experienced there resulted from a lack of the exercise of due care in

the selection of the samples of wheat in head, with the result that it was over ripe. I do know that a Mr. Smith was temporarily employed on this work last year. I will, however, get the names for my hon. friend of all who were employed and the period at which they did their work.

Mr. GARDINER: The minister will agree that the end of July is no time to collect samples of grain in the West. As I have said, I see no reason why money should be spent in a futile search of that kind. I have no objection to representatives of the department collecting the samples at the proper time, but it cannot be done at the end of July.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I have not seen the samples received this year and I cannot say where they came from, but I understand that Mr. Tolmie is highly pleased with them. The getting of good samples this year was not a difficult matter, owing to the extra good crop that was grown in western Canada, particularly in Manitoba and Saskatchewan.

Mr. BANCROFT: I happen to know something with regard to the gathering of these samples in Manitoba. The work is done by one of the permanent employees of the Immigration department there; as I understand it, it is part of his regular duties. As to going out in July, I may say that part of his work is to gather samples of native and cultivated grasses, and that of course, has to be done in July.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What was the total expenditure under this vote last year, and what was the proportion spent in each country where there was an exhibition?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): For the eleven months of the last year the total expenditure was $121,998. That includes $12,000 in connection with the visit of Colonel Belcher to Canada on behalf of the British Empire Exhibition.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: We have not the answer yet. We spent last year $121,000. In what different countries was the money spent, and in what proportions?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I have not the figures here, but I will get them for my hon. friend.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: We started out with this item in 1921-22 in the amount of $90,000; last year it was $115,000, and the appropriation this year is $140,000. I understand from the general remarks of the minister that the activities of the department are to be increased. We require to know what has been spent in the past and where, because we have the idea that in some instances the efforts of the department went in the wrong direction. That information ought to be given to the committee before the item passes. Then, there is the question of salaries. We have in the main vote an appropriation of $700,000 for salaries, and under the head of Chinese Immigration the amount for salaries is $34,000. How much of this vote is for salaries, and what was paid out under that head last year?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The accountant informs me that there is no increase in the number of employees. The details are as follows: A. W. Tolmie, Exhibition Commissioner, $4,320; A. W. Despard, Chief of Agriculture and Exhibit Division, $3,240; W. D. Dalglish, Chief of Mineral and Decorative division, $3,240; J. O. Turcotte, Chief of Designing and Decorative division, $3,240. Miss E. M. Livingston, clerk-stenographer, $1,080; A. Pereira, clerk-stenographer, $1,600; R. G. Brown, exhibit decorator, $1,305; O. O Joubarne, caretaker, $1,080. There are eight permanent employees with salaries aggregating $19,105. The temporary staff is as follows: R. J. Beesley, carpenter and A. De Jausserand, $5.60 per day (or current rate); W. Bayard, painter, $5.20 per day; and four labourers at $3.60 per day. The total amount estimated for wages for temporary employees is $5,895, making the total amount for salaries $25,000.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: We have not yet got the information, which I submit is both pertinent and necessary.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The amount spent last year?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: An hon. gentleman to my left asked, what is the cost of getting together these exhibits? Secondly, who are the men that look after that activity and where are they employed? I have asked what amount was spent last year and where was it spent? I have learned that $121,998 was spent, but the minister is not in a position to tell us where it was spent so that we might know whether it was usefully spent. Reserving the right to have that information perhaps he can tell us where it is proposed to spend this $140,000.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I have not that information at the moment.

Item stands.

Relief of distressed Canadians abroad, $10,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I wonder if the minister could tell us what was spent last year and what the condition is as to stranded and distressed Canadians overseas?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Last year, for the seven months ending October 31, 1922, we spent $5,922.92. It is, of course, very difficult to foresee just what your expenses will be under this vote. It is to cover the expenses incurred chiefly through the office of the High Commissioner for Canada in London for relief and assistance to bona-fide Canadians who may be stranded abroad and temporarily distressed financially. In cases where
5 p.m. the department affords assistance to the extent of supplying transportation back to Canada, an undertaking is got from the individual to refund the sums advanced, and the department undertakes to collect from him personally in the first place, or secondly from his immediate relatives or friends. The amount this year, $10,000, is considered a reasonable estimate for the purpose.

Mr. CHAPLIN: The amount of the vote for 1921-1922 was $6,000. It grew last year, but it seems to me that now things are getting better we should not be saddled with such a large expense for the coming year.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Has the minister a list of the countries in which these distressed Canadians are located, and the number in each country?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): This amount is spent largely through the office of the High Commissioner for Canada in London, and by far the greater proportion of the cases would be in Great Britain.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: I was thinking more of the United States. Has the minister a statement of the amount spent there for the relief of distressed Canadians?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): There have not been more than three or four cases all told, in the United States.

Mr. KNOX: What percentage of the money advanced in this way is paid back again?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): About ten per cent.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I wonder if the minister could not tell us just what class of people he finds requiring assistance. At one time we had a great many soldiers who had taken their discharge and were in very necessitous circumstances in England, and had to be helped home. Has that class been entirely looked after?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Answering my hon. friend from Lincoln, the reason for the increase last year was that votes for a similar purpose in the other departments were cut off, and it was all included in one vote in the Immigration department. The Immigration department was performing the service to a very large extent, but formerly the expense was distributed among other departments. This year we are providing the service and the money as well.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I noticed that the year before it was $6,000, and it seemed a big increase last year.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): That was the reason.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think the minister is quite right. At one time there were several votes for looking after the soldier who had taken his discharge and really ought to have been looked after in England. Has that class been completely looked after by this time, or are there still Canadian soldiers in distressful circumstances in London?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): We have fewer applications for assistance, but cases of this kind are constantly arising, although I assume there will be fewer returned soldiers seeking assistance.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Could the minister tell us what the policy is? Does the stranded soldier over there get this aid as his right, or is it given in one case and refused in the other?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Not so far as I know. The High Commissioner makes a decision as to who should be sent back.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Does he report?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I understand that the time has expired for bringing men back from the Old Country.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): That is true, and yet it is not true. Canada could not afford to refuse to bring back a man who was stranded. While the vote applies to civilians, there is no particular vote for the soldier. Therefore he is brought back by the same vote as brings back the civilians. He is,

therefore, a distressed Canadian. There is not any special vote to provide for the returned soldier.

Item agreed to.

St. John immigration buildings, $23,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Can the minister tell us how that work stands. I am speaking from recollection, and I hope my hon. friend will correct me if I am wrong. I think the improvements at St. John were to cost approximately $42,000.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): It must be more than that.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think the committee should have full details as to what is going on there, and how it is being spent.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The amount we are asking in the vote for 1923 is $23,000. The sum voted for 1922-23 was $25,000. Under an agreement entered into between the Department of Immigration and Colonization and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, the department is bearing one half the cost of construction and maintenance of the following buildings necessary for the proper handling of immigrants arriving at the port of St. John:

Baggage shed, our share..	$88,048 28
Detention quarters, our share..	55,748 68
Waiting room, our share..	20,419 11
Total cost to department..	164,216 07
($5,748.68 extras total paid by department).	

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That $5,748.68 is for extras?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes. That leaves the sum of $158,467.39. This sum is payable in ten yearly instalments plus interest at the rate of 5½ per cent on outstanding balances at the end of each year.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: When do we start paying? How much has been paid?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): We paid $25,000 last year.

Mr. CHAPLIN: In the previous year there was an amount of $43,000 for the same thing.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I was $1,000 out. I said $42,000.

Mr. MacLAREN: These buildings have been completed, have they not?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): So far as I know, they are now completed. This is the total cost of the building, $158,467.39. Was my hon. friend referring to two years ago when he spoke of $43,000.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Yes.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The answer that the accountant gives me, although we have not the figures here, is that this will provide for the fourth payment. There was a payment of $43,000 which practically covered two payments, or a proportionate amount of them, I presume based on the date of construction. Last year we paid $25,000. This year we are paying $23,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I suppose the amounts will decrease?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Certainly.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then what will be next year's payment?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The same, I suppose, less interest—based on ten annual payments.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: How much is for interest and how much for principal of this $23,000.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): This information can easily be secured. We have not it before us. If the item is allowed to pass, we will bring the information.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The minister explains that we have to pay $158,467.39 in ten annual instalments. That would make the capital of each annual instalment $15,826.73. Nevertheless last year we paid $25,000. Of course it is plus interest. What rate of interest was charged?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I think that perhaps in addition there is caretaking, cleaning etc., and that would amount to a very considerable sum. My hon. friend is probably correct. Our principal payment is in the neighbourhood of $16,000, and the interest on the amount charged makes the balance up to $23,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What rate of interest is charged?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Five and one-half per cent.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I hardly think it will run up to that figure.

Mr. CHAPLIN: What is the general arrangement regarding the upkeep of this proposition and the cost of maintenance? I understand, as regards the building itself, we pay half the cost and the Canadian Pacific pay the other half. What about the care of it?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The hon. gentleman's question is as to maintenance, is it not?

Mr. CHAPLIN: Not only maintenance, but the cost of running, heating, caretaking.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Operation of cleaning, 100 per cent; for construction of the building, 50 per cent, and subsequent maintenance of the structure and seats, 50 per cent. I do not know why seats are included, unless, perhaps, they are permanent.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is the cost of cleaning?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I have not the figures before me, but I will give the proportion. Electric lighting, 100 per cent; water supply, 100 per cent.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Can the minister give us the figure for the electric lighting?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Steam heating, wages and fuel—the Canadian Pacific pay that.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: We need not bother about that.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Nursery fittings and furniture.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Who pays that?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The government. Toilet necessaries and supplies, 100 per cent.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Are the nursery fittings and the chairs not included in the total given by the minister as the capital cost? I think the sum was to include the construction and also the fitting up.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Probably I had better read the agreement and we shall get a better idea of the matter:

Agreement made this 7th day of September 1922.

Between

His Majesty the King, represented by the Minister of Immigration and Colonization, hereinafter referred to as "the minister".

of the First Part,

and

Canadian Pacific Railway Company, hereinafter referred to as "the company",

of the second part:

Whereas the parties hereto have agreed to co-operate with a view of furnishing better facilities for the handling of steamship passengers and baggage and for the reception of immigrants at St. John, New Brunswick;

And whereas, pursuant to an understanding between the parties the company has constructed a baggage shed and other works, hereinafter referred to, upon land belonging to the city of St. John, with the consent of the said city;

And whereas, the parties have agreed to enter into these presents to evidence the arrangement under which the said works have been constructed, the minister being duly thereunto authorized by Order in Council P.C. No. 3143, dated 18th December, 1920;

Now therefore this indenture witnesseth that the parties do hereby covenant, promise and agree with each other as follows:

1. The company hereby assigns to the minister the right granted by the city of St. John to the company under an agreement dated the 24th day of December, 1919, to erect and maintain a baggage shed and other structures upon the site of the old cattle pens immediately to the southward of No. 4 shed at West St. John, and to occupy and use the same for the purpose mentioned in the said agreement, and the minister hereby accepts such assignment and agrees to be bound by all the covenants contained in the said agreement and on the part of the company to be performed.

2. The minister shall assume control of the said works and of the additions which have been made thereto by the consent of the city of St. John, and, subject to the terms of paragraph 5 hereof, shall at all times suitably maintain and light the same for the purpose of handling traffic to and from the trains and ships of the company, and also for the use of persons and their baggage brought to it by any passenger steamer other than those of the company.

3. The company will supply suitable heating for the baggage shed and additions thereto, viz: waiting room, detention quarters, etc., during the handling of passengers and baggage on the arrival of steamships;

4. The company will have the use of the platforms for the handling of passengers, baggage, mail and express traffic to and from its trains and steamships and shall be entitled to have reserved for it in the baggage shed suitable and sufficient accommodation railway and steamship baggage checking offices and for on-hand bonded baggage room.

5. The cost of construction, maintenance and operation of the said works shall be borne by the parties in the following proportions—

	Cost to be borne by Dom. govt. Immgn. dept.	C.P.R.
	Per cent	Per cent
Baggage shed—		
Construction of building..	50	50
Subsequent maintenance of structure..	50	50
Operation—		
Cleaning by baggage staff.. ..		100
Electric lighting..	100	
Water supply..	100	
Steam heating, wages and fuel		100
Waiting room—		
Construction of building and seats..	50	50
Subsequent maintenance of structure and seats..	50	50
Operation—		
Cleaning..	100	
Electric lighting..	100	
Water supply..	100	
Steam heating, wages and fuel		100
Nursery fittings and furniture	100	
Toilet accessories and supplies..	100	
Immigration quarters.	Cost above	
Construction of building..	$50,000	$50,000
	Per cent	Per cent
Subsequent maintenance of structure..	50	50
Kitchen equipment, furniture and installation..	100	
Steam and water connection to special kitchen equipment.. ..	100	
Operation—		
Cleaning, lighting and water..	100	
Steam heating..		100

6. The total cost of construction of the said works is $322,683.46, of which the proportion to be borne by the minister is $164,216.08, computed as follows:

	Total cost	Dom. govt. shares
Baggage shed..	$176,096 55	$88,048 28
Waiting room..	40,838 22	20,419 11
Immigration quarters	105,748 69	55,748 68
	$322,683 46	$164,216 08

Of the said sum of $164,216.08, the minister has already paid to the company the sum of $5,748.69, leaving a balance of $158,467.39, which is to be paid by the minister as follows. The sum of $88,048.28 in ten equal annual instalments, commencing the 1st January, 1920; and the sum of $70,419.11 in ten equal annual instalments commencing the 1st January, 1921. The minister will also pay to the company interest on the first day of January in each year at the rate of five and one-half per cent (5½%) per annum on the balance from time to time remaining unpaid.

7. In the event of the port of St. John being nationalized or brought under the jurisdiction of a harbour commission, or of the buildings being otherwise disposed of, the minister shall thereupon forthwith pay to the company the unpaid balance of the said one-half of the cost of construction and accrued interest thereon, and in that event the company shall also be entitled to one-half of any compensation that may be awarded in respect of the said works, exclusive of fixtures supplied at the sole expense of the minister.

8. The word structure, as mentioned in this agreement means the buildings as completed, equipped with plumbing, heating equipment, etc., on a co-operative basis by the Dominion government and the Canadian Pacific Railway in connection with which the Dominion government has paid one-half and the Canadian Pacific Railway one-half.

9. The term maintenance, as mentioned in paragraph 5 above, includes repairs, improvements, alterations and renewals which may be mutually agreed upon of any part of the structure in which the company claims 50 per cent salvage.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I understand, then, that we are to pay ten instalments, amounting to some $88,000, and another ten amounting to $70,000 odd. I understood the minister to say that the ten instalments covering the $70,000 were to commence in 1921. Is that not an error? Or do we pay both sets of instalments concurrently, in the same ten-year period? As I understood the reading of the agreement, the $80,000 payments came first.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Of the $164,216.08 the minister has already paid the sum of $5,748.69 leaving a balance of $158,467.39, which is to be paid as follows: $88,048.28 in ten equal annual instalments commencing January 1, 1920, and $70,419.11 in ten equal annual instalments commencing January 1, 1921. Interest is to be paid on the first day of January in each year at the rate of 5½ per cent.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then, as I have said, we do start paying both sets of instalments now.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: So that we are paying approximately $15,000 a year.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The only difference is that we commenced paying in 1920 in the one case and in 1921 in the other.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Who is doing the work of cleaning, maintenance, etc?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): It will be carried on under the supervision of the commissioner in charge. I cannot give my hon. friend accurate information as to whether one staff will do the work and a division of costs be made afterwards, or whether it will be done by two staffs.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: In some instances the burden is thrown on the company and in others on the government. I want to know what the department is really doing there. Take this particular item, for instance. How much of this is salaries, and how much is required for cleaning, etc?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): None of the items I have mentioned are for the purposes of cleaning. This is merely to cover interest on principal and re-payment on the building fund.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: If this is merely an item of interest, and re-payment on the building fund it cannot possibly amount to $23,000.

Mr. CAHILL: Why not? The agreement shows payments of $15,000 and $8,000 respectively, or $23,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The hon. gentleman has not been following the committee. We have been told that $43,000 of the capital has been paid. If it is paid it is no longer subject to the 5½ per cent. We were told also that $25,000 was paid last year. These two sums amount to $68,000 and that reduces the capital to below $100,000. Now, $5,500 is 5½ per cent on $100,000. In other words we do not know where we are. I will ask the minister if that is true. I understood that in the first place, $43,000 has been paid on this account. It that true?

Mr. CAHILL: According to the agreement the minister read, $8,000 was to be paid in 1920 and $8,000 plus $7,000 in 1921. So that it is impossible to have paid $60,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am not discussing the possibility of its having been paid; I am asking the minister whether it is true that these amounts have been paid. Maybe the information we got before was wrong; I do not know. It was said that a sum, which of course includes interest, of $43,000 was paid on account of this claim in 1922. Now, I am asking the minister whether that information is correct?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I scarcely think it can be correct in the light of the agreement. This is 1923; 1921 was the date from which the interest was to be charged in one case, and 1920 in the other. We have not the figures before us and we cannot give them accurately, and I think therefore that the best thing that we can do is to get the correct figures dealing with the whole situation from its inception.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: So that the item stands?

Mr. CHAPLIN: Does the city of St. John retain any interest or title in the land on which the building stands?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): It would appear from the agreement that they still retain the ownership in the land.

Mr. CHAPLIN: It seems a most extraordinary thing that the Canadian Pacific Railway should put up a building on a piece of land owned by another corporation. They are not in the habit of doing that.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): All I know about the matter is what is in the agreement. One of the provisions of the agreement is this:

> Whereas, pursuant to an understanding between the parties, the company has constructed a baggage shed and other works hereinafter referred to upon land belonging to the city of St. John, with the consent of the said city, etc.

Mr. CHAPLIN: That is what I understood the minister to read. It seems a most extraordinary arrangement.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Another provision reads:

> The company hereby assigns to the minister the right granted by the city of St. John, etc.

Mr. CHAPLIN: It seems to me a most extraordinary thing that a building of this magnitude, half owned by the government and half by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, should be placed upon land owned by the city of St. John.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think the city gave the government and the Canadian Pacific Railway the right to erect the building there.

Mr. CHAPLIN: It does not say so.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: No, Mr. Chairman. The minister himself does not know how this matter stands. I think his first figures were all wrong.

Mr. DUFF: Who signed the agreement?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I signed it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not blame the minister for signing the agreement, all I want is to get the facts. I think it will be found that the city has given an absolute right for the maintenance of this property and that we are to get the use of the land free of cost. I am not finding fault with that. All we want to know is what we are voting, and what it is for. The minister has himself given us certain figures which apparently are wrong.

Mr. CAHILL: The amount was not paid on principal alone, but on principal and interest.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am inclined to agree with my hon. friend, but we were told to the contrary.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): After a careful reading of the agreement I think that possibly the statement is not correct. Those sums of money were not paid.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think you are right. I think there is an error there.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): We will get that information.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Mr. Chairman, I do not understand the idea of calling an item "carried" when the minister himself admits a mistake has been made in the figures. Either the committee has or has not a right to know what it is voting for. If it has that right the item must stand; if it has not that right we will discuss the point.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I am not engaging in any discussion as to whether the item shall stand or not. I have promised the hon. gentleman this information and I will get it for him.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It is no good to us after the item is passed.

Mr. LAPOINTE: And no wrong either.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It may be, I do not know. The hon. minister says he is not in a position to-day to give the committee this information. If the Chair desires a discussion upon the right of the committee to get the information, I am quite prepared to take it up.

Mr. CANNON: My hon. friend seems to have new scruples. I remember when he was sitting on this side, and I was sitting on the other side, whenever I wanted information, and the minister did not happen to have it at hand, he would say: "Let the item pass and I will get you the information afterwards." I am quite sure that the hon. minister will supply the information promised. My hon. friend and most of his colleagues did the same thing. I may recall to his memory the hon. gentleman who was Minister of Railways. He had quite a habit of inviting us to go to his office to get information. I do not think the hon. gentleman need have such keen scruples. This is nothing new.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: No, it is nothing new. I do not know, Mr. Chairman, whether it is thought that I have a right to the information or not. I do not recollect any particular instance that the hon. gentleman is complaining about. I should like him to tell me when I refused to give him any information he was entitled to. I should also like to know, when I was on the other side of the House, whether I ever got an item through on the pretence of giving information afterwards and failing to do so.

Mr. CANNON: That is not what I meant, and I never so stated. I said it very often happened that when the hon. gentleman was minister he would say "Let the item pass and I will give the information to my hon. friend when I have it." Very often this was done by the hon. gentleman and by most of his colleagues.

Mr. CAHILL: It has always been done.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The accountant thinks he can get this information immediately after dinner, when we can close out the item.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: We can deal with it this evening.

Item stands.

To provide assistance by advances or grants to immigrants under agreement to be made with the Imperial government under the Empire Settlement Act, 1922, and to hereby authorize the Governor in Council to make such agreement as he may deem expedient thereunder, and to expend the moneys hereby voted in such manner and subject to such regulations as he may prescribe, $600,000.

Mr. BEAUBIEN: Mr. Chairman, I have been waiting to make a few remarks with regard to immigration. I restrained myself last night because I thought the minister was anxious to pass the item we were then discussing, and also because my remarks might have been out of order like those of a good many other members who spoke yesterday. I never like to speak very long, so I am glad to see the clock says twenty minutes to six. I intend to close within twenty minutes.

I think it is my duty at the outset to express my views on immigration in order to offset some of the views presented by members from western Canada, especially from the prairie provinces. My sympathies are with the acting-Minister of Immigration (Mr. Stewart). I think it is evident from the amount of information that he could not give us to-day that he is overworked and is not able to keep in touch with every branch of his department. Therefore I would very strongly recommend that the government appoint a minister to take sole charge of immigration, which is one of the most important questions we have to deal with. My sympathy for the minister is also aroused because of certain statements that have been made from his own side of the House as well as from this side.

I wish to express my appreciation of my honoured leader from Brandon (Mr. Forke) on his stand in regard to immigration. Wherever he has spoken in the Dominion he has said that what we wanted were more people of the right type, and I agree with him. I also wish to congratulate the member for Springfield (Mr. Hoey) on his contribution to the debate, although he had the temerity to say that probably some of us farmers in Manitoba tried to scratch too much land. However, I quite agree that this is so in many cases. In fact I have myself tried to scratch too much land.

I am glad, Mr. Chairman, that no member from the province of Manitoba defamed his province. I think it is a credit to my colleagues from Manitoba. We know we have hard conditions in western Canada; indeed, there is not a member of this House outside the hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Jelliff) more hard up than myself.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: How do you know?

Mr. BEAUBIEN: And if the resolution of the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Leader) had carried I would have been even more hard up. But here let me make a statement of a personal character. I left the province of Quebec forty-one years ago next month.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: How old were you?

Mr. ROBB: You were brought up in a good province.

Mr. BEAUBIEN: I left as a baby and have lived in the province of Manitoba on the banks of the Red river since 1882. I have travelled throughout the whole of western Canada right to the coast and know it about as well as the average man in this country. And I might state right here that one of the biggest troubles in this House is that we do not know our own country sufficiently well. I want to extend an invitation to hon. members from eastern Canada to come out to the West and see our country.

Mr. POWER: The climate is too dry.

Mr. BEAUBIEN: I may tell the hon. member for Quebec South that we are going to have a vote on that question in Manitoba next June. So you see that I have a fair knowledge of the province of Manitoba, and to that province I wish chiefly to refer. No one has more faith in western Canada than I have; no one has more faith in Manitoba than I have. We are hard up, but we are hopeful. In Manitoba we have more and better land prepared than has been the case at any other time in the history of the province. This question of immigration is a peculiar one in some respects. Mr. C. H. Burnell, president of the United Farmers of Manitoba, stated that the question of immigration came down to this: do we want neighbours? We want them in Manitoba. Do we want more children to fill our schools? We do want them. Do we want more people to patronize our railways? We do. If my hon. friends in Alberta do not want immigrants, I may tell the minister that he may send to Manitoba those he has allotted to Alberta, and we will give them a good welcome.

I would like to point out also that through a short-sighted policy—at least I think so; I may be wrong—on the part of our late provincial government, the Mennonites are leaving the province and going to Mexico. I have great respect for them; they are good farmers. They are leaving some of the best lands we have in Manitoba, and to-day those lands, with buildings in good condition, can be had at reasonable prices. So that there is quite an advantage available to people who come to our part of the country. I would advise the minister, however, to endeavour to get men who have a little capital, because to have money is a great advantage and to be without it is a serious handicap. The question arises, where are we going to get immigrants? I suggest that if the minister devoted all his energy to getting back the Canadians who have gone from our country to the United States, he would be doing something well worth while. There are millions of Canadians over there whose hearts are still with Canada. If the minister would endeavour to bring back a lot of the French Canadians, those families where the stork comes round about once a year, he would not have to give his attention to child immigration from older countries. And there are not only French Canadians; there are good Scotch Canadians in those eastern states—and I know how good the Scotch are, because I have a Scotch wife. Then there are the Irish Canadians—and I am standing beside an Irishman right here. These are the people we should try to bring into the country, people who have a certain amount of money. I am not in favour of going to Europe to get immigrants. I have nothing against the European people; I think a lot of them. But under present conditions in Europe you cannot get immigrants from there who have any money and it is going to be hard for anyone who comes here without it. I know from conversations I have had and from inquiries I have received that there are many people in the eastern states that are willing to come to Canada and assume their share in the task of building up our country. I would, therefore, strongly advise the minister to use his best efforts to get immigrants from there.

Under this item of $600,000 I do not know exactly what the proposal of the minister is, but it seems to me that it is going to be more or less in the nature of assistance to steamship companies. I may be wrong, and I hope I am. But I do think that if that $600,000 were used to carry on a propaganda in the United States with a view to bringing back our own good Canadians the result would be more beneficial than any payments out for steamship fares. In Manitoba, within a comparatively short distance of the city of Winnipeg, we have all kinds of wheat lands that are unoccupied and that can be bought at a small sum per acre. If you bring immigrants to Manitoba you do not immediately have to start to build branch line railways; they are there already and those who come

to our province can all settle within a reasonable distance of railway facilities, which is no small advantage for any immigrant. Then Manitoba being the oldest province in the West, we have far more institutions than they have in the other provinces; in fact, as the member for Springfield (Mr. Hoey) quite correctly said the other day, we are over-institutionalized. I think the minister should certainly do all he can to give Manitoba a large share of immigrants.

I stated, Sir, that I wished to conclude my remarks within twenty minutes, and I shall not detain the committee longer. But I did not want to let this debate go by without expressing my views on the questions before the committee and without expressing my faith in Canada. I am Canadian born and I am proud of it. I repeat that no one has more faith in this country than I have and, at the same time, less money in his pocket.

At six o'clock the Speaker resumed the chair and the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 4, respecting certain patents of Leonard Clayton Ridge.—Mr. Harris.

Bill No. 33, respecting The Canadian Niagara Bridge Company.—Mr. Stewart (Hamilton).

Bill No. 35, respecting The Ottawa, Northern and Western Railway Company.—Mr. McGiverin.

Bill No. 39, respecting The Rutland and Noyan Railway Company.—Mr. Tobin.

Bill No. 40, respecting a certain patent of Henry Matthew Wells and James Edward Southcombe.—Mr. Maclean (Halifax).

Bill No. 46, respecting The Community, General Hospital, Alms House, and Seminary of Learning of the Sisters of Charity at Ottawa.—Mr. Chevrier.

Bill No. 47, respecting a certain patent of Clarence P. Landreth.—Mr. Maclean (Halifax).

Bill No. 48, respecting The Manitoba and North Western Railway Company of Canada.—Mr. McMurray.

Bill No. 49, respecting a patent of Robert A. Campbell.—Mr. McMaster.

Bill No. 50, to incorporate The Protestant Federation of Patriotic Women of Canada.—Mr. Ryckman.

Bill No. 51, respecting a certain patent of James M. Richardson.—Mr. Chew.

Bill No. 55, (from the Senate), for the relief of Margaret Elizabeth Moran.—Mr. Church.

Bill No. 56, (from the Senate), for the relief of Ethel Lillian Duncan.—Mr. Macdonald (Pictou).

Bill No. 57, (from the Senate), for the relief of Florence Mary Ramsden.—Mr. Macdonald (Pictou).

Bill No. 58, (from the Senate), for the relief of Ross John Craig.—Mr. Macdonald (Pictou).

Bill No. 59, (from the Senate), for the relief of Florence Dodds.—Mr. Hocken.

Bill No. 60, (from the Senate), for the relief of Blanche Hilton.—Mr. Harris.

Bill No. 61 (from the Senate), for the relief of May Woodbridge.—Mr. Harris.

Bill No. 62 (from the Senate), for the relief of Alice May Smith.—Mr. White.

Bill No. 63 (from the Senate), for the relief of Albert Ernest Mould.—Sir Henry Drayton.

Bill No. 64 (from the Senate), for the relief of Winifred Rose Foster.—Mr. German.

Bill No. 65 (from the Senate), for the relief of Emily May Small.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 66 (from the Senate), for the relief of Irene Herdsman.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 67 (from the Senate), for the relief of John Frederick King Hall.—Mr. McMaster.

Bill No. 68 (from the Senate), for the relief of Herbert Martin.—Mr. Shaw.

Bill No. 69 (from the Senate), for the relief of Frederick John Saunders.—Mr. Shaw.

Bill No. 70 (from the Senate), for the relief of Robert Archibald Logan.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 71 (from the Senate), for the relief of Violet Marie Finn.—Mr. Sheard.

Bill No. 73 (from the Senate), for the relief of Harriet Ethelwyn Kingsley.—Mr. Rankin.

Bill No. 76 (from the Senate), for the relief of Ernest Warren Porter.—Mr. Ross (Kingston).

Bill No. 77 (from the Senate), for the relief of May Elizabeth Meng.—Mr. Hunt.

Bill No. 78 (from the Senate), for the relief of Maud Vera Butler.—Mr. Ladner.

Bill No. 79 (from the Senate), for the relief of Lillian Black.—Mr. Hocken.

Bill No. 80 (from the Senate), for the relief of Florence Elizabeth McDonald.—Mr. Church.

Bill No. 81 (from the Senate), for the relief of Gretta Melville.—Mr. Ryckman.

CANADIAN PRESS LIMITED

House in committee on Bill No. 53, respecting Canadian Press Limited.

On section 1—Change of name and rights saved.

Mr. CAHILL: I would like some explanation of the meaning of this bill.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I have not charge of the bill but I am familiar with it. I think the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) is very familiar with this subject. It is merely a company which looks after the collection and dissemination of newspaper news. They are changing their name, and turning the company from an ordinary share company to a company which will have no stock issue at all. The different newspapers will have a representative in that company. Those representatives are called shareholders, although as a matter of fact they will have no money in it. The management will look after the collection and distribution of news particularly for the newspapers interested in it. They change from a share company into one without money shares and one that is to be without profit.

Mr. CAHILL: Is it not pretty much a monopoly in regard to news items? Will the bringing of this company under Dominion legislation have any effect in regard to any person suing the company?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: There is a provision in the bill reserving all rights in that regard. As to monopolies, I think my hon. friend is looking after all monopolies this year, even in the newspapers.

Mr. MARTELL: Is there anything in the bill to prevent any newspaper that may be subsequently established from going into the association?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not think so.

Mr. BOYS: I might say, in the absence of the hon. member in charge of the bill, that this measure has two purposes. One is that the word "limited" now existing shall be dropped. The company is now known as the Canadian Press Limited and the word "limited" will be dropped. The purpose of the bill is to convert the company from one with share capital to a corporation without share capital and with no participation in profits by anyone, and there is a clause in the bill which provides that if there is any money made it cannot be distributed as dividends.

Section agreed to.

[Mr. Beaubien.]

On section 5—Provisions of Companies Act not applicable to corporation.

Mr. COPP: This clause exempts the company from the operation of certain clauses of the Companies Act.

Mr. BOYS: These clauses are not applicable to a company with share capital.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY

IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION

The House again in Committe of Supply.

To provide assistance under Empire Settlement Act, 1922, $600,000.

Mr. FORKE: On behalf of the members in this part of the House, I would ask that this item stand and that the minister be requested to bring it down in itemized form. The item reads:

To provide assistance by advances or grants to immigrants under agreement to be made with the Imperial government under the Empire Settlement Act, 1922, and to hereby authorize the Governor in Council to make such agreement as he may deem expedient thereunder, and to expend the moneys hereby voted in such manner and subject to such regulations as he may prescribe, $600,000.

Item 53 I desire also to be brought down itemized. It is as follows:

Immigration contingencies and general expenses, including grants to immigration or colonization societies, or associations, as may be authorized by the Governor General in Council, $1,850,000.

Mr. FOURNIER: Why do you want them itemized?

Mr. FORKE: Because we want to know what they mean.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Perhaps, then, I might give the information in regard to item 58 for which hon. members have asked.

Item stands.

St. John immigration buildings, $23,000.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The amount paid for the fiscal year 1920-21 was $8,804.83; the amount paid for the fiscal year 1921-22 was $37,194.06; and for the fiscal year 1922-23 $22,610. These are interest and principal payments to date.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That does not give us the information we want. It does not show how much we have paid for principal, how much for interest and how much towards upkeep. We have not got that yet.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): We shall have to have more time to get that.

Item stands.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Perhaps my hon. friend has information in regard to item 55, which also was allowed to stand.

Exhibitions—salaries and expenses, $140,000.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Gardiner) asked who was in charge of the collection of exhibits in the West. The answer is: Mr. Oakley, assisted by Mr. John Hoey and Mr. W. C. Carson at Winnipeg. Mr. Despard and Mr. Dalgleish, respectively are in charge of the preparation of the fruit and mineral exhibits at Ottawa.

Mr. BOYS: I observe that for 1920-21 this vote was $80,000; for 1921-22, $90,000; for 1922-23, $15,000; and for 1923-24 we are now considering an expenditure of $140,000. As far as I know immigration and colonization has not been on the increase in recent years, on the contrary, it has declined, but for some reason the item itself is increasing very rapidly from year to year. What is the explanation?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I gave the explanation before dinner. I promised to give my hon. friend a list of places where fairs are held; I have not been able to get the expenditure in each case. We are spending more money on exhibitions, believing that attractive exhibits of the products of Canada, particularly at fairs in the United States, is money well spent. We are concentrating our efforts there, although we spent $25,000 for the same purpose in Great Britain last year. This is the list of the places in the United States where we have exhibited our products:

Davenport, Iowa; Hartford, Conn.; Springfield, Mass.; Brockton, Mass.; Waterbury, Vermont; Poland, Maine; Manchester, N.H.; Syracuse, N.Y.; Atlanta, Georgia; Cincinnati, Ohio; Dayton, Ohio; Columbus, Ohio; Detroit, Mich.; Grand Rapids, Mich.; Indianapolis, Indiana; Louisville, Ky.; Memphis, Tenn.; Sedalia, Mo.; Dallas, Texas; Waco, Texas; Sioux City, Iowa; Des Moines, Iowa; Waterloo, Iowa; Mason City, Iowa; Oskaloosa, Iowa; Minneapolis, Minn.; Milwaukee, Minn.; Fargo, N.D.; Haron, N.D.; Lincoln, Neb.; Spokane, Wash.; Salem, Oregon; Chicago, Ill. (International).

These are all fairly large fairs and it requires a considerable expenditure to set up our exhibits.

Mr. GOOD: Is the purpose of these exhibits to attract settlers?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Mr. CALDWELL: Does this item merely cover salaries in connection with these exhibits?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No. The $140,000 I am asking for covers the total expense for the United States. In addition we have two cars on the road in Great Britain for exhibition purposes accompanied by lecturers. This expense is taken care of in the larger vote for immigration contingencies.

Mr. BOYS: Are we getting results from this expenditure?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I am pleased to tell my hon. friend that the immigration returns for February are 50 per cent higher than for the same month of last year. So we are getting some results for our expenditure.

Mr. CHAPLIN: How long has the exhibition been running at Atlanta, for instance?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I am sorry I cannot answer my hon. friend's question. I got the list of fairs from Mr. Tolmie.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Is Atlanta a good point at which to exhibit our products?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I think there might be some doubt about Tampa, Florida, but a great many people go down from the central states to spend the winter in the South, and they have a very fine fair at Atlanta. Our people think they secure good results. They get a great number of inquiries about Canada from visitors to the fair.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is Palm Beach overlooked?

Mr. GRAHAM: There is a show there every minute.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I understood the minister to say that the object of advertising at Atlanta or Tampa was because a lot of Canadians go down there every winter, and thus they get an opportunity to see our exhibits.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I am sorry my hon. friend misunderstood me. I said people from the central states go down South in the winter time.

Mr. BOYS: It is just at the fairs you do the exhibiting?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Mr. BOYS: I think the best city in the South for this purpose would be St. Peters-

burg. It has a much larger population than the other places mentioned and you will find a tremendous number of visitors there in January and February.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: But they are all wealthy people and play golf.

Mr. GOOD: How many settlers have we secured as a result of this expenditure on fairs in the United States?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I stood at the International in Chicago for a few hours and saw a great many people from various parts of the United States discussing our exhibits with our agents and taking our advertising pamphlets, but it would be very difficult to say how many settlers came here as a result.

Mr. GOOD: I presume we have some record of the number of immigrants from the United States?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes, we have; but what proportion would come as a result of having seen our exhibits it would be very difficult to say. I think my hon. friend will agree that if we will not spend any money to attract immigrants we cannot expect very many to come here.

Mr. GOOD: Are we getting results from this particular kind of advertising at the present time?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes, I believe it is the best form of advertising we can engage in.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Will the minister give us his own views on this subject? Everyone appreciates that it is a first-rate idea to advertise our farms in places where there is a reasonable chance of getting immigrants. For example, the central West and further west, in climates which are at least not tropical. But does the minister really think it is wise to spend money upon exhibits at winter resorts attended by pleasure seekers—golfers, bathers, and so on from all over the continent, people who certainly are not thinking of migrating? Is the idea to give a first rate winter holiday to some of our officials? If so, and if the minister thinks we should spend money in that way, the idea is a good one. Does the minister honestly think he is going to get immigrants from Tampa, Florida, or from Georgia?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I know of at least six or seven who came from Ohio into western Canada and who had been at Tampa. Henry Ford has made it possible for farmers to travel great distances these days. I am told that as many as six or seven hundred farmers with motor cars visited that fair in the winter season. I may say I had the same view that my hon. friend holds in the matter and I made some investigation as to who attended these fairs. I was under the impression that they were patronized by rich men who were there spending the winter and seeking recreation. We set up exactly the same exhibit at Tampa that we show at Chicago and at Des Moines. These people seem to wander around a good deal; they travel immense distances in their own cars. My hon. friend will agree, from the list I have read of the fairs in which we are interested, that we are not spending a very large amount of money.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It may be too small and too finely spread to do any good.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The bulk of our people come from central and western United States. The eastern circuit I have mentioned is given attention largely to induce people to come into eastern Canada. In my opinion this money is well spent; it is better than newspaper advertising. The people see the exhibits and learn exactly what can be done in Canada. In fact, I think the expenditure is one we might increase to our advantage.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: So long as it was made where it would be some good. How much money is spent on these exhibits in the southern states and in the semi-tropical zone?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The same as at Iowa, for example. It is the same exhibit.

Mr. HANSON: What is the average cost for each exhibit?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I cannot give that information, but it cannot run very high. The goods are in charge of experts; they are moved from place to place, and the cost is reduced to a minimum.

Mr. BOYS: What is the proportion for salaries?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The amount is $25,000.

Mr. BOYS: If you divide the balance by the number of fairs in which we participate, you would get the cost, I assume, of each exhibit?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Practically.

Mr. FORKE: How many years has the minister been spending money at Tampa for these purposes?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): 9 p.m. Three.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: At how many places in Great Britain do we exhibit and how long have we been doing so?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I cannot give that information. That work is in charge of Mr. Obed Smith. Most of these exhibits are permanent in their character; an exception, of course, is the travelling car I have mentioned.

Mr. BOYS: These exhibits do not form part of this item?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No, except as regards the collection of exhibits.

Mr. LADNER: Are any of these exhibits made on the occasion of international expositions at centres like Brussels and Paris?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): So far as I know, those places are not visited by our exhibits. We are sending a commercial exhibit to France this year that will travel in a train of motor lorries.

Mr. LADNER: I understand that the government received an invitation to send an exhibit to the Brussels Fair of last year. Did the government participate in that fair for trade purposes?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Not our department.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: We are now spending, according to the minister, $90,000 in the States and $25,000 in Great Britain. There is an increase of $25,000. Where is that increase to go?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): It will go to both Great Britain and the United States.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Will there be any extensions down in Georgia?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): There will be no extension in Florida or Georgia, so far as I know. My hon. friend does not think it is good business to send our exhibits down there?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I certainly do not.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I may say that I am only going on the reports in the department. I promise my hon. friend that I will make careful inquiries and if it is not profitable to go down there I will cut the expenditure out. We are spending a largely increased amount on advertising this year and I am keying every advertisement in order to be able to give full information as to the value we are receiving for our money. It is my intention to do the same thing in connection with the fairs. Of course, my hon. friend will understand how difficult it is to know just what you are getting in the way of direct returns from a fair, but the farmers are interested in fairs; they go to them and enjoy them, and it is the farmers we are trying to attract.

Mr. LADNER: Are there any moneys spent along this line in Oregon and Washington, and if so, in what counties?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Spokane is the only point we visit with the fair.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: What amount was spent in Great Britain under this heading last year? The amount this year is $25,000.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No. I will give my hon. friend the amount we estimate for exhibitions in Great Britain this year, although it does not come under this item. We propose to spend in Great Britain $302,000, and in the United States $370,000. That is in advertising, and in just this kind of work. We exhibit the different products at these exhibitions.

Mr. LADNER: Are these products our natural resources or manufactured products?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The exhibits I am speaking of now are all agricultural products?

Mr. LADNER: Do they include timber from British Columbia, Douglas fir, for instance, fruit or anything of that kind?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes. I saw that in London in the British Columbia office. As a matter of fact, the immigration offices of this government are in the same building at the moment.

Mr. McBRIDE: I would just like to say a word in connection with these fairs. I think it was in 1910 that the World's Fair was held at Seattle. Canada had an exhibit down there. I have always thought a good deal of Canada, but never felt as proud of Canada as I did when I looked at our exhibition in Seattle. I happened to go down there twice, and on the second occasion I had some friends with me who had come out from the Old Country, and they were amazed at the exhibition. All the people I talked to admitted that Canada's exhibit was the best there. I think a little

money spent in this way is the best advertisement Canada can get, and I do not think the committee should hold up this estimate any longer.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am glad that the Minister of Finance is in his seat at the present time. I just want to make a general observation as to the estimates, about something which I have always felt was wrong. My hon. friend knows how hard it is to get things changed. I want to draw not only the attention of this House but his attention in particular to this matter.

One of the great defects in our method of book-keeping and the presentation of our estimates at the present time is that no one can very well find out what the cost of anything is to the country. Just to illustrate. Civil government is supposed to carry the salary lists of the country. It is supposed to have segregated there the salaries having regard to the different activities of the country, but it does not by any manner of means include them all. We have a way of putting in salaries here, and there, and the other place. We have a switch of salaries this year from one vote to another vote. I am not saying it is wrong, except that the whole principle is absolutely wrong, because by doing that any method of comparison disappears. There ought to be one account for the salaries. Take, for example, the Department of Immigration and Colonization. We have in the first instance a civil government list amounting to $272,000. That is all salaries. Then in vote No. 52 we have for the outside service, salaries amounting to $700,000, which has to be added to the other salaries. Then in the few items we have been considering this afternoon we have salaries in the vote for Chinese immigration, over and above the other activities, amounting to $34,000. Then we have salaries of $25,000 covered up in the exhibition vote. I throw this out as a suggestion to my hon. friend. It really would be a good thing if everybody short of the expert could know just what the different activities of the country were costing to the country. Here we have in this one department civil government salaries amounting to $272,000, and salaries covered by these other items I have mentioned amounting in all to $829,000.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: With reference to the expenditure under this vote of $25,000 in Great Britain and $90,000 in the United States—

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): My hon. friend is wrong. Where does he get the $90,000? It is $50,000.

[Mr. McBride.]

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I took the figures down as they were given by the minister, and I certainly understood that $90,000 was being spent in the United States, $25,000 in Great Britain, and $25,000 for salaries, making a total of $140,000. If I am wrong I would like to be corrected.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): My hon. friend never heard me say that there was $90,000 appropriated for the United States.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: We were told that $25,000 was being spent in Great Britain, and $25,000 for salaries. Then where the balance is to be spent if not in the United States, I do not know.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I will give the hon. gentleman the information, and will he take it down this time? If these questions are for the purpose of holding up this vote, there is no use in giving information. I have given it half a dozen times already.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Let us get it.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Take it down this time, please. The amount of the vote is $140,000; collection of exhibits, $35,000; exhibits in the United States, $50,000; exhibits in Great Britain, $20,000, and window displays, $8,000; salaries as per detailed statement, $25,000, and unforeseen, $2,000. The figures I have given represent the cost of sending these exhibits to the Old Country and to the United States, and do not include the cost of the fair itself.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I want to apologize to my hon. friend. I am sure no one wants to bother him, but on the other hand he will bear with me, I do not think he ever said a word about that $35,000 cost of collection.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I mentioned it innumerable times to-night. Was there not an inquiry from the hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Gardiner) as to who gathered the exhibits in Quebec?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: We got the name but not the amount.

The CHAIRMAN: The amount was given.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then I want to apologize, as I got up to do. I am very sorry. Let us see if we have it right now. We have $35,000 for the collection of the exhibits. Are the salaries or any of the officials included in that $35,000?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: No. The $50,000 for the United States is the cost of exhibiting the samples which are collected here and sent there.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The same thing applies.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What happens to the collection that costs you $35,000?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): They are collected for the same purpose.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am trying to help my hon. friend but he will not let me. The cost for collecting samples was $35,000, and those samples are sent to the States--

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I will read exactly what is done. I read it twice before:

This is to include the purchase price of samples of grains, grasses, fruits, vegetables and mineral specimens, together with expenses of field men, and staff in grain warehouse in Winnipeg.

Exhibits at state and county fairs in the United States, $50,000. This to include charges for space, freight, express, duty on exhibits, travelling expenses of agents in charge, also salary and expenses of temporary assistants at different fairs.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: You send those exhibits down there; you do not get them in the States? I suppose these are part of the exhibits you paid $35,000 to collect?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I would imagine so.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That is what I asked a moment ago when we had the difficulty. So that the $50,000 for the States would be over and above the samples covered by the $35,000 and I think that the same thing would apply to the $20,000 for Great Britain.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes. The memo I have reads:

Exhibits in Great Britain including freight of shipment for Canada, freight and express charges in Great Britain, rental of space and expense of assistants.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not think you told us what window displays are?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): These are window displays in the various agencies of the department.

Item agreed to.

To provide assistance to immigrants under the Empire Settlement Act, 1922, $600,000.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): My hon. friend (Mr. Forke) asked for a more detailed statement of this item. I can quite appreciate his request for information on the large amount that will come up for consideration next week, but I want to point out that this will be a very difficult matter to itemize. We are endeavouring at the moment to make an arrangement with the Overseas Settlement Board for co-operation. If we do not get co-operation we cannot spend the money. I explained the proposal the other day, and I will explain it again to-night briefly. The first idea we had was the bringing of children from the Old Country. I pointed out that there was a place for these children in Canada, but that they would not be brought here if there were no foster homes for them. I have a list of the homes or places from where these children will be secured in Great Britain, and I though it was good business to ask for an appropriation to encourage the immigration of these young people. The organizations that have been doing this work have found it exceedingly difficult in recent years to secure the funds for the maintenance of the homes and carrying on the work of the education of these children and the training and clothing of them. It has been carried on very largely by voluntary effort on the part of English people, and there is a number of very admirable homes from which these children can be selected. I sent Mr. Smart over there to make an examination of the children, first to see where we could secure the kind of children that would be desirable to bring to Canada, because I want to assure the committee that we do not desire to bring any children who would be undesirable. They will all be carefully selected and brought to Canada on application from Canadian people themselves. Unless there are homes for them they will not be brought. It has to be borne in mind that we expect the Empire Settlement Board to join us and put up the same amount of money we will put up, and in this particular case we do not expect any return. It will be a straight grant. I had estimated—I do not know whether the amount will cover the cost—$80 per head to pay the passage of these children; that would be $40 for the Canadian government and $40 for the Overseas Settlement Board. I will read you the names of the homes. There are many other homes in addition to these where fine children can be procured, but these are homes that have been in existence for a number of years, and eventually I hope that, perhaps, we can branch out, if this scheme proves successful, and there is a demand for children, or a place for them to go. These homes will be inspected as well as the children, so that the complaint that is so frequently made that children are being made slaves and are not receiving attention will be avoided as far as possible. It would

also entail the cost of the inspection of these children once or twice a year, at least. Some one asked the other night if these children would be sent to school. They will come under the provisions of the laws of the province in which they are located, and as hon. members know in some of the provinces today the school age has been extended to sixteen years. These are some of the places we hope to place the children—

	Year	Children Immigrated
Miss Macpherson and Mrs. Birt, London and Liverpool, (Canadian Head-quarters), Marchmont Homes, Belleville, Ont..	1868 to 1921	13,976
Miss Rye and Church of England, Niagara-on-Lake, Ont., and Sherbrooke, Que.	1868 to 1921	3,766
Mr. (now Sir) J. T. Middlemore, Fairview, Halifax, N.S...	1873 to 1921	4,915
The National Children's Home and Orphanage (formerly Dr. T. Bowman Stephenson) Hamilton, Ont..	1874 to 1921	2,761
Mrs. Bilbrough-Wallace (Marchmont Home), Belleville, Ont..	1878 to 1915	5,529
Cardinal Manning (Ottawa and Montreal)..	1880 to 1888	1,403
Dr. Barnardo, Toronto, Peterborough and Winnipeg. Man.	1882 to 1922	25,456
Mr. J. W. C. Fegan, Toronto..	1884 to 1922	2,798
Mr. Wm. Quarrier, Brockville, Ont..	1890 to 1922	4,074
The Catholic Emigration Association and amalgamated societies, St. George's Home, Ottawa..	1897 to 1922	5,998
The Salvation Army..	1905 to 1922	820
Minor Agencies..	1897 to 1922	4,920
Total..		76,416

The minor agencies are not named; they are put in this largely for statistical purposes. Thus, this does not involve the expenditure of a huge sum of money for administration. it involves two of our officials in the Old Land making selections, and I notice that a little difficulty has arisen in connection with this very question in the joint action of the Australian government and the British government. I want to assure the committee that if they allow me to have this money, the most careful selection will be made of those children who will be brought to Canada, and also, of other people who are coming. I know I am being criticized very frequently because we are somewhat anxious to maintain the standards; that is, we want those who come to Canada to be mentally, morally and physically fit. I think that is desirable; I have always felt so. More than that, I think these children will assimilate into the life of Canada, will be assimilated into Canadian homes, will become Canadian citizens and will, perhaps, in a much better way adapt themselves to Canadian conditions than those who are of more mature years before coming to Canada. We have no definite arrangement at the moment with the Imperial authorities, because some considerable discussion is involved as to what methods are to be employed. A day or two ago, I received a wire intimating that the British authorities were viewing our proposal with favour.

Mr. LEWIS: Will the minister kindly answer my question as regards the minimum age of the child?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): We propose to bring the bulk of the children between the ages of eight and fourteen. I know there is a great difference of opinion as to what age the child should be, but purely as an experiment, we propose to bring out at least a couple of hundred boys and girls between the ages of fourteen and seventeen, if we can secure places for them.

Mr. GOULD: Will the same interest be shown in finding homes for the children? I speak from a humanitarian point of view. The reason I ask the question is that I have. in many instances, seen children placed in homes where they did not receive quite as good treatment as, in my opinion, they might have. Will the department see that the homes are real homes for these children?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I have no complaint to offer as regards any province; but I think Ontario is, perhaps, the best field in which to test out a plan of this kind, and Quebec is similarly situated. Those provinces are more thickly populated, and they have classes of homes into which those children can, perhaps, be taken, and an environment that will give the children a better chance. I see the hon. member for Victoria and Carleton (Mr. Caldwell) looking at me. I am now speaking of the older provinces.

Mr. CALDWELL: Is Quebec not more inclined to grow her own children?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I was very much interested in looking over the figures to see that quite a number of those children go into Quebec, in spite of the fact that the people of that province, to their credit, raise a large number of very fine children. The older provinces are undoubtedly the best places in which to put those children. Their homes are established, and while the West will take some of those children, in the main, they will go into the older pro-

vinces. I am not so familiar with Quebec; but as regards Ontario, in discussing the matter with Mr. Manning Doherty, I found that they had not only agricultural agents but representatives travelling almost continually visiting those homes. In Ontario, they have and have had for years an officer in charge, whose business it is to be going about the country constantly visiting these homes. We propose on behalf of the federal government, if possible, to visit these children twice a year, and before a child is placed, to get a recommendation from the responsible people in the neighbourhood as to the character of the home into which the child is going. That is most essential. If you are careful about the selection of the child, it is just as well to be careful as regards the home into which you put the child.

Mr. GOULD: As regards the $40 which is the amount, I think, the minister mentioned as Canada's obligation, the homes where those children are placed would not be obliged to return the $40?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No, that is a grant outright.

Mr. HOEY: Is it the minister's intention to spend this entire sum on child immigration?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No, that covers only $200,000.

Mr. HANSON: The minister has stressed the question of selection on the part of the department, and I am glad to know that he is not unmindful of the question of inspection. In days gone by, I have had a little to do with the Middlemore children who are the ones who have been brought to New Brunswick in recent years. I would advise the minister that, as far as possible, in each province where it is proposed to place these children, he should have a permanent standing committee in each local community. For instance, in New Brunswick he might arrange —and I think this could be arranged through the authorities of the Middlemore Home—to have a committee in the shire town of every county. I am not unmindful of the fact that a man's neighbours do not usually give him a bad standing, especially in matters of this kind, and I have known of citizens applying for those children being given characters not altogether warranted. If you had a standing committee in each central community, I am sure you would find they would take the pains to sift the character of applicants, so as to make sure that those children were not being put into improper homes. I have known of cases where the most outrageous cruelty has been committed against such children. That is a crime the country will not stand for; but it is better to prevent it than to cure it after. The minister read a list of the homes which have been sending children to Canada. I wonder if he has on his list a home known as the Cossar Home for boys. I would like to tell the minister about the activities of this home which is one of the smaller institutions of this kind. In the city of Glasgow there is a citizen known as Dr. George C. Cossar, who for a number of years past has been engaged in the work of rescuing the waifs of that city. At his own expense he takes them in and cares for them and sends them out to a large farm at Gagetown in the province of New Brunswick. The boys he sends out are for the most part around the ages mentioned by the minister. They are taught practical farming and are kept on the farm until they are ready to shift for themselves. This gentleman has brought out to this country at his own expense a very large number of boys, and in view of the fact that he is the only person engaged in work of this kind, what he has achieved is, I think, remarkable. The boys who have been settled in New Brunswick have with one single exception been a credit to him and to themselves, and when the war broke out, I am informed by the manager of the farm, every single one of them enlisted and fought for his country. The minister might tell us whether he intends to give any encouragement to agencies such as this one, which has done such a splendid work. If he would like to have more information privately I should be glad to give it to him.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I think that it is good business to begin this work only with such organizations as have made a success of it and can exercise some care in the mattter of selection and in inspection afterwards. Our Mr. Smart, who has had a long experience in the work, will visit the children and make inquiries about the home. I quite realize the responsibility that we are taking upon ourselves in a matter of this kind, and if we make mistakes the advertising would be very bad for us. I think it is well for us, therefore, to begin with the people who have experience and who have made a success of this sort of work, because after all there are only certain classes of people who are adapted for engaging in work of this character. I assure the committee that we shall try to exercise the greatest care in whatever is done in this matter.

Mr. LEWIS: The minister said something about selecting the children from good homes. Does he mean homes in the Old Land or in Canada as well, and are these children orphans?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Mr. Smart reports, and I gather the same thing from Commissioner Lamb of the Salvation Army, that there are in Great Britain innumerable families of children who have no very bright outlook for the future and whose parents find it difficult to maintain them. These children are a splendid class of young people, and the parents would be willing, if they were assured that the children were going into homes under proper supervision, to allow them to come out on some engagement or other. But we are not attempting that, because I think the committee will readily understand how difficult it would be to have an organization that could take care of immigration of that sort. At any rate we are not attempting it at the moment. Later on we may branch out in this direction, but personally I want to go carefully and slowly in beginning an undertaking of this kind. After all, bringing children to Canada is not a new thing for the organizations I have mentioned. So far as that goes it would be merely a matter of giving them a per capita allowance for the children they brought out and established. We have done a considerable amount of this work in the past, not by way of per capita grants, but by means of a general grant. But if we are to undertake the thing in a systematic way we must accept some responsibility for the selection both of the children and of the home.

Mr. SHAW: Is it the policy of the department in such cases to have the children legally adopted by the foster parents? If so, at the expiration of what time does the adoption take place? Further is any supervision maintained by the department in the case of adoption?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): That is a matter to which we have not given a great deal of consideration, deeming it wise to follow the procedure adopted by these well-organized institutions who, as a matter of fact, have the children taken right into the homes of the foster parents in a great many instances. I think my hon. friend will realize that, with the two hundred 'teen age boys and girls whom we might establish, some other plan would have to be adopted, such as an arrangement for two or three years, with provision for some return for the services rendered by the boy or girl of that age. But for the small children it would be preferable to have them adopted permanently into the home.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I should not like this item to pass without expressing my appreciation of what the minister is doing in this regard. I do not know of anything that will redound more to the credit of the government than this work, if proper supervision is exercised, as the minister intimates he is prepared to see shall be the case. I also want to express my great admiration for the work, referred to by my hon. friend (Mr. Hanson), of that philanthropic gentleman in Glasgow in bringing these boys to the country. I remember in 1908 or 1909 I had charge as I had had for a few years, of the immigration work in the province of Ontario. This gentleman, a man of considerable means, has made this work his life vocation and to it he has devoted his time, his means and his ability. He is anxious to see that the under-privileged boys in the Old Land get a better chance, and I am glad to know that in the province of New Brunswick he has received such encouragement. When he came out to this country I met him, and I have often wondered how he succeeded in his work. I made close inquiries at the time and found that he had established in Glasgow a home at a large farm where he taught the boys agriculture. They were thoroughly instructed in the business and on being sent out here they were sent to the home that has been mentioned, afterwards being placed in the rural districts. I notice that a great number of the homes referred to by the minister are located in the province of Ontario, and I quite agree that that province is probably as well adapted as any other, if not more so, for taking care of these young people. It is an easy matter, to find out whether proper supervision is being exercised in the homes in which these children are placed, and if it is discovered that such is not the case you may rest assured that a condition of this kind will not continue very long. I am satisfied, however, that the work will be satisfactorily carried on while there is co-operation with the provincial governments, who have already the machinery to take care of the children. I want to express my approval of what is being done in this matter, and I trust that this devoted philanthropist of Glasgow, who has made this his lifework and who is putting his means into it, will receive the encouragement to which he is undoubtedly entitled.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: While I am glad to see the government are now taking some some little interest in immigration from the Mother Country—and I sincerely congratulate them upon arousing from the slumber they were enjoying—I would ask my hon. friend what arrangement was made between Great Britain and Australia and New Zealand under which, according to the Associated Press, those dominions secured 11,000 immigrants, and what was the arrangement under which Canada was able to get in the same length of time only 130 immigrants?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Does my hon. friend expect an answer?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Certainly. I am now dealing with the scheme of immigration started by the Mother Country, and if I am wrong I want my hon. friend to interrupt me at once. Under this scheme I ask my hon. friend what the arrangement was with the Mother Country under which Australia and New Zealand got 11,000 immigrants in the period during which we were able to get only 130? Now I hope my hon. friend will understand what I am asking him.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I do not think my hon. friend's arithmetic is correct.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I stood up for correction.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I have not the official figures before me, but is my hon. friend aware—and I think he is—that notwithstanding the fact that Australia has spent huge sums to establish British people there, last year about 86,000 people entered Australia and about 72,000 left? Of course my hon. friend wants to make a comparison between Canada, where we are just beginning a scheme of selected, assisted immigration, and Australia, where they have had the scheme in operation for some time. But if we had secured such a small net gain as has Australia I think my hon. friend might very well criticize us rather severely. He seems to be under the impression that Canada is the only country from which people happen to be migrating, but he is very much mistaken. The Australian immigration scheme has already involved a huge expenditure on assisted passages and the purchase of land for settlers. Speaking for myself personally, I want to approach this question with due caution. I have said upon innumerable occasions that I wish to see people from Great Britain settle in Canada. That is my desire. But when my hon. friend says that 132—

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The figure is 130.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Where did my hon. friend get the information?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Does my hon. friend consider that he has answered my question?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I quite appreciate the fact that my hon. friend does not want to discuss this matter overmuch, that he wants to get off into something collateral, to talk about emigration from Australia. I was not talking about emigration from Canada, although the Lord knows we have enough of it. I was simply asking for information that the department ought to possess, and that is—what was the arrangement with the Mother Country and Australia under which Australia got 11,000 immigrants and we got during the same period 130. My hon. friend asks me where my particulars came from. Let me tell him that these are the particulars that resulted in his sending Mr. Black over to England, because when I drew his attention to the matter in this House he got up and told me that the government had sent that gentleman over to look after the matter. The figures were given by the Associated Press. I do not know if they are right. I am not the minister of the department. I do not know how many people the department brought in under this assisted scheme. The press may be absolutely wrong.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): If my hon. friend is talking about the assisted scheme—

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Certainly.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): —I may tell him that none came into Canada under this scheme.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The Associated Press said 130 came.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I beg my hon. friend's pardon. I did not understand him correctly. I take it all back.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That is all right. But is my hon. friend not sure that some of the agencies he has himself mentioned managed to bring over those 130 immigrants? Did his department bring over any under this scheme?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: So this British Empire scheme, so far as Canada was con-

cerned, was a dead letter until the matter was brought to my hon. friend's attention in the House about three weeks ago, when he sent his deputy over.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I have never been accused of evolving a scheme so quickly as that. Indeed, the whole current of criticism is that I have been acting too slowly.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I agree.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): But I have made a wonderful record upon this occasion if this is all the result of the suggestion of my hon. friend since parliament assembled. However, I am not going to take credit for it. I discussed this matter and sent Mr. Smart to England last fall, as I pointed out to my hon. friend, to look into the situation. I will admit that perhaps I have been cautious. I am not always cautious, and sometimes I have regretted my haste. But I should like to know how successful a scheme of assisted immigration is likely to be. It is all very well to say, "We will vote a big sum of money to bring out a large number of people." But we do not know what we are going to do with them when they come here unless we vote a further sum to establish them upon the land, because I think my hon. friend will agree with me that generally throughout Canada there was not at that time much opportunity for newcomers in the urban centres. There is to-day. To the extent there is such opportunity we will endeavour to place immigrants in our urban centres. But because Great Britain and Australia have joined hands in a scheme of this kind, I do not know that we would be warranted in embarking on such a heavy expenditure as has Australia in connection with it. South Africa seems to be dealing rather carefully with the matter, although they are spending money upon improving their land holdings for the purpose of placing settlers upon them. I want to start in a moderate way. My hon. friend says that 130 people were assisted to Canada.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not know. I have quoted the figures given by the Associated Press.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I do not know where they came from. A greater number of young domestic servants came into this country under the assisted passage scheme. My hon. friend knows that people in Montreal, in Saskatchewan, the Ontario government, have been acting in this matter for years, so I hardly know where the 130 would originate; there must have been a much larger number than that. It is important that this matter should receive careful consideration, and we have given it that consideration. I think we are warranted in asking for the co-operation of the Overseas Settlement Board for this purpose.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The minister has not yet answered my question. If it is an improper question, that is a different matter. Surely the department knows what is being done under this large Empire scheme by the other dominions, and surely it is proper that we should have that information.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Australia, in addition to assisting the payment of passages —and that applies to adults as well as to children—has a land settlement scheme, a training scheme—they seem to have innumerable schemes involving the expenditure of money in a rather lavish way. But after all, they have not got very many more immigrants than Canada and not nearly as many as the United States. Clearly the Britisher wants to go to Canada because it is closer. My hon. friend knows that the Australian scheme involves a very large expenditure.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not. That is why I am asking.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): After the adult has paid his share of the passage money, one-third being paid by the Australian government and the other third by the Overeas Settlement Board, an additional £5 would bring him to Canada, so that we have an advantageous position in that respect. Roughly speaking, the Australian scheme embraces training for those who desire it, the advantage of free land and certain assistance in getting settled upon that land.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: The minister takes a great deal of credit for being cautious; it is quite evident that so far nothing has been done in this matter. I pointed out last night that on three different occasions it has been stated that the government had an immigration policy which was to be put into operation, but we are now informed that no arrangement has so far been made in connection with the overseas settlement scheme. It is a remarkable fact that we are spending much money in the United States to induce immigration from that country and a relatively small amount in the Old Land; and we refuse to co-operate with the British government in establishing their people here.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): We did not last session—it may have been our duty to do it—make any proposal to join in a programme of this sort. The matter of providing homes

for those who come here is being examined at the moment, and all that remains to be done is to make the arrangement with the overseas government, and that we are endeavouring to do. My hon. friend knows that we must have the money.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: It would not be unusual or surprising for the government to place their plans before parliament in order to justify any expenditure they might subsequently propose in that respect. I noticed a statement in the Globe some time ago that the Canada Colonization Association were receiving financial assistance from the British government in connection with the scheme discussed here a few days ago. Evidently this company has been making arrangements with the British government with a view to putting into effect the policy which is to be provided for under item 52. Last night I asked the minister what arrangements had been made and he said that that would be discussed under that item. The minister suggests that the money had not been voted and that nothing could be done. But the government need not wait until the money is actually voted before formulating their plans. We ought to know exactly what the British government propose and what the arrangements under consideration are. There appear to be three different plans, one in respect to domestic servants, one in respect to children, and another for ordinary settlers. I have no doubt that the 130 people who came out here were brought into Canada through the instrumentality of the government of Ontario, which for years has been advancing money to assist deserving settlers. In fact, Ontario was compelled to adopt that method because of the neglect of the federal government in the matter. Homes were obtained for these children in advance, and about four-fifths of them, I believe were located in Ontario. This is the season when immigrants should be arriving here, not months later when the demand will slacken off. We have a party expected to arrive in Toronto next week from the north of Scotland, and an agent of the Ontario Department of Immigration has gone to meet them at the seaboard. Places are already provided for them. There is any number of applications for help in the hands of the department, more than they can possibly supply. Yet the minister informs this House that the plans are not yet completed, and here we are almost into the month of April and the immigrants should be arriving within the next few weeks and be placed on the farms of this particular province at least. I think it shows that the minister, instead of being cautious, has been neglecting the duties that should be discharged by his department. It may be that through pressure of work connected with several other departments he has not been able to devote the time he should to this work, but it is altogether too important a matter to be treated lightly.

10 p.m.

When I asked the minister a question a short time ago as to the amount of money that was being spent in the United States and Great Britain, he replied that he had given the figures on several occasions and he wanted me to take them down. Well, I took them down, and before he sat down he had given two different sets of figures, and I found that I was nearer right than he was when he stated that I had taken a wrong view of the situation.

I do not believe the minister is treating this matter seriously, and I am inclined to believe the House is not being treated in the manner it should be. I am sure the people of this country are looking for something different from the Department of Immigration at this time, owing to the fact that during all the years of the war immigration was practically shut out of this country. It was not natural to expect immigration then, but the result is that to-day the agricultural industry of this country is at a standstill because of the lack of labour on the farms, and there is an abundance of labour to be had for the British government is willing to assist in this matter. We do not know just how far. We cannot get that information from the minister. I think this matter is altogether too important to be rushed through in this way without the House being given the information to which it is entitled.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): This $600,000 vote is divided into three—$200,000 for children, $200,000 for domestics, and $200,000 to be loaned to individuals for passages under a nomination scheme. We expect the British government will agree to all three, because this is practically what they are doing with the Australian government. Indeed, that is their offer, and we have simply devised our scheme so that we will have no difficulty in that respect. I mentioned a moment ago that there did appear to be difficulty developing over selection with the Australian govenment. I hope we shall not have that difficulty. That refers entirely to children.

So far as farm labour is concerned, it is coming to every province in Canada, and to every railroad station in Canada. Our department has been receiving for the last three months applications from one end of Canada

to the other from farmers who are willing to hire, preferably by the year. Farm labour is coming forward daily from Great Britain, and some also from the Continent, from Holland and Scandinavia. Every agent of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and every agent of the Canadian National Railways has been an immigration agent for this purpose.

What my hon. friend says about the government of Ontario is very true. I have sought on several occasions to work in co-operation with the provincial governments. That is my desire, and we are working with them to a certain extent, but I do not think we have yet reached that stage of co-operation that will bring real success to an immigration scheme, though I am hoping to reach that stage. I am quite free to admit that I find an element of suspicion in connection with the federal Immigation department. I do not know why, but I understand that it originated some years ago. So far as I am concerned, my sole desire is for co-operation all round.

As to the children, everything is arranged, except that I am not able to say definitely to-night that we have an agreement with the British government. I hope I shall be able to say that in a day or two because I had a wire to-night which would indicate that matters are almost settled. That is being arranged through Mr. Larkin, the High Commisioner for Canada in London, in co-operation with the Overeas Settlement Board and Mr. Black, the Deputy Minister, who is over there at the present time.

I should like to deal for a moment with the other phase of the question. The domestic servant problem is one that I endeavoured to arrange in co-operation with the provincial governments. Ontario, as my hon. friend has said, has been spending money for years to bring out domestic servants to this province, and I believe with very fair success. The province of Saskatchewan is also engaged in this work, and has been for some years. The lady who makes the selections in England for Saskatchewan has been employed partly by the federal authorities and partly by the Saskatchewan government. Both these provinces prefer to work as they have been doing in the past. Nova Scotia prepared to utilize the Salvation Army, and New Brunswick—I am speaking from memory —is prepared to do the same thing. Ontario, in spite of the fact that they are bringing out domestics themselves, has also an arrangement with the Salvation Army to bring out domestics. Manitoba has expressed the desire that the Army might be used for this purpose so far as they are concerned, and so has British Columbia. So far as Alberta is concerned, they do not desire to go into a scheme of this kind at all. The reason I mention these matters is to show that we did endeavour to get the provincial governments to say how many of these young women might find employment in the respective provinces, and where they could be placed, and we sought to get them to assume the responsibility, because this is not a grant; it is a loan, with a ten per cent reduction for losses, for the full amount of the passage.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: May I ask what it is proposed to loan in each individual case?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): If the domestic was coming to Nova Scotia, to Halifax, for instance, her loan would be the cost of her passage to Halifax, and similarly if she were going to Winnipeg. If she were going to British Columbia it would be just that much more. There is a minimum and a maximum that can be loaned, but the amount in each case depends altogether on the destination for which the domestic is bound.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: What is estimated to be about the average cost for passage of each individual?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): About $125, taking Winnipeg as a central point.

Mr. CALDWELL: What arrangement has the government made for the collection of these loans?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I am coming to that portion of it, because there is where our difficulties begin.

Mr. CALDWELL: I thought so.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): With a federal organization scattered all over Canada for the collection of the money to be advanced, it would be too cumbersome and too expensive; therefore you can only utilize some responsible organization that is engaged in the work. The provincial governments of Ontario and Saskatchewan are putting up their money. They are taking their own chances of collection, and making their own selection. Although the province of Saskatchewan at one time showed a desire to join us in this scheme, so far none of the provinces is prepared to go into it, and I am not sure that, so far, we have any organization of a responsible character prepared to come forward and say they will re-pay 90 per cent of the advance, except the Salvation Army, and they are recognized by the Overseas Settlement Board. I hope

that we shall later be able to get a responsible organization that will give a guarantee of that sort. The Salvation Army have carried on with the Ontario government, and have given satisfaction, so far as I can find out. I inquired of the Hon. Manning Doherty, as to the results they had had in the collection of the moneys advanced to the Army, and he told me they had had splendid results and that the system relieved the government of the responsibility of making the collections of the moneys advanced. There is no doubt that there will be other organizations which would undertake this work, but so far the Salvation Army is the only organization that is able to meet the requirements and satisfy the Overseas Settlement Board, because in this particular case, so far as they are concerned, I want the committee to realize that the Overseas Settlement Board, whether money is advanced by way of a loan, expect the federal government of the country to which a person is emigrating to repay that loan, or whatever portion of that loan is collected, on a fifty-fifty basis. So far as the Army is concerned, they are making a division, the Army paying one-third, the domestic herself, or the individual, where they are dealing with males, one-third and the government one-third. So far as we are concerned, we will have to put up 50 per cent. In this particular case the Overseas Settlement Board would put up the other 50 per cent, and they guarantee to return 90 per cent of the loan. That is the guarantee they offer as a responsible organization.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: To make that clear, the guarantee is given by whom?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): By the Salvation Army.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Not by the association that puts up the 50 per cent.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No; the Overseas Settlement Board is quite prepared to have the Army responsible for their contribution, to repay it to them if we so desire. There is just that one difference. They have expressed the willingness if we so desire, if any advances are made to the Army, to accept the army as the responsible medium for repayment. That would, of course, reduce the risk very materially. That is the only organization that we have at the moment to deal with, in so far as domestic servants are concerned. I hope we will be able to get some other responsible organizations to engage in this work, because as near as we can estimate the amount, 5,000 domestic servants could be placed in Canada if they could be procured.

One difficulty is that there seems to be so many occupations in Canada into which these young women can enter, that they do not remain very long in the homes to which they come in Canada. The other scheme I have in mind is the nominated scheme of passage.

Mr. LEWIS: In regard to the domestics that are to be brought out. I understand the shipping authorities will look after the girls or domestics on board ship, but that when they get on the train in Canada, no such provision is made in regard to their food. Who looks after that end of it.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): A conductress accompanies every unaccompanied young woman; if arrangements are made that they travel in groups, we send a conductress right through to Vancouver. That has been done for two or three years.

Mr. LEWIS: When I travelled on one of the Transcontinental trains some time ago, I noticed about thirty young women, English, Scotch and Irish. The young woman who looked after them went into the Pullman and had her meal. I would expect that, but I passed time and again through the colonist car, where the girls were located, and I found they were eating in any style. There did not seem to be any practical provision made for their meals. These girls coming to this country would not know what provision to make for their meals, and I was wondering if the conductress was responsible for them, and whether, when you got thirty girls of that description, travelling in a colonist car, three nights on the train, any provision was made that they should be kept separate? Because there are no proper beds and they sleep on slats.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The purpose for which the conductress is appointed and paid is to see to the protection of these young women, and land them at the various hostels provided in every province in Canada now. That is the sole purpose of having a conductress accompany these young women. If they are neglectful of their duty we would be glad to hear it.

Mr. LEWIS: I did not mean to suggest that. Does the department look after the food situation, or do they have to provide it themselves?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The government has not been bringing these girls out. I understand the Saskatchewan government, for example, in nearly every case has someone to whom the girl is going. In many cases an advance is made by the individual himself

the farmer or the businessman. He sends $160 or $170, brings out the young woman and she is placed in his home. If he has not the money the government in many cases finds it for him. The federal authorities have been given the services of these conductresses and they assemble the girls at the immigration halls in parties of not less than eight, usually up to thirty or forty, and travel right across Canada with them.

Dealing with the nominative scheme, it is the most difficult thing, I think hon. gentlemen will agree, to hold the young man. I have looked into this question and I may say, in answer to my hon. friend from Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) that I have thought very seriously of offering assistance to many of these young Scotch labourers who are quite prepared to come to Canada, but have not the means to pay their passage. But the great difficulty is that these young men will possibly move out. There is nothing that will hold them if they are not satisfied, and you lose touch with them and, perhaps, lose the money that you advance for their passage. Some scheme may be devised of bringing the unattached man out and keeping him in the country, because there are in the Old Land numbers of young men who could be brought out and successfully established in Canada. We have adopted a scheme of asking the farmer here, because this applies only to the farmer, to nominate someone that he knows in the Old Land. We ask that either he or the man who is coming, contribute 25 per cent of the cost of bringing the man out. In 99 cases out of a hundred, practically, these nominations will be of married men with families whose friends are desirous of bringing them out to Canada. In many cases the nomination will be of the wife and family of a man already here. We have decided on rather a simple scheme for the purpose of securing the return of the money. In the first place, the nominator puts up 25 per cent of it. He gives a bond, upon which we expect him to get the name of at least another responsible party, for the repayment of the loan in one year if it is for two persons, that is a man, his wife and a small child, or in two years, if the family is larger, the loan being without interest. That is the scheme we have in connection with nominated passages. We have made arrangements with the Bankers' Association that we shall send the forms upon which to make application to local banks in every community, and they will attend to the collection free of charge. Briefly, that is the scheme that we have to offer for the other $200,000, and it seems to me that it is safe. I feel that I am warranted in asking for a trial of it, and I think it will bring here people who will settle permanently, because they are being brought by their friends who are vitally interested in them, and in that case they are more liable to remain in that particular locality or to settle down permanently in our midst.

[Mr. Chas. Stewart.]

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I do not think any risk is being taken. The chief objection I have is that nothing is being done. I refer to an article which appeared in the press in September last which I now have in my hand to this effect:

The Peopling of Canada

The Canadian people will approve both the aim and method of the federal government's new immigration policy, etc. The services of the Canadian Colonization Association, an organization backed by private capital, which has been a long time mapping out the field for immigration to this country and will have the financial support of the Imperial government, will be employed in the location of settlers.

Is this the government's policy or is it not? This has been published in the press of this country and it has not been denied. If this other organization is the medium through which immigration into this country is going to be solicited, and we are just being led to believe that something is going to be done by the government, we should have a little understanding with regard to item 53 before this one is passed. This seems a most remarkable state of affairs when we are passing votes for agencies, for salaries of immigration agents. I brought this to the minister's attention last night, and I was told that it had absolutely nothing to do with the other association; yet the very fact that this $200,000 is to be devoted to advancing loans to enable settlers to come to this country, leads me to believe that there is something we have not so far been made acquainted with. I should like the minister to inform the committee whether this article which I have read has any foundation or not, and whether any advances have already been made to the Canada Calonization Company to bring settlers to this country.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What paper was that?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: This was published in the Toronto Globe of September 12, and it has not been contradicted so far as I know. I find that ever since that time the same paper has announced that another immigration policy was being advanced by the government. Surely we are not asked to wait at this time of the year, almost the begin-

ning of April, for the government to formulate and to put into effect a policy to bring immigrants into this country for the present year. It is simply a matter of waiting to see what is going to happen. Under ordinary circumstances, it would be well to exercise some of the caution to which the minister has referred; but there is no risk to be run as regards the domestic servants who have been referred to. The provincial governments through the hostels which they have throughout the country, have all the machinery, and there is no risk to be run as regards advances made to domestic servants. Ontario has been doing this for years, and it will not entail a cent of expense on the government to do this work. My hon. friend referred to domestics who have been coming out here and asked whether anyone was in charge. Those who come into Ontario are met at the port of landing; they are taken care of until they enter their homes, and after that certain control is kept over them and a close touch is kept with what is going on. If the government are not prepared to act, then they should lend assistance to the provincial government to do something. They should not force the provincial governments to do all the work along this line, and then endeavour to claim some of the credit. The government, from the minister's own admission to-night, are doing absolutely nothing, and I believe from reports published broadcast throughout this country, that another company which is being subsidized by the government is engaged in this work and is now receiving similar grants from the Imperial government. Has any money been advanced to this Canadian Colonization Company up to the present time? That is a fair question; it is a question which is pertinent to the item before the committee. I am sorry that I have to leave in order to catch my train, but I think we deserve some information as regards the question which I have submitted. I want to know whether any arrangement has already been completed by the Canada Colonization Association with the British government to receive financial assistance in order to bring settlers to this country.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): My hon. friend will remember that the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. Shaw) asked the question two weeks ago with respect to the matter that he has mentioned.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I did not hear it.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The question was answered: "Yes, the Canada Colonization Association got $40,000 from the government last October."

Mr. FORKE: That has nothing to do with the $600,000.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Not a thing.

Mr. FORKE: Then why waste time discussing it?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: My hon. friend is very much concerned about wasting time, and I hope he will continue to exercise his caution in that regard. The question I asked was what arrangement had been made between the Canada Colonization Association, which is subsidized by this government and which the minister informed the committee he was keeping in close touch with to earmark every move they were making, so that no advantage could be taken of the government, and the Imperial government to receive financial assistance, as intimated by the newspaper article which I have read.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I have already answered my hon. friend.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: But he is referring to the Imperial government.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I do not know if they have made an arrangement with the Imperial government. I know that they are simply working in the United States.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: This is the newspaper which represents the government in this province. The editorial which I refer to has this heading:

> The Canadian people will approve both the aim and the method of the federal government's new policy.

This is the heading, and the report goes on to state:

> The services of the Canada Colonization Association—an association backed by private capital—which has been a long time mapping out the field for immigration to this country and which will have the financial support of the Imperial government, will be employed in the location of settlers.

This is the newspaper article that has led the people of the country to believe that this association was engaged in this work, and the minister tells us now that he has no definite information regarding the matter. The deputy minister is in the Old Country, but surely the minister can keep in touch with events over there. Are we simply putting these items in the estimates to make it appear to the people that the government propose some time to do something along this line, but that in the meantime they have no in-

tention of doing anything? If that is the case I think it would be better to say so now and end the farce.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I have been trying all evening to tell my hon. friend what we were doing. At one stage of the proceedings he seemed quite favourable, but now he appears to have a different attitude altogether. I am extremely anxious to carry out what I have suggested to-night, and I thought I was going to have the support of my hon. friend, but apparently he does not desire me to get on with the attempt I am making to have the arrangement completed in the Old Land. I am very anxious to bring people from the Old Country into Canada, and I have spent considerable time to-night explaining to the committee what we are doing. I hope I made myself clear, because I certainly did want to put the position fully before the committee. At one stage my hon. friend was quite enthusiastic; he said, "Here at last is something upon which I can agree with the minister." But unfortunately I have spoiled it all by explaining too much.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: The minister has certainly devoted a good deal of time to informing the House as to what he has not done, but as regards anything having been done, I fail to see what results have been obtained through the policy that has been featured in the press so often during the last few months.

Mr. CALDWELL: My criticism of the minister's policy will not be of the character offered by the hon. member (Mr. Sutherland). He has criticized the minister in one breath for not having done anything, and, in the next breath, for spending money on the Canada Colonization Association. If I have any criticism to offer it is because the minister has paid over money to this association before it has been voted by parliament. I fully approve of the policy of not making any agreement that calls for an expenditure of public moneys until it is voted by parliament, and I am glad that the minister has been exercising some caution in this respect. I do take strong exception to money being paid to this association. I do not approve of the scheme at all. However, I did not rise at this moment to make any speech on this point. I simply want to endorse what has been said by my leader (Mr. Forke) earlier in the evening, and to suggest that the minister give the items in connection with this vote of $600,000. I would ask him to put those items on Hansard so that we may be able to consider them beforehand. My leader asked that this item, together with item 53, be allowed to stand that the details be put on Hansard, and I should like to defer any further remarks in conection with these votes so that the minister might have an opportunity to comply with the hon. member's request.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The whole item covers some $1,700,000, and I think I may justly plead fatigue. I have had a fairly strenuous day and it would take a considerable time to give those items. If the leader of the House (Mr. Mackenzie King) will permit me, I shall be glad to do it on Tuesday.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: We all want to save the minister as much as we can. Would it not be easier to have the details drawn up and a copy sent to the hon. member (Mr. Forke) and to anyone else who might want it? I have tried to follow the minister as closely as possible. As far as I can understand him, in connection with the first item of $200,000, in so far as our financial commitments are concerned, the British government puts up 50 per cent and we 50 per cent, and both say good-bye to it. In regard to the next item, the domestics, that also is something that is handled entirely in co-operation with the British government. They are to be responsible for 50 per cent, and we for 50 per cent. But there is in connection with that a further qualification. The British government's share is to be repaid before we get ours, unless we make an arrangement with the Salvation Army and substitute them for ourselves so that we shall have no further responsibility for the 50 per cent.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: There remains, however, a third class which I understood my hon. friend to say the home government had nothing to do with.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Oh, yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then I misunderstood my hon. friend, because it seemed to me that we were putting up money for the nominator, on the bond of the nominator, on the payment of 25 per cent in cash. I did not understand that the British government had anything to do with this.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then the whole of the vote depends on the making of an agreement with the British government. I should like to know whether a draft agreement has yet been prepared, so that we may have some idea of its contents.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No, we have not yet got a draft agreement with the British government; that will have to be entered into. I am waiting for particulars to know what form that draft will take.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I notice further that for the purposes of the agreement we are to have regulations. I wonder whether my hon. friend could not give the committee some idea as to what regulations he will adopt for the purposes of assisting and helping the immigrant, on the one hand, and protecting the country, on the other. The whole thing is to be done by way of regulations. Does he propose new regulations? Is so, in what connection does he need anything new?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): There is very little needed. I regret that I did not before inform the committee that we expect the Overseas Settlement Board to join in the third scheme. That is the hope but there will be this difference in connection with it, that we shall be responsible for the whole amount. Of course it will be divided between the Overseas government and the federal government of Canada, but we shall be responsible for the repaymnt of the whole amount. That is the difference between the domestic scheme and that of the nominated passage. But it is only on account of the Salvation Army that we escape the responsibility for the half furnished by the British government in the scheme for bringing out domestics. The regulations are much along the lines that I have explained. Arrangements have been made with the banks, and they understand what we propose doing. As these bonds come in properly filled out we send them forward.

Mr. CALDWELL: Just a word further in regard to putting a detailed statement befor us so we may have an opportunity to consider it during the week end. Practically every member is on two or three committees, some of which are sitting twice a day, and it is only on Saturdays and Mondays that we have a chance to attend to anything outside that work. For this reason I hope the minister will give us, even although it be only in brief outline, particulars of the items under which the $1,800,000 will be spent. Unfortunately most of the Progressive members are from the extreme ends of the Dominion and do not go home over the week end, so they will be here and in a position to study these particulars. If the minister adopts this suggestion I am sure it will expedite the passage of these items.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I had in mind that hon. members would be having a week's rest.

Mr. CALDWELL: We would like an opportunity to consider these particulars before Monday afternoon if possible. Could the minister not give us a brief outline of the expenditures?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): They are innumerable.

Mr. CALDWELL: All we want is a brief outline of the heads under which the $1,800,000 will be spent.

Mr. FORKE: Does the minister intend to go on with this next week?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I should like to have the assisted passage scheme disposed of, because until it is settled I am unable to say definitely to the British government whether we can begin or not.

Mr. FORKE: If the minister does not intend to go on with it next week he could put the items on Hansard later.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I can put them on to-night.

Mr. FORKE: As we have had a pretty full explanation regarding the $600,000 vote I would suggest that it be passed.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): It would facilitate business very much if the committee would agree to let it pass.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not think I could agree to that, Mr. Chairman. I should like to have a little more information as to the form of the agreement and the regulations. I would point out to my hon. friend that the way the vote is worded leaves a doubt as to whether he would make his arrangements for nominated passages through the British government. He hopes to, but he is not at all sure about it. At the same time he wants to do business. If he takes his vote this way he cannot do it apart from the agreement. I think he had better consider very carefully whether he wants the bargain in that form.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I had Mr. Edwards draw this agreement after careful consideration of the Overseas Settlement Act. He drew it as best he could in conformity with the act.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: If the minister does business under the overseas scheme entirely the agreement is perfectly well drawn. I understood that my hon. friend was going

to do business under that act as far as children and domestics are concerned, but beyond those classes he was not quite determined how to proceed.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Oh yes, I have no intention of using any part of this money except in conjunction with the Overseas Settlement Board.

Item agreed to.

Mr. FORKE: I do not think there is any particular hurry for putting the particulars on Hansard to-night.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I cannot very well give a summary without using all these sheets, involving several hundred names and the amounts mentioned for printing and advertising, in Great Britain $202,000 and in the United States $370,000 if I remember correctly, and a great many other items. Would it be satisfactory to the committee if I prepared a statement of the amounts spent on salaries and advertising and lumped these together? Otherwise it will mean a great deal of detail.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: If the minister is preparing a statement why not set out the information in detail? It will be quite easy to do so.

Mr. FORKE: If we could get an intelligent grasp of how these moneys are being spent we would be satisfied. It would facilitate the business of the committee if we had this information beforehand.

Progress reported.

INTERIM SUPPLY

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): Before the adjournment may I call the attention of the House to the fact that we are on the edge of a new fiscal year, and though we have made considerable progress with the Estimates the supplies are not in a condition to warrant us making anything like an extensive appropriation. I am going to ask the House on Monday, if I can obtain unanimous consent, for a special supply bill covering two months of the coming year. I give notice in this informal way in the hope that the House will agree to it without division.

On motion of Mr. Fielding the House adjourned at 10.55 p.m.

[Sir Henry Drayton.]

Monday, March 26, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

INTERIM SUPPLY

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): In accordance with an intimation given on Friday last, I desire to ask the unanimous consent of the House to the several steps that would be necessary for the passing of an Interim Supply Bill. If there be no objection, I move that the House do now proceed to Government Orders for that purpose.

Motion agreed to.

The House proceeded to consider certain resolutions reported from Committee of Supply.

Agriculture—experimental farms, $1,525,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON (West York): The unanimous consent given, as I understood it, was a consent that my hon. friend should get his interim supply, but that he should confine it to interim supply, and not ask the House to go through the form of taking all the different estimates that have already been passed and of asking for concurrences.

Mr. FIELDING: The usual course is that we take all the estimates that have been dealt with and add one-sixth of the remainder. I think that is the invariable practice. If that is not so, I shall have to let the matter stand over until to-morrow and re-cast the resolution.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What we used to do, and what my hon. friend always took objection to, was to vote one-sixth, full right being reserved to object, later on, to any estimates that had not already been passed. We have to-day some important matters that, I think, should not lose their right of way for the purpose of concurring in everything that has been voted. I am perfectly willing to consent to all that we thought would be done, namely, that the government should have the necessary interim supply, and we consent to a resolution now going through for one-sixth, the usual supply, as interim supply, without prejudice to the opposition or anybody else who may wish to object to any individual item.

Mr. FIELDING: The difficulty is that we have already voted the whole amount of the estimate in a number of instances, and it is rather inconvenient to vote one-sixth of what

we have already voted six-sixths of. I do not think anybody's right is prejudiced by our concurring in any of these resolutions. I think, if my hon. friend will look into the matter, he will find that what I propose now is exactly what has been the custom.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: We can take it as it was last year.

Mr. FIELDING: I have not the papers ready for the motion in that form.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am quite content that the motion be put in that way now, or to-morrow, if my hon. friend so desires.

Mr. FIELDING: To-morrow will do.

Item stands.

COMMITTEE ON MINES AND MINERALS

CHANGE IN MEMBERSHIP

On the motion of Mr. Fielding, the House reverted to the order, "Motions."

Mr. MACKENZIE KING moved:

That the name of Mr. Garland (Bow River) be substituted for that of Mr. Speakman as member of the standing committee on Mines and Minerals.

Motion agreed to.

EASTER ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: With the consent of the House I beg to move:

That when this House adjourns on Wednesday, the 28th instant, it stand adjourned until Monday, the 9th of April.

Motion agreed to.

INTERNATIONAL LABOUR CONFERENCE

Mr. MURDOCK: I beg to lay on the Table papers requested by the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) on Friday last, relative to representation at the meeting of the Geneva body of International Labour office on April 10, next.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT

BETTING INFORMATION

Sir LOMER GOUIN (Minister of Justice) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 102 to amend the Criminal Code.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Explain.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: The purpose of the bill is to prohibit the giving of information as to betting on horse races and fights.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will this be the only amendment to the Criminal Code which the government will introduce this session?

Mr. BUREAU: That is for the government to decide.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): How far does this proposal go?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: This is the bill which I mentioned some weeks ago as embodying a suggestion which was submitted to us by the Attorney General of Ontario.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

THE BUDGET

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir HENRY DRAYTON (West York): As the question of the Easter adjournment has now been settled, I suppose my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) would like to announce to the House when he will bring down the budget. We should like to know whether it will be just after the recess, or when.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): My hon. friend is quite right; I should certainly like to make the announcement he requests. But there are many things which I should like to do that are not immediately in my power.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Perhaps the minister might assist hon. members to the extent of informing the House that he is not going to bring down the budget the first week after we re-assemble.

Mr. FIELDING: I think I may oblige my hon. friend so far as to say that he is correct in that assumption.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—RETIRING BONUSES

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. WARD: I desire to draw the attention of the government to a question which has been standing on the order paper in my name cince the 9th day of March. The question is one which I believe to be of national importance and I should like to have some assurance from the government as to when I may expect an answer.

Mr. GRAHAM: What is the question?

Mr. WARD: The question is No. 2 on today's order paper, and relates to bonuses to retiring officials and directors of the Canadian National Railways.

Mr. GRAHAM: The answer will be brought down shortly.

PRIVATE BILLS

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 86 (from the Senate), for the relief of Frederick Wesley Graham.—Mr. Hunt.

Bill No. 87 (from the Senate), for the relief of Catherine Gunyo Chatterson Odell.—Mr. Macdonald (Pictou).

Bill No. 88 (from the Senate), for the relief of Marietta Isabel Wilson.—Mr. Church.

Bill No. 89 (from the Senate), for the relief of Marian Eugenie MacCordick).—Mr. Jacobs.

Bill No. 90 (from the Senate), for the relief of Elizabeth Frankland.—Mr. Church.

Bill No. 91 (from the Senate), for the relief of Arnold Carrington Burke.—Mr. Church.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

PORT ARTHUR AND FORT WILLIAM—GRAIN

Hon. Mr. STEVENS:

1. What was the total amount of dockages on all grain received at Port Arthur and Fort William by regular public terminal elevators for calendar year 1922 and for crop year ending August 31, 1922?

2. What was the weekly average price paid the producer for dockages from public terminal elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur from 1st September to 31st December, 1922?

3. What was the total amount of dockages on all grain received at Fort William by the government elevator for calendar year 1922, and for crop year ending August 31, 1922?

4. What were the weekly average prices paid the producer for dockages from government elevator, Fort William, from 1st September to 31st December, 1922?

5. What was the total amount of revenue received by the government elevator at Fort William for screenings for crop year 1922?

6. What is the information as applied to public terminal elevators and the government elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur:—(a) Total amount of wheat scalpings shipped from same; (b) total amount of oats scalpings shipped from same; (c) total amount of second recleaned scalpings shipped from same; (d) total amount of elevator scalpings shipped from same; (e) total amount of elevator screenings shipped from same; (f) total amount of second recleaned scalpings received in crop 1922 at regular terminal elevators; (g) total amount of elevator screenings received in crop 1922 at regular terminal elevators; (h) total amount of oats scalpings received in crop 1922 at regular terminal elevators; (i) total amount of wheat scalpings received in crop 1922 at regular terminal elevator; (j) total amount of elevator scalpings received in crop 1922 at regular terminal elevators?

[Mr. Ward.]

Hon. Mr. ROBB: This question has been on the order paper some time, and it may have to stand for a few days yet, as we have to send to the different outports where there are elevators to secure the returns. I am merely making this explanation for the information of the hon. member in whose name the question stands.

Question stands.

DRAWBACKS

Mr. FANSHER:

1. What was the value of the materials imported into Canada, during the last fiscal year, which entered into the manufacture of goods finally exported from Canada and on which a drawback was paid?

2. What was the amount of duty paid on these materials?

3. What was the amount of money returned to the importers in the way of rebates or drawbacks?

4. What was the value of the materials imported into Canada, during the past fiscal year, for the manufacture of goods for home consumption upon which a drawback was paid?

5. What was the amount of duty paid on these materials?

6. What was the amount of money returned to the importers in the way of rebates or drawbacks?

Hon. Mr. BUREAU: I have already asked the hon. member to state his question more precisely, because the only way in which we can know when what materials are imported for manufacturing purposes is when the drawback is asked for. I cannot answer the question as it stands on the order paper, because no declaration is made at the customs that any particular materials are imported for manufacturing purposes.

Mr. BLACK (Huron): The hon. member is not in the House.

Mr. BUREAU: He can see me if he cares to.

Question stands.

GRAIN—PORTS OF SHIPMENT

Hon. Mr. BAXTER:

1. What quantity of grain has been carried to Portland, Maine, for shipment since 1st November, 1922, and was brought to that port wholly or partly by Government railways?

2. Of the total quantity how much is Canadian grown and how much American grown?

3. How much grain has been carried to St. John, New Brunswick, since 1st November, 1922, by the Canadian National Railways for shipment?

4. Of that quantity how much is Canadian grown and how much American grown?

5. How much grain has been carried to St. John, New Brunswick, since 1st November, 1922, by the Canadian Pacific Railway for shipment?

6. Of that quantity how much is Canadian grown and how much American grown?

7. How much grain has been carried to Halifax, Nova Scotia, since 1st November, 1922, by the Canadian National Railways for shipment?

8. Of that quantity how much is Canadian grown and how much American grown?

Hon. Mr. ROBB:

1. and 2. Receipts of Canadian grain at Portland, Maine, since November 1, 1922, via Canadian Government Railways.

	Bushels
Wheat	11,133,180
Oats	1,649,892
Barley	612,955
Rye	1,360,781
Total	14,756,808

Receipts of American Grain not available.

3.

	Canadian Grain Bushels	U.S. Grain Bushels	Total Bushels
Wheat	957,085	55,107	1,012,192
Oats	585,282	.....	585,282
Barley	174,009	.....	174,009
Corn	.....	12,495	12,495
Rye	.....	299,680	299,680
Total	1,716,376	367,282	2,083,658

4. Answered by No. 3.

5.

	Canadian Grain Bushels	U.S. Grain Bushels	Total Bushels
Wheat	8,635,368	102,994	8,738,362
Oats	1,764,921	.....	1,764,921
Barley	647,692	.....	647,692
Corn	.....	628,686	628,686
Rye	.....	1,470,441	1,470,441
Total	11,047,981	2,202,121	13,250,102

6. Answered by No. 5.

7. Nil.

8. Nil.

SCARFE VARNISH WORKS

Mr. CHARTERS:

1. What purchases have been made since the present government came into power by the Canadian National Railway or by the Grand Trunk Railway from the Scarfe Varnish Works, Brantford, Ontario?

2. Were such purchases made after public competition? If so, in what cases?

3. Is the president of this firm the Mr. Reginald Scarfe who is president of the Liberal Association at Brantford, Ontario?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. $14,203.

2. All such purchases are made after public competition.

3. No information; but, in any event, the holding of such a position by the president of the firm would neither help nor hinder the purchases which, quality established, are determined by considerations of price, not politics.

GRANVILLE ISLAND—TAX

Hon. Mr. STEVENS:

1. Has the Dominion Government been approached by the city council of Vancouver regarding the taxation, by the city, of Granville island?

2. If so, has any decision been arrived at and what is it?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. The city council of Vancouver has not directly approached the Dominion government respecting the taxation of Granville island. Representations have been made to the Department of Marine and Fisheries to the effect that Granville island should be taxed for the benefit of the city.

2. Under consideration.

EXCURSION RAILWAY RATES

Mr. CHURCH:

1. Is it the intention of the government to introduce legislation this session to amend the Railway Act so as to restore cheap, special rate excursion tickets (as was the custom before the war) on such special occasions as public holidays, week-ends, fall fairs, sporting contests, games and conferences?

2. If the government does not propose such legislation this Session, in view of the special and many urgent requests for these special rates last session from numerous fall fair organizations, the Canadian National Exhibition and many sportsmen's organizations and agricultural societies in Canada, will the government or Minister of Railways use their good offices with the railway companies to restore this old and long established custom and practice as to special rates?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. It is not the intention of the government to introduce such legislation. This must be left to the initiative of the railways, subject to the supervision of the Railway Board in regard to discrimination, etc., as provided by the Railway Act.

2. The government understands that the railways, in 1922, made the following arrangements for specially reduced fares, and is assured that the railways will carefully consider whether it is advisable to make any other special fares along the lines indicated in the question of the hon. member:

Effective July 10, 1922, the Canadian Railways voluntarily put the following reduced fares into effect:

Organized Excursions and Pilgrimages.—100 or more adult fares guaranteed—lowest one-way first class, fare and one-third for the round trip minimum fare 50 cents per adult ticket and 25 cents per child's ticket.

Celebrations, demonstrations, regattas and political meetings—lowest one-way first-class fare and one-half for the round trip—minimum fare 25 cents for adults or children.

Round trip party fares—10 or more adults travelling together on going trip—one-way first-class fare and one-half for the round trip.

Circuit tour party fares—10 or more adults travelling together for entire trip—seventy-five per cent or one-way first-class fare between stop over points.

Week end fares—two and one-half (2½) cents per mile. From industrial centres to country districts. Good going Saturday and Sunday; return limit Monday.

Larger Agricultural Exhibitions—Lowest one-way first-class fare and one-third for round trip; minimum fare for adults or children 25 cents; Territory—to be agreed upon between interested lines.

Smaller Agricultural Exhibitions and Fall Fairs—Lowest one-way first-class fare and one-third for round trip, minimum fare for adults or children 25 cents. Territory—from points where the lowest one-way first-class fare to place of exhibition does not exceed $3.

DEPARTMENTAL OFFICES—RUGS

Mr. COOTE:

During each of the last three years, how many rugs have been purchased for departmental offices and what was the cost of same?

Hon. Mr. KING (Kootenay): In the fiscal year 1920-21, purchased 36 at a cost of $2,967.95; in 1921-22, 49 at a cost of $5,279.61, including rug for the Privy Council chamber; and in 1922-23, 44 at a cost of $4,113.36.

HON. MR. PUGSLEY, COMMISSIONER

Mr. HANSON:

1. Has the Hon. William Pugsley been appointed a commissioner to investigate Canadian claims against Germany and other former enemy countries arising out of the war?

2. If so, when was he appointed, and what are the terms of his appointment, financial and otherwise?

Hon. Mr. COPP:

1. The Hon. William Pugsley was appointed by Order-in-Council dated the 13th March, 1923, a Commissioner under Part I of the Inquiries Act, to investigate and report upon all claims filed with the Department of the Secretary of State, as follows:

(a) Claims of persons residing or carrying on business in Canada who have been subjected to loss and pecuniary damages arising through the destruction of life and property through the illegal warfare of the enemy, and

(b) Claims for damages to which persons residing or carrying on business in Canada, have been subjected for breaches of contracts, which contracts were prevented from being carried out owing to the operation of the Statutory List of persons in neutral countries with whom such contracts were declared illegal;

for the purpose of determining whether such claims are within the categories referred to in the First Annex to Section I of Part VIII of the Treaty of Peace of Versailles, the fair amount of such claims, and to make such findings as may be of assistance to the government in determining which, if any, of such claims should be paid, and the extent of payment thereof.

Under the said Order-in-Council the said the Hon. William Pugsley was also appointed a Commissioner under the Inquiries Act for the purpose of considering and recommending to the Custodian of Enemy Property releases where the parties are necessitous, suffering and in hardship.

2. No terms of appointment, financial or otherwise have been arranged other than those set out in the Order in Council above referred to.

CHARTERED BANKS—FARMER SHAREHOLDERS

Mr. BLACK (Yukon):

1. How many of the shareholders of the chartered banks of Canada in each province of Canada in 1922 were farmers?

2. How many farmers in each province of the Dominion paid Dominion income tax in 1922?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING:

1. Persons designated as farmers, ranchers and fruit growers in the returns of shareholders of chartered banks as at December 31, 1922, numbered as follows:

Alberta	216
British Columbia	93
Manitoba	830
New Brunswick	65
Nova Scotia	245
Ontario	1,188
Prince Edward Island	38
Quebec	465
Saskatchewan	748
Total	3,887

2.

Alberta	1,638
British Columbia	640
Manitoba	3,458
New Brunswick	48
Nova Scotia	198
Ontario	6,138
Prince Edward Island	40
Quebec	150
Saskatchewan	6,560
Yukon	3
Total	18,873

VANCOUVER TERMINAL ELEVATOR

Mr. COOTE:

1. What was the number of bushels of each kind of grain handled by the Terminal elevator at Vancouver in the year 1922?
2. What were the total receipts and expenditures in connection with this elevator in the year 1922?
3. What is the total storage capacity of this elevator?
4. What was the cost of this elevator?
5. When was it completed?

Hon. Mr. ROBB:

1.

	Stock on hand Dec. 31, 1921	Receipts	Total Handlings
Wheat	822,930	12,085,158	12,908,088
Oats	410	33,004	33,414
Barley	nil	1,823	1,823
Flax	nil	nil	nil
Rye	nil	155,335	155,335
Total	823,340	12,275,320	13,098,660

2. Total receipts $171,273.02. Total expenditure $73,868.59.

3. 1,250,000 bushels.

4. Capital cost to January 1, 1923, $837,351.71.

5. November 30, 1916.

SOREL POSTMASTERSHIP

Mr. HANSON:

1. Did the position of postmaster at Sorel, Quebec, become vacant in the year 1922 by the death of the incumbent?
2. How many applications were received for the said position, and what were their names?
3. Were not applications received from three returned soldiers?
4. If so, why was not the position given to one of them instead of going to J. Edouard Champoux, the present postmaster?
5. Is he not a brother-in-law of the sitting member for the county of Richelieu?

Hon. Mr. COPP:

1. Yes.

2. Eight, viz., R. Garceau, R.S., R. Villandre, R. S., B. Godin, R. S., J. E. Champoux, J. O. Duhamel, J. E. Rajotte, J. H. Lamothe, L. Forget.

3. Yes.

4. None of the three returned soldiers were considered qualified under the terms of the Civil Service Act and the Commission's regulations,—Garceau on account of his unfavourable standing in the community; Villandre had been non-resident in Sorel since May, 1920; and Godin had not the necessary education qualifications.

5. No information.

JEAN BILODEAU

Mr. HANSON:

1. Is Jean Bilodeau, captain on Dredge No. 12, located at Sorel, Quebec?
2. If so, when was he appointed?
3. Is this the same Jean Bilodeau who was chief engineer of the dredge Tarte, now known as dredge No. 7, when one of the boilers exploded causing the death of three of the crew in or about the year 1906?
4. Is it not a fact that at the time of the said explosion, the said Jean Bilodeau only held a fourth class certicate?
5. Does he hold a captain's certificate?
6. If not, why has he been appointed to his present position?
7. Is it not a fact that the said Jean Bilodeau is one of the chief organizers of the Liberal party in the city of Sorel, P.Q?
8. Did dredge No. 12 sink while operating at Contrecœur, Quebec, in or about the month of August, 1922, as a result of the gross negligence and incapacity of the said Jean Bilodeau, who was captain in charge at the time?
9. What was the cost of refloating said dredge?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. Yes.

2 and 3. There is no record in the Department of Marine and Fisheries of the date on which he joined the ship channel service. He was chief engineer on Dredge No. 7 when the service was transferred from the Public Works department on March 11, 1904, and remained in that position until July 28th, 1909, when he was promoted to the position of Foreman of Machine Shop at Sorel. He remained in the latter position until April 24, 1914, when he was retired as the result of charges of political partizanship made against him. He was appointed to his present position on April 24, 1922. There was no boiler explosion in 1906 but there was an explosion in 1903 during which time he was chief engineer.

4. Yes.

5. No.

6. A certificated master is not required on this class of vessel.

7. The Department of Marine and Fisheries has no information.

8. No.

9. The dredge sunk at Sorel when not in operation. The cost of refloating was approximately $12,000.

PEAT INDUSTRY

Mr. BINETTE:

1. What amount, if any, did the government spend last year to help the peat industry in the county of Prescott?
2. Is it the intention of the government to aid this Canadian industry so as to help the Canadian consumer to secure a substitute for foreign coal?

Hon. Mr. MOTHERWELL:

1. The expenditure in connection with peat fuel investigations at Alfred, Ontario, for the fiscal year 1922-23 to February 28, has been $45,574.59 and of this one half or $22,787.29 has been spent by the federal government.

2. The question has been presented to the government for consideration.

SERVICE TO MEDITERRANEAN

Mr. SPENCE:

Canada, being dependent for a large quantity of citrous fruits, olive oils, dates, figs, raisins, and similar products shipped from Mediterranean ports, has the government considered:—

1. The establishment of a regular boat service between the Mediterranean ports and Canada?

2. If so, when will such service commence, and at what intervals will they sail?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. The management of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine state that the question of establishing a regular service between the Mediterranean ports and Canada has been very thoroughly considered, and it has been decided that the present is not an opportune time to inaugurate such a service.

2. Answered by No. 1.

ORDERS IN COUNCIL

Hon. Mr. MANION:

1. What number of orders in council were passed during the year ending December 31, 1921?

2. What number of orders in council were passed during the year ending December 31, 1922?

Right Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE KING:

1. Year 1921, 5,861.

2. Year 1922, 5,621.

Mr. D. W. MORRISON

Mr. HANSON:

1. Has Mr. D. W. Morrison been dismissed from the position of Postmaster of St. Peters, Nova Scotia?

2. If so, what are the grounds of his dismissal?

3. Was an investigation held before the dismissal was made? If not, why not?

4. Has the Civil Service Commission been instructed to advertise for applicants for the position?

5. If so, will preference be given to returned soldiers?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM (for Postmaster General):

1. Yes.

2. Active political partisanship.

3. D. W. Morrison was appointed by Mr. Robert L. MacLellan as his agent during the federal elections of 1921, and acted as such.

4. The position has been advertised.

5. The vacancy will be filled in the best interests of the public service and consistent with the provisions of the Civil Service Act.

ST. JOHN RIVER WHARVES

Mr. JONES:

What, if anything, was said by the Minister of Public Works during an interview in February last with Premier Veniot, of New Brunswick, which would justify the latter in saying that he was persuaded that the federal government would take over the wharves on the St. John river as reported in the Daily Telegraph on 24th February last?

[Mr. Motherwell.]

Hon. Mr. KING (Kootenay):

Premier Veniot of New Brunswick did interview the Minister of Public Works relative to taking over the wharves on the St. John river, and was informed that the matter would receive serious consideration.

ONTARIO GOVERNMENT BANKS

Mr. HANSON:

1. Has the Department of Finance in any way recognized or authorized the banking operations of the province of Ontario?

2. Is it true, as reported in the press, that the savings deposits now being taken by the Ontario government are costing that province over 7 per cent?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING:

1. The operations of the Ontario government, in receiving money on deposit, are conducted under the authority of a statute of the province. The Department of Finance of Canada has no connection with them in any way.

2. The Department of Finance has no information concerning the cost of the operations in question.

HARBOUR COLD STORAGE

Mr. THOMPSON:

1. Is the Harbour cold storage a national institution?

2. To what extent is it financed by the government and at what rate of interest?

3. What are the net results (profit and loss) on the operating expenses of this storage for its first year's operations?

4. How will deficits be met, and in event of loss will harbour dues be increased to meet same?

5. Are the rates charged by the harbour commission lower than other public cold storages charged previous to opening the harbour commission's plant?

6. Is it the intention of the government to subsidize cold storage to be operated by co-operative associations in various parts of the country with the idea of having a chain of storages in the country to supply the harbour cold storage and thus have all under government control?

7. Would there be any discrimination against private individuals or corporations who might desire a subsidy for a cold storage plant, or is it intended to assist only rural communities that are organized?

8. Has any provision been made for the continuance of a subsidized cold storage in case of disorganization of the co-operative societies?

9. In the event of public cold storages being closed as a result of competition is there likely to be any increase in the rates charged by the harbour commission?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Mr. Speaker, I do not know of any corporation or organization called the harbour cold storage. I surmise, however, that the hon. gentleman refers to the Montreal cold storage. If this is so I will have the required answer prepared.

Mr. SPEAKER: Stands.

WELLAND SHIP CANAL

Mr. THOMPSON:

1. Have all the sections of the Welland Ship Canal been placed under contract?
2. During the fiscal year 1922-23 have the contractors operated their respective contracts at a rate that will ensure the completion of the project within the various contract stipulations? If not, why not?
3. Has the engineer in charge a pre-arranged schedule of operation for the contractors? If so, why does he not compel the contractors to fulfil it?
4. What will the interest charges be, on the Welland Ship Canal, on borrowed capital for the ensuing year?
5. Why is the work not operated more vigorously, and why should the government pay unnecessary interest on uncompleted work?
6. How many men were employed on each of the contracts during January?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. No.
2. Yes; contractors made such progress as will permit them to complete their contracts within times stipulated in their respective contracts.
3. Engineers' schedules are limited in their application by the terms of contracts, which terms contractors are compelled to fulfil.
4. The amounts expended by the Dominion of Canada in the construction of the Welland Ship Canal were not provided by specific borrowing and no interest has been charged.
5. The vigour of operations is determined by consideration of all factors affecting ultimate maximum economy. Undue expedition in the conduct of such construction work would result in losses from inefficiency of operations greatly in excess of the saving effected on interest account.
6. Daily average for month of January, 1923: Sections Nos. 1 and 2, 284; sections Nos. 3 and 4, 336; section No. 5, 154; construction railway, 72, not allocated between sections 1 and 2 and 3 and 4.

MARA, P.O.

Mr. MacKELVIE:

1. What is the name of the present postmaster for Mara, British Columbia?
2. When was he appointed?
3. For what length of term?
4. Is he under bonds?
5. If so, in what amount and who are the bondsmen?
6. Is there an assistant postmaster employed by the Post Office department at Mara?
7. If so, what is his name and amount of salary paid him?
8. Who has the contract to carry His Majesty's mail from the railway station to the post office?
9. What is the present cost to the government for this work per month?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Cyril E. Rosoman.
2. 9th May, 1921 .
3. Indefinite.
4. No.
5. Answered by 4.
6. No.
7. Answered by 6.
8. The estate of the late Mary E. Rosoman.
9. $12.50.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

MR. D. W. MORRISON

Mr. HANSON:

For a copy of all papers, writings, telegrams, orders in council, affidavits or documents of any kind relating to the dismissal of Mr. D. W. Morrison from the position of postmaster of St. Peters, Nova Scotia, including all communications to and from Mr. W. E. McLellan, acting district superintendent of the Post Office department for the province of Nova Scotia.

MRS. NOLIN

Mr. BOURASSA:

For a copy of all papers, correspondence, letters, telegrams, petitions, requests and other documents, exchanged between the Post Office department and any persons, from the year 1911 to date in regard to the resignation of Mrs. J. Nolin, postmistress of St. David, County of Levis.

MR. U. BELANGER

Mr. PELLETIER:

For a copy of all letters, papers, reports and other documents, regarding the dismissal of U. Belanger, station agent at Padoue, county of Matane, in 1922.

MR. A. C. BELANGER

Mr. PELLETIER:

For a copy of all letters, papers, reports and other documents, regarding the dismissal of A. C. Belanger, night station agent at St. Moise, Matane county, in 1922.

MR. JOSEPH LEBLANC

Mr. LEGER:

For a copy of all letters, papers, telegram, correspondence and other documents, in the possession of the government, exchanged between Mr. Walter Fisher, Chief Fishery Inspector, Eastern Division, Halifax, Nova Scotia; T. W. Crocker, Fishery Inspector, Newcastle, New Brunswick, and Joseph Le Blanc of Richibucto Village, and the Department of Marine and Fisheries, in reference to the seizure and confiscation of the Joseph Le Blanc fishing boat, so called, for illegal fishing, in the year 1922, at Richibucto Cape, New Brunswick. Also a copy of the order given by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for the release of said confiscated boat to the said Joseph Le Blanc.

FRENCH TRANSLATION AND PRINTING

Mr. VIEN:

For a return showing a statement of:—

1. All annual and supplementary reports of the department of the public service which, since the appointment of the Editorial Committee (October 4th, 1917) to date, have been printed in the English language, and which have not, at the time or later, been translated into the French language, or which, having been translated, have not been printed;

2. All pamphlets and miscellaneous book work which have been printed in the English language, during the same period to date, and which have not, at the time or later, been translated into the French language, or which, having been translated, have not been printed;

3. All the orders or rulings issued by either the Editorial Committee or the departments, under which such translation has not been effected, or under which, after translation, the printing of the said documents has not taken place.

EQUALIZATION OF RAILWAY RATES

PRIORITY OF MR. CLARK'S MOTION

Mr. J. A. CLARK (Burrard): Mr. Speaker, on Monday last when I moved my resolution on the equalization of freight rates it stood over for the purpose of enabling you, Sir, to look into the question of whether it was in order. I then asked that the motion should be given right of way to-day, and I understood that the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) acceded to my request. At least, he stated that subject to your decision my motion would be given priority. He also stated that he would consult with members of his own party who had resolutions on the order paper ahead of mine with a view of securing that right of way.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, my recollection of what I said when my hon. friend asked that the priority of his motion might be preserved is that I intimated the government would do whatever lay within its power to meet his wishes, seeing that he was dropping his motion for the time being to suit your convenience, Sir, to enable you to look up certain references. Of course, the government's power in a matter of this kind is limited by the consent of the House. If the House is agreeable to giving the hon. gentleman precedence, the government is perfectly willing he should have it.

Mr. CLARK: I think my right hon. friend has apparently forgotten that after I had spoken to the motion, being in some doubt as to what interpretation might be placed upon the words I used, I immediately crossed the floor and explained to him that I intended to ask that my motion should be given right of way over all other motions, and should be taken up to-day. I also requested that the other motions, which stood in my way should be proceeded with last Wednesday. The first motion now on the order paper is one of those which I then referred to.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think my hon. friend did come over and speak to me, and I said I would see what could be done. But he will be the first to admit that I could not make any promise which would bind the entire House. I have spoken to other hon. members who have resolutions ahead, but they maintain that it is their right to insist on their motions being called in their regular order. I am afraid, therefore, that unless they are willing to withdraw from that position at this moment, my power in the matter is limited.

BANKRUPTCY

PROPOSED ABROGATION OR AMENDMENT OF BANKRUPTCY ACT, 1919

Mr. PIERRE F. CASGRAIN (Charlevoix-Montmorency) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, in view of the fact that the Bankruptcy Act, 1919, and amendments thereto, does not obtain the results expected, and is the source of complaints from various industries and trades, it is desirable that the said law should be amended or abrogated.

He said: Mr. Speaker, last year I had on the order paper a resolution similar to this but I did not press it because I was given to understand that substantial amendments would be introduced to the Bankruptcy Act. The amendments, however, which were bought down in the last lap of the session, were of not much importance; they did not cover many of the points discussed and did not appear at any rate to be such as to afford relief.

All over the country to-day, especially in the province of Quebec, the present law and its application is criticized. Its enforcement during the last three years has been sufficient to prove to the general public that the law is not as good as it was thought it would be, not even as good as the old system which formerly prevailed under the abandonment of property provisions in our province and the Winding-up Act. Everybody will understand that the bankruptcy law is of the highest importance; it has a great influence on the economic and commercial life of the country, and even, I would add, on its morality. When our present law was passed one of its objects was to provide that when a person became insolvent his wealth and property should belong to his creditors and be distributed among them equitably; that a debtor was to be liberated if he were not proved guilty of any fraud, and that the costs were to be reduced to a minimum. That is what we were told when the provisions of the present law were introduced in the House in 1919 and that had been the object of previous laws respecting bankruptcy in this country. Since its enforcement, however, the present law seems to have

opened the door to fraud and speculation. It has been injurious to the credit of individuals and commercial firms and in large measure has contributed to the financial depression that at present exists in this country. There is a good deal of feeling against the law, not only in the province of Quebec but also in other parts of the Dominion. And just here I cannot do better, Mr. Speaker, than to cite to the House some remarks made by Mr. Colby, then member for Stanstead, when the law of 1880 was repealed. He said:

> The idea of protecting the honest and unfortunate debtor was a humane and proper idea, but in England, in the United States and in Canada, where endeavours have been made to protect the honest and unfortunate trader, the door had been unfortunately opened to fraud, demoralization, recklessness, and evils so numerous that it became necessary in the public interest, that these facilities should be done away with.

This seems to have been the case in connection with the present law. I believe also that the promoters of the law, who were desirous of having uniform legislation on the subject—and I am told that the idea originated in the western provinces, the Canadian Credit Men's Association being its chief promoter—have had fault to find with it since it went into force. Mr. Detchon, the general manager of that association, is reported as having said recently that the law is favourable to the dishonest trader who makes use of the same to get rid of his indebtedness and in a certain way to keep the greatest part of his money to the detriment of his creditors. In the province of Quebec numerous trustees have been appointed under this law, and their aim and object has been to show people financially embarrassed the way to get out of their difficulties. We have seen circulars issued to people of the trades and industries and to others, asking them to call meetings of their officers or trustees for the purpose of discussing methods of overcoming their financial difficulties of the moment and of trying to get rid of their debt and turning over a new leaf. These people have sent notices out and have employed canvassers not only in the cities but in the country districts as well. We have seen many of them in the province of Quebec going to honest farmers in certain communities who are in some little financial difficulty and offering to fix things up for them. They tell these farmers that if they will let them look after their affairs they will put them under the provisions of the Bankruptcy Act so that they may have freedom from all their creditors. I am told that a great many people in the rural districts have been lured by these canvassers who told them that their financial difficulties would be relieved, and the result has been that they have run into further difficulties. Sometimes they have succeeded in paying only 10, 15 or 20 per cent and have not been any better off after they failed; in fact, their position has been worse.

The present law provides facilities to enable the debtor to go to a trustee, open all his affairs to him, and ask him to make a settlement. In my opinion too much freedom is thus allowed to the debtor who is not so scrupulous, because he can go to a trustee and by preparing a statement of his affairs from two to six months ahead he can make a showing which, while substantially according to the facts, is not fully accurate and may thus make an attempt to get away with something. I may be told that there is a provision in the law under which such a trustee may be removed. It is true that a trustee may be removed for cause after a meeting of creditors called for the purpose. But it is usually the case that when a man goes to the trouble of getting a trustee to look after his affairs for him he has beforehand sought the opinion of some of the largest creditors and obtained their consent to the arrangement on the understanding that those creditors will get off not too badly and that they will be paid a certain amount of their claim. Then when an attempt is made to put out the trustees who have been so chosen, the creditors who have not been consulted find themselves in the dark; they are without support, and thus there cannot be secured the number of creditors necessary to bring about the removal of the trustees. This is one of the bad features of the law. In Montreal and in the rural districts as well people have failed who would have been able to meet their indebtedness with a little effort; they could have found a remedy for their financial difficulties without taking a course that would leave their creditors with nothing.

The cost of operations under the present law is too great. One of the objects of the law, as was stated on its introduction, was to reduce the costs of legal services and of trustees. I had a case in court where the creditors had taken proceedings against a debtor, obtained judgment and the property was in the hands of the sheriff to be sold. The cost amounted to about $300. Just a day or so before the date fixed for the sale, the trustee went to the debtor and explained the situation to him. The debtor immediately made an assignment, took the benefit of the law, and the costs were useless. Now the assets of the estate have been wound up, and the costs will have to be paid by the creditors for proceedings against the debtor, although the proceedings were of no avail. The creditors will lose the costs they have paid.

We had another case in which the assets of an insolvent debtor realized the sum of $680, and the fees for the proceedings and for the legal advice of the trustees amounted to $527; the balance went to the privileged creditors and the ordinary creditors went away with nothing. Another case was that of Le Union Co-operation des Fermiers de St. Leon-le-Grand. The proceeds in that case amounted to $3,943.40, and the cost and disbursements amounted to $2,056.44, leaving a dividend of 8½ per cent to the creditors. To-day in most of the small cases the costs absorb nearly the whole amount realized, and the ordinary creditors receive hardly anything. So that we are not much more advanced than we were under the old law. Then we have the bill of costs also of the lawyers, and in this case I am not speaking for myself, and I am not trying to unduly protect the lawyer, because some comments were made in this House a few weeks ago that lawyers were crowding the people hard. This law was made to try to prevent abuses. I had occasion to examine bills of cost myself and I find that the bills of cost are just as heavy as before.

Under the old law, in the superior court of the province of Quebec, it would cost us for a petition from $16 to $20—not more than $20—and now the costs under an order amount to $60, $85 or $90. Last year I had occasion to present a petition to a trustee to declare a dividend, and the costs amounted to $85. It is the same case everywhere, and the trustees themselves and the registrar are authorized by this law to charge for each and every single thing they do, and if any hon. member who has a moment to spare would kindly look at the tariff, which is to be found at the end of the sections, he would find that the bailiff, the trustees, the employees and all the assistants of the trustees, are well and favourably protected, much more than they were under the old law, The Winding-up Act and the Judicial Abandonment of Property Act as administered in Quebec before this law was in force.

There is another objection to this law. The law allowed the trader to fail, and by allowing the trader to fail, it has ruined in my opinion the credit of a great many other persons. We saw last year a great many people who would have been able, under other circumstances, to withstand the commercial and industrial depression and meet their liabilities and claims of their creditors, if it had not been for the bankruptcy law which is in force. We have seen many cases where the merchant would have been able to borrow from the bank or from individuals to carry on and obtain the necessary amount of money to settle his affairs, but he could not borrow this money on account of the bankruptcy law, because the people would say to him, "We have no guarantee, if we advance you a certain amount of money, that in a few days from now, with the help of some trustees or other creditors, you will not assign, and we will be left in the cold and will have no recourse under the law." Many of these merchants have gone to the banks and tried to borrow money and the banks have refused to lend them money because they were afraid they might assign and the bank would not be protected. Another objection is that a hypothec or mortgage created within three months preceding the insolvency is declared void, and that the creditor under the mortgage or hypothec has not the right to recover, according to the rank of the hypothec. The result is that in our province of Quebec, in farming districts, farmers who have become embarrassed under the old law would have been able to obtain money on their farming property, have found the door closed to them on account of this very same law, because the people did not trust them and they were afraid that the hypothec they would obtain on their property would be declared null and void. Since the law has been in force we have seen many merchants and others refusing to give credit to traders or other persons on account of this law. The industrial people, trades people, the business men and the manufacturers are all opposed to the law, and it is a strange thing that those who were pressing for this law in 1919 are all now in favour of the proposition that it should be either abrogated or amended in a way to protect the interest of the merchant, the manufacturer and the industrial people.

At a certain meeting of La Chambre de Commerce in Montreal, which is a French institution similar to the Board of Trade in Ontario, a resolution was passed declaring that La Chambre de Commerce was opposed to the law, and stating that even with the amendments passed at the last session of parliament the law was too wide and more advantageous to the bankrupt.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Will the hon. member allow me a question?

Mr. CASGRAIN: Yes.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Do I understand the hon. member to say that a mortgage registered within three months prior to an assignment act is invalid, even if it were a bona fide mortgage, and no mala fides?

Mr. CASGRAIN: I will come to that point. We have in our civil code article 2023 which says that a mortgage registered within thirty days of the insolvency of the debtor, if it is notoriously known that the man is insolvent, is no good. We have also article 2090 which prevents the registration of any mortgage or privilege on the movable property of the debtor within 30 days immediately preceding the insolvency.

Then I say if we have these provisions in our law to protect us and protect the creditors against the insolvent debtors, or the traders who might be in bad circumstances, I do not see why we should have gone to the trouble of enacting in this new law other articles which have made it worse for us, which are cumbersome, and are in a certain way overlapping the law of the province of Quebec.

Mr. LADNER: Does the bankruptcy law not distinguish between actual money advanced in exchange for a mortgage and the other class where the mortgage is given for a past due debt?

Mr. CASGRAIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am not in a position to answer that question now. I do not think the law makes any distinction as to that, at any rate not that I can remember. I know the law, and it is very complicated and pretty hard to understand. There are lawyers, and many trustees of long standing, in the province of Quebec who are not able to understand it. They find, too, that in many cases, there are contradictions in the law.

Mr. JACOBS: The hon. gentleman will admit there are some lawyers who understand it.

Mr. CASGRAIN: My hon. friend no doubt understands the law as he has made a special study of it, just as he has in the case of the Immigration Act. I say that the law, as it is at present framed is not in the interest of the business community and should either be amended or repealed. I am not alone in that belief. I have cited the opinions of the Chambre de Commerce of Montreal and I hope I may be permitted to read a few extracts of what we see every day in the newspapers of our province. When I opened my newspaper some time ago I saw the heading "Bankruptcy Law Operation Flayed." That was the heading over the report of a certain organization, the Old Colony Club, which was meeting at the Windsor hotel in Montreal and trying to find some way out of the existing difficulties either by the improvement of the present law or by its abrogation. A headline in another newspaper was worded "Bankruptcy Act Not Understood." It may be that that is what my hon. friend was drawing my attention to a moment ago. This had reference to a meeting of the local Rotary Club of Montreal at which efforts were made to discover some amendments to the law which it was thought would remedy the existing conditions in the country. The heading over another newspaper article reads "Bankruptcy Law Needs Amendment." So you see that people, not only in the city of Montreal but in other districts of the province, are getting busy and endeavouring to devise some means of amending this law.

I have here also an article which was published in the Montreal Gazette about the time of the opening of the present session, and I quote from that article the folllowing:

> The results have been, apparently, advantageous, but not to the creditors. The present law does not differ in principle from its short-lived predecessor of 1875-80. The fault with the old law was attributed to administrative weaknesses, and the new statute was professedly designed to remedy these defects.

And then further on:

> The principal objection to the existing law in Canada, as expressed from time to time, is that it does not adequately safeguard the interests of the creditors and of legitimate business, in short, that it makes insolvency profitable to the debtor. It has been criticized further upon the score of expense and upon the ground that it is cumbersome, and the amendments made last year were intended to improve it in these respects.
>
> These amendments did not affect the principle of the law, and do not, apparently, meet the main objection, namely, that the statute encourages bankruptcy. Such an objection, if substantiated, is sufficient to condemn the act, as, obviously, the purpose of the law is frustrated in the result alleged. The case may not be as bad as it is represented to be, but the volume and character of the criticisms denote a fundamental flaw somewhere in the system, and the matter is of sufficient importance to engage the attention of the government and of parliament.

It is for this reason that I am now moving this resolution, in the hope that hon. members will co-operate with me and impress upon the Minister of Justice the importance of making certain desired amendments to the law.

Another effect which this law has had is that it has practically abolished articles 853 and 892 of our code of civil procedure, regarding the abandonment of property, which were in force for fifteen years before they were thus practically superseded and which gave entire satisfaction. Article 891 declares that a debtor is liberated from debt only up to the extent of the amount that his creditors receive from the proceeds of the sale of his assets. On the other hand section 58 of the new Bankruptcy law states that a bankrupt

4 p.m.

person may ask and obtain his release if he had not been proven guilty of any fraud, there being however, certain conditions which must be complied with. It is easy to imagine all the abuses that might possibly flow from such a law. Instead of forcing the bankrupt trader to fulfil his obligations and respect his dealings with his creditors, to my mind, this provision encourages the trader to incur further liabilities. There is also the opportunity of indulging in speculation by giving to the unscrupulous trader a chance, after having made some bad bargain, or of indulging in some imprudent dealings, to get free by making a settlement of some kind on easy terms with his creditors. Sometimes creditors, even though they may have sufficient time, are not interested enough in the settlement of their claims. Very often they do not look with sufficient care into these cases when they are brought to their attention, or when they receive a notice to approve or disapprove of an agreement or a settlement. It is too much the custom of such people to say, "I have made a certain amount of money out of this man, I have had certain transactions with him and in most cases he has paid me well; I shall lose a certain amount in the present case but I will let it go at that." In other cases the creditors are discouraged and do not want to spend more time and money in what they look upon as an uncertainty. The consequence is the bankrupt is liberated when he should not be freed at all. Under the old law in our province, which law is still in force, respecting the judicial abandonment of property, only a man who was in danger of arrest on a capias or a trader in a bad financial condition could assign. To-day, under this Dominion law, any person, whether he is a trader or not, can assign. Under article 853 of the provincial law only a debtor who was liable to be arrested, or a trader who had ceased his payments, could make an assignment. To-day, under this Dominion law, any man can do so whether he is a trader, a real estate operator, an engineer, or even a trustee; and I am told that in certain cities there are men acting as trustees who have made compromises with their creditors and who are operating under an extension of time. I am told that such men as these have, unfortunately, been given the administration of certain estates in the district in which they reside. The position of these men might have escaped the notice of the department because of their being highly recommended. I am, however, informed on good authority that there are such cases and it is hardly necessary to say that such men should not be occupying the position of trustees.

Another objection that I see to the present law is this: articles 1,999 and 2,005 of our civil code which were made for the protection of the landlord have been, to a certain extent, abrogated and the landlord has not the privilege which he enjoyed under the old law. Under section 52 of the present law the landlord is only granted three months' rental previous to the insolvency. A trustee can occupy the premises from month to month at the same rental, or at a certain rental fixed by the court. The trustee also has the privilege to cancel the lease at any time during the year, and the result is that in many cases the landlord suffers great loss and great inconvenience.

Sections 29 and 48 of the present law also seem to me to be objectionable because they do away with certain features of the clauses of the marriage contract which have been the basis and the mainstay of the family life and of the marital rights as between husband and wife.

Another objection to the law I find in article 85, which deals with the permission given to a company to assign. According to article 85, a company may assign if it is duly represented, and this other paragraph of the law states that a firm has a right to assign by one of its members. I am informed that in Montreal, in the case of Byers and Craig, one of the partners of the firm put the firm into liquidation and judgment was rendered on that point that, according to the article, as it was drafted, there was no other course than to maintain the action of the partner which was supposed to be binding on behalf of the firm. This article should be amended in such a way as to protect a member of a firm who might be put into trouble and lose a good deal of the money he had invested in the firm, if any other member could put the firm into insolvency. The trouble was that when this law was made, it was made to cover and protect creditors in other parts of the country than Quebec which do not seem to have the same provisions that we have in our civil code and code of procedure, and it is for this reason that we see many articles in the law and many things in the rules and regulations which seem to be overlapping and which cause so much trouble, as has been the experience since the law has been in force.

Many insolvencies have occurred recently in Quebec. If you open a newspaper or pass through any of the streets of our cities, what do you see? "Bankruptcy" or "sale judicially authorized." We see this in Montreal, especi-

ally. This is due, I believe to the fact that the law renders it too easy to the debtor to avail himself of its provisions. If we consider the many insolvencies that have taken place, we find that most of the insolvencies—at any rate I am so informed as regards the district of Montreal—have been voluntary and that the debtors themselves have gone to the trustees and arranged their affairs with them and a few of their creditors to try to get away with the matter. We are presented sometimes with a compromise or a certain agreement reached with a number of creditors who have the largest claims, and as I said at the beginning of my remarks, it is pretty hard to upset them. Formerly, it was only the trader who could assign, because he needed credit and he was in business; but to-day any person who is a debtor can make an assignment. We have also in the law a provision that a debtor can assign, not only in his district, but in other places, and I have seen many cases where debtors of rural districts have assigned in the district of Montreal. One of my hon. friends was pointing out to me that one debtor in the district of Joliette had assigned in another district entirely different from his own. This complicates matters and compels creditors to follow up their debtors to other districts than those in which they ought to assign, as was the case under the old law thereby increasing expenses.

To find out if the results of this law have been good, I think I can do no better than to give to the House the figures of the numerous cases which have originated since the law came into force. The figures are as follows for Canada:

Date	Number of insolvent cases	Assets	Liabilities
1916..	596	$ 5,000,000	$ 9,000,000
1917..	370	4,000,000	5,000,000
1918..	873	11,251,341	14,502,477
1919..	755	10,741,441	16,256,250
1920..	1,878	18,569,516	26,474,301
1921..	2,451	57,158,597	73,299,111
1922, for first six months..	1,899	24,372,548	32,423,961

For the first nine months of 1922, I am informed, there are 2,729 cases, and of those 1,083, or 40 per cent, are in Quebec. Of those 1,083 cases, I am informed that 300 were farmers in our good old province of Quebec, who had found a way to fail, a thing unknown formerly in the rural districts in our good province of Quebec which has had the reputation of being honest and paying its debts

Mr. MICHAUD: Does the hon. member mean to say that there were no bankruptcies amongst farmers until the Bankruptcy Act came into force?

Mr. CASGRAIN: There might have been some cases of bankruptcy, people who were assigning; but there were not so many. Under the old law the farmer, if he was carrying on a trade or business, could assign; but if a farmer simply was cultivating the land, he could not assign. Under the present law, he cannot be forced into bankruptcy; but he can himself make an assignment, and that is what is being done in many cases.

Mr. MORIN: Could his property be sold by the sheriff if he failed to meet his liabilities?

Mr. CASGRAIN: Yes.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Like everyone else.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Yes.

Mr. SHAW: Would my hon. friend deny to farmers the right of seeking relief under the provisions of the Bankruptcy Act, the right he accords to others?

Mr. CASGRAIN: No. But before we had that law, farmers who were embarrassed were able to meet their liabilities and pull themselves through. Since the law has been in force, there seems to be a microbe or epidemic which has taken a few of those people, who have assigned at the instance of other people who are not so scrupulous as they ought to be. For instance some of the trustees go out into the rural districts and impress upon those people what the relief is under the law; that they ought to apply it to themselves, and that if they would put their affairs into the hands of the trustees, those trustees would settle all their difficulties for them. Under the old law, they had the relief of borrowing money on good terms in those rural districts where such facilities exist. On account of this new bankruptcy law, the people are afraid to do business with them, because they fear they may be left in the dark.

Mr. BOYS: What was the law in Quebec as regards bankruptcy? Is there no act by which a resident of Quebec can voluntarily assign?

Mr. CASGRAIN: We have, under the law of Quebec, as I quoted before, articles 853 to 892, whereby a firm or a person who is a trader under his own name or firm name, could make a judicial abandonment of his property or be forced to assign where he owed more than $200. Then we had for in-

corporated companies the provisions general to the Dominion of Canada of the Winding-up Act.

Mr. BOYS: My hon. friend has given figures of five or six years. I think he gave the figure of assignments in Quebec in 1921, as 2,451. Were those all assignments of merchants?

Mr. CASGRAIN: I am not in a position to answer that question, but I may say that in a great number of these cases the people voluntarily assigned, which goes to show that under the new law they are more eager to seek relief, for the reason that they can obtain their freedom more easily than was formerly possible. Under the old law they were liberated only to the extent that their estate could pay; now they are fully liberated, under the provisions of articles 58 to 60, if their estate can bring fifty cents in the dollar. Under these circumstances they are more eager to seek relief, and that is why since 1919 up to the present time we have seen a great many more insolvency cases and bankrupt estates in the province of Quebec than we have known before.

When one sees all these insolvency cases occurring and so many bankrupts seeking relief, one is reminded of the old custom that prevailed in France, where conditions are of course different to-day. In the old days in France the insolvent was forced to wear a green bonnet until such time as all his debts had been discharged to the satisfaction of his creditors. But when we see how easily debtors can now have their affairs settled, and with what little trouble they can get out of their difficulties, I think that in a few years we may have to establish a new order of decoration. These people are so successful in escaping from their responsibilities that, I am led to believe, we may deem it advisable to give them titles. The principal difficulty of the new law seems to lie in the facility—greater than under the law as it previously stood—with which a man can obtain relief from the consequences of failure, and the greater ability he has now to free himself. As I pointed out a moment ago, this condition induces a great many people to seek relief, and is also a strong incentive to dishonesty, because I am fairly certain that a great many of these people must arrange with the trustees and some of the largest creditors before being able to settle their affairs as satisfactorily as they seem to be able to do.

The present state of things also undermines credit, because people are afraid to advance money to any tradesman for the reason that they fear he may fail and then be able to avail himself of the provisions of the law at any time. Another objection to the law as it stands is the fact that the costs of liquidation are much too high. The law was intended to make all legislation uniform, but in my opinion, as things stand now, it only tends to make the evil uniform. I would also point out that this law encroaches on our provincial law, on our civil code and procedure. And one of the last, but by no means the least serious, of the objections I have to it is that it has been responsible for the appointment of too many trustees. When the law was first enacted we were given to understand that only about fifty trustees would be appointed for the district and city of Montreal, and that there would be some trustees located in other districts. I am told that in Montreal there are over 165, indeed, nearly 200 trustees to-day. Nearly everybody could be appointed a trustee under this system, but at present I understand that the gates have been closed and that it is not so easy to have trustees appointed. Very good reasons must be advanced and more security given. The trustees under this law are supposed to give a bond in regard to their administration, but I am informed that many of them give no bond except when they have in view the settlement of an estate. When that is the case they go and give the bond.

As I said before, it has been pointed out that in some of the big cities a few persons have been acting as trustees notwithstanding that they have availed themselves of the provisions of the Bankruptcy Act and are themselves under compromise. In this respect I would suggest that the government adopt the course that was followed last year by the provincial government of our province. It was discovered that, in the case of a number of persons who were acting as commissioners of the superior court, there were certain abuses in some districts. The government discharged them all by process of an act which was passed at the last session, and only those were reappointed who could show that they were sufficiently qualified for the position. I believe that it would be well to-day if all trustees were removed by this government and if only those were reappointed who could give the best guarantee and recommendation. At any rate, I would not appoint as many as have been appointed in the past. All these men have to earn their living, and this is one of the reasons why we have seen so many of them going into the rural districts and inducing people to avail themselves of the law.

An hon. MEMBER: Are they appointed by the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. CASGRAIN: No, they are not under the Civil Service Commission, their appointment lies only with the Minister of Justice and the Secretary of State. Trustees are appointed by order in council. That is good.

It is my opinion that the bankruptcy law, with its many amendments and rules and regulations, is altogether too voluminous and complicated. We have a law that covers 72 pages and is embraced in 98 articles, and rules and regulations and every year since its enactment it has been amended. Indeed, it was amended even before it was put into force, because after the act had been passed in this Chamber it was discovered, upon consultation with some of the best lawyers, that it contained serious errors and omissions. The amendments that have been passed, together with the regulations and forms, are very cumbersome and complicated, and the law consequently does not afford that measure of relief which the people had expected. The forms which it is required to comply with are also for the most part useless and costly, and I venture the opinion that the rules of procedure contain too much red tape, so that creditors will never realize their wish of seeing estates wound up with any degree of expedition unless these rules and regulations are made somewhat more practicable.

I might refer to another feature of the law. I am told that last year certain amendments were enacted by which a trustee is bound to make a return of the affairs of the insolvent debtor for the last year and the year previous to the insolvency. In most cases this has worked very unsatisfactorily both from the point of view of the trustee and, as well, from that of the creditors, more especially of privileged creditors. In one case of which I have personal knowledge a trustee had prepared all his dividend sheets and he received a notification from the Income Tax department not to pay any privileged creditors or any others before the Income Tax office had adjudged what amount was to be paid by the trustee on account of the returns not made and the taxes not paid by the insolvent debtor, depriving thereby the privileged creditors, as well as the lawyers, the trustee and other persons similarly interested in the estate of the payment of their just claims and fees. And in most of these cases, from the books that are kept by the insolvent debtor, it is absolutely impossible for the trustees to prepare such returns.

When we consult the statutes we find that not only once has this parliament tried to legislate in the matter of bankruptcy. But each time it has been unlucky. We find that in 1839 a Bankruptcy Act was passed, only to be repealed in 1843, and six years later replaced by another statute. In 1863 Sir John Abbott introduced a bankruptcy bill which became law in 1864 and was amended from time to time. In 1874 under the Mackenzie administration a further bankruptcy bill was enacted, but six years later it was repealed. Judge Fortin, who later became a judge of the superior court of the district of Montreal, when a member of this House introduced a bill applicable to bankruptcy proceedings throughout the Dominion. With the assistance of some of the ablest lawyers of Montreal he drafted what it was hoped would bring relief to both debtors and creditors but the government of the day did not view the measure favourably, having in mind the unsatisfactory results obtained under the old law, and the bill failed to pass the House of Commons.

If we examine the defects of our old bankruptcy laws we shall find them practically the same as those which mar the Bankruptcy Act of 1919. On this point I wish to quote the views of Judge Desiré Girouard contained in a book which he published on the bankruptcy law of 1864. He then advanced the following objections to that statute:

> Firstly, it is prejudicial to commerce, because it opens new doors to fraud, affords to the bankrupt new means of deception. What is to be expected from a law which, from the first to the thirteenth clause, and from the first to the hundred and thirty-first paragraph, favours almost always the insolvent and not the creditor? Be it remarked, this assertion is not gratuitous; had we no other proof of it than the fact of all the advertisements and notices of failures, which have crowded, since the coming into force of the statute, the columns of our newspapers, our position would be fully established. But again, when we glance at the provisions of the act, the mode, voluntary as well as compulsory, of winding up the affairs of the insolvent; when it is observed that the bankrupt has himself the control of the important delays of the announcement of his failure and the divesting himself of his estate; that he can still with impunity defeat the law and defraud his creditors, obtain, in spite of the latter, a judicial discharge; when it is clear that the hope of such discharge will be for the debtor a powerful motive to induce him to diminish his assets, and afterwards to declare himself in a state of bankruptcy, in order to come out of it enriched with the spoils of the mass; when, we say, we consider all these complications and formalities, which here, as always, serve the debtor and not the creditor; when we remember, in fine, all these delays and costs of liquidation, without forgetting the expenses of the insolvent in obtaining his discharge and attending the meetings of creditors, for the arrangement of his own affairs, it is easy to see, we say again, that the fact, the evidence of which we invoked, it but the rigorous consequence of the law, the inevitable result of the provisions of the act.
>
> But it is not only because the act favours the interests of the insolvent to the detriment of his creditors that it is fatal to the commerce of the country, but because, like every other bankrupt law, it will injure our credit abroad.

And in support of his argument he quotes the following article from the Revue de Législation written expressly for the benefit of Canada in 1846 when the bankruptcy law of 1843 was in operation:

"The internal commerce of the country," says the anonymous writer, "ought to be sober, prudent and limited; the bankrupt laws in assuring beforehand the discharge from debts, will render it improvident, hazardous, and rash; first cause of mistrust. The facility of freeing himself from embarrassments and of avoiding his struggle always uncertain, will on the very first difficulty paralyze the energy and determination of the trader; for why struggle to pay debts, when it is so easy not to have any? This is a second cause of mistrust. When the labour and talents of the insolvent were the settled guarantee of his creditors, it was for their interest to make this labour and these talents available: and thence all these aids and encouragements which never failed to the unfortunate, and which assisted him to overcome difficulties and to regain lost ground. Bankrupt laws have put an end to this state of things, and hence a third source of mistrust.'

Finally, we think we do not stretch the truth in affirming that a large number of merchants, if not the greater number, would be satisfied with few amendments and simple additions to the existing laws, for the sole purpose of defining and punishing fraud and giving to the cession de biens its proper and necessary effects.

I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that either in the province of Quebec or in the Dominion generally do we need such a law as we find in the Bankruptcy Act of 1919. It is very hard to frame a law which shall be satisafctory of application in a new country, and we find that it was not until 1886 and 1898 that England and the United States respectively, both much older countries than ours, considered such a course necessary or desirable. We are a country in the making, and we have so many new elements mixing with our population, so many foreign immigrants who are not educated to our standard of ethics and morality, and our territory is so vast, that it is very difficult to draft a general law of bankrupcy to protect the opposing interests of creditors and debtors and ensure a just and economical distribution of insolvent estates. If in the province of Quebec the resentment against the Bankruptcy Act is stronger than in other provinces, it may be due to the fact that, especially in the district of Montreal, we have a very large proportion of foreigners who sometimes are inclined to seek freedom from their indebtedness in a way that our native population would not consider for a moment. I am told that in the province of Ontario this law has not been so adversely criticised. The reason for this may be that there is one-third less population of foreign origin in Ontario than there is in the province of Quebec, particularly in the city of Montreal.

[Mr. Casgrain.]

Under this law a further objectionable feature is that large credit corporations are enabled to wield too much influence. For instance, we see big corporations such as the Credit Business Men's Association and other trustee companies engaging in the liquidation of insolvent estates more than was the case under the old law. I do not say that this state of affairs is altogether bad, but I do say that these companies having better means of administering the estates of insolvents it is very difficult for individual trustees who are not so well organized to secure a fair share of business, and this may be the reason why so many of these men go into outlying districts and try to induce people to assign.

Our present bankruptcy law has for the most part proven a boon and a benefit to the foreign element who have recently come to this country from Europe. They arrive here with neither a business nor any other reputation to lose and have no scruples about adopting questionable practices to rid themselves of their financial obligations.

The Bankruptcy Act of 1919 was introduced to secure a more equitable, speedy and economical distribution of a debtor's property and to prevent the excessive abuses and endless expenses which attend bankruptcy proceedings under the old system. But I believe the act was conceived in a hurry and was ill digested. In fact, it was one of those laws wished on us, like the Board of Commerce and other legislation passed by the Union government. which we later found encroached upon the rights of Quebec and the other provinces. It saw the light, I am informed, in an obscure law office in Winnipeg, was fostered here by the hon. member for George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs) and finally adopted by the government of the day in despair. It has proved like our other bankruptcy acts, anti-social and anti-economic. It has done so much harm and so little good that I submit it ought to be consigned to the pigeon-hole to take its place with the Board of Commerce Act and other defunct laws passed by the Union government.

The old Winding-up Act and the provisions respecting the abandonment of property in our code of civil procedure in Quebec are, I submit, sufficient to meet all present purposes and to give general satisfaction to the public. A few amendments may be necessary, but that being done I think everybody would be satisfied. Above all, what we need in a law of this kind, if it has come to stay, is plain and simple language, not the equivocal language which predominates

in the present act and which is the cause of much trouble and difficulty. It has been found under this law that in many cases the rights given to the province of Quebec under the civil code and the code of procedure had to be maintained before the courts through the submission of proof that notwithstanding this federal act we had the right to avail ourselves of certain provisions existing in our own laws. A gentleman who was in his lifetime a great lawyer in Montreal, Mr. C. H. Stephens, expressed the view that the code of procedure and the provisions respecting the judicial abandonment of property that we had in the province of Quebec were sufficient to meet all the needs of the people of that province. Speaking of the impossibility of removing from the minds of the people of certain provinces the idea that it is unjust and cruel to take the assets of a debtor and not liberate him from his liabilities, he said:

> To expose the groundlessness of this idea, it ought perhaps to be sufficient to point out that for 15 years, this province has, so far at least as its local interests are concerned, got on better with the half a dozen articles inserted in our Code of Procedure, than under the most elaborate of the insolvent acts which were previously in force.

He pointed out that under our provincial law, a system for distributing insolvent estates, there has been less litigation, less costs and a total absence of that demoralizing influence which constituted the great predominating evil of the acts passed before the present law came into force.

I believe the remarks I have made are sufficient to show that the laws of this parliament in the matter of bankruptcy have not met with favour of the public at large. These laws were introduced with the idea of remedying the existing evils, but in each case it has been found after a few years of operation of the law that the best results were not being obtained. In fact, these bankruptcy laws have been a nuisance; they have been the source of much trouble in our province, and we have been forced to spend large sums to ensure the maintenance of our rights under the civil code and the code of civil procedure. I would also point out that when we had no bankruptcy act we got along just as well as, if not better than, we do under the present system.

Let us see what some of the best legal minds in the province of Quebec have to say about this law. There was a debate in the legislative assembly last year and the previous year, when a resolution was adopted in this form:

> "The legislature of the province of Quebec regret that the Bankruptcy Act as amended invites dishonesty and fraud and causes serious trouble to both trade and industry, which is of a nature to ruin credit, and it requests the federal government to repeal the act."

Hon. Mr. Perrault, Minister of Lands and Colonization for the province of Quebec, speaking in a debate last year, stated that the law had only opened the door to fraud and speculation; that it should not be amended but should be repealed. Hon. Mr. Galipeault, provincial Minister of Public Works, speaking on the occasion of the opening of the courts in the city of Quebec in September last, stated:

> "The Canadian Bar, it is said, was responsible for the adoption of the new Bankruptcy Act by endorsing it after this project had been before the federal House for some time. If this is true, the association might have been more fortunate in its first move. The province of Quebec, which had the advantage of having its own bankruptcy law, which was less expensive and more easily operated will not be the only one to suffer from a law so rapidly studied, and which is so defective and means spoliation in many cases.
>
> "For all those who are attached to our civil laws, constant care and watch is necessary to prevent any encroachment on our privileges.
>
> "The tendency to centralize and unify legislation is becoming more and more visible since a few years, and there seems to be an admitted attempt to encroach on provincial rights and attack our civil laws.

The present Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin) expressed the same opinion a few years ago in addressing a convention of the Canadian Bar Association at the Ritz-Carlton in Montreal. He expressed the hope that when they recommended amendments to the different legislatures and to the federal parliament they should not ask for uniformity of laws which would be prejudicial to the laws of the province of Quebec. Hon. L. A. Taschereau, Premier of Quebec, has also expressed his opinion with regard to the present law. I shall have to quote it in French, because I have the extract of his speech from reports published in the French newspapers. Mr. Taschereau said:

> The government has sanctioned the repeal of the act, Mr. Taschereau said, and now we shall have it examined by our most eminent legal authorities, and, should it be found to be ultra vires, we shall ask to have it referred to the Supreme Court so as to have it declared unconstitutional. The government think that the act has not proved satisfactory and it is willing to do its utmost so as to have it declared unconstitutional.
>
> If bankrupts occur in rural districts, further states the Prime Minister, it is neither due to taxes, nor to the erecting of schools and building of roads, but evidently to the Bankruptcy Act. The rural country was deluged with soliciting agents who induced the farmers to go into bankruptcy and many were taken in. The Act has been disastrous to the credit of farmers and as long as it exists we shall find the same results which, at present, we are encountering. The Premier reiterates that the government will take all the means possible to have this unjust law repealed.

With reference to the maintaining of our rights under the civil code and the code of

procedure in our province, a case was decided last fall before the court of appeal, a case in which the Riordon Company was interested, the Danford case. A certain creditor claimed the right to exercise a certain privilege; the question was taken before the court of appeal, and in rendering their decision the judges said:

> The legislators during the short period of life of the act have so amended it that it is scarcely recognizable in its present form. It may be that before the Supreme Court could pass upon the question, further amendments would be made, either making clear what is evidently ambiguous or destroying entirely all rights of the privileged creditor.

That is the judgment of the court of King's Bench. I am told that the question is now before the Supreme Court of Canada, but judgment has not yet been rendered. We have also, Mr. Speaker, not an expression of opinion, but some remarks made by the hon. Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin) himself when he had occasion to speak last year at a meeting of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association. At that time one gentleman made a speech regarding the weak points of the law and the difficulties occasioned by it, and this is what the Minister of Justice is reported as saying on that occasion—I quote in French:

> I cannot but thank, said Sir Lomer Gouin, Mr. Deslongchamps for his interesting remarks on the Bankruptcy Act. I had already heard complaints in regard to this legislation, but this is the first time I have listened to such a clear statement of the grievances with which you have to put up. I am aware that bankruptcy laws have been adopted by the government, and some provinces, and, I also know that some have been repealed when they were found impracticable. I cannot express an opinion on what has been said by Mr. Deslongchamps, but what I may say without hesitation, is that manufacturers for whom this act was passed have made representation to the government that the act lends itself to abuse and that it is not in the interest of trade and the community at large, and, they may rest assured that the government will do its duty and give them justice.

On another occasion we have the report of Mr. Lambert, who was the president of La Chambre de Commerce of Montreal, who was reported as having had an interview also and discussing these matters with the Minister of Justice. I will read the following clipping with regard to the interview:

> He also reported on an interview accorded himself and other members of the chambre de commerce by Hon. Sir Lomer Gouin, when the bankruptcy law had been discussed. Eleven amendments, recently approved by the Chambre had been submitted to the Minister of Justice and Sir Lomer Gouin had told them that he would do all in his power to see that a drastic change would be made as soon as possible. He had gone further, continued Mr. Lambert for he had declared that if the law was not repealed it would undoubtedly disappear anyhow, as it had been found most unsatisfactory for everybody concerned.

[Mr. Casgrain.]

I have here amendments submitted by La Chambre de Commerce of Montreal, which are eleven in all. I think the Minister of Justice must have had copies of these amendments because I believe they were submitted to the government. They point out certain modifications which would likely be made, in order to improve the present law, if it is not repealed, along the lines I have suggested this afternoon. I will not weary the House reading these amendments, or reading different letters which I have received from numerous manufacturers, industrial and other people in my district in the province of Quebec. I am glad to know we have at the head of the Department of Justice the minister who now occupies that position (Sir Lomer Gouin). He was leader in the province of Quebec for many years, has made good laws and brought prosperity to the province. I admit that this law might have some good effects, but it was not satisfactory on all points, and needs amendments, if amendments can possibly be made. If too many amendments would render the law ambiguous, as pointed out in the judgment of the court of appeal, I think it better to repeal the law entirely, and get the best legal minds in this country, those who have had the best experience, to frame up a new law which would give satisfaction to the province of Quebec and to the Dominion at large.

On the other hand, if the law is to remain as it stands, and if we have not time this session or other sessions to enact a new law, it might be provided that this law should not apply in the province of Quebec. A few years ago we had a law similar, which was of widespread application, the Lord's Day Act, but when that act was passed a provision was made that every province in the Dominion which would pass a similar law, or which had a law in existence before the passing of that act, would be exempted from the operation of that Dominion law. I want to see the rights of the province of Quebec protected, and I would like to see our civil code and civil procedure maintained in integrity.

I hope the Minister of Justice will do his best to remedy the present existing conditions as regards the province of Quebec.

Hon. HUGH GUTHRIE (South Wellington): As one of those who had something to do with the Bankruptcy Act now under discussion, when that act was passed through this House two or three years ago, perhaps it would not be out of place for me to offer a few remarks in regard to the motion now before the House. It so happened that I

had the honour of occupying the office of Solicitor General of Canada at the time when the Bankruptcy Act in its initial stages came before parliament. I believe in the first instance my hon. friend for George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs) introduced the bill into this House; that bill was subsequently taken over by the government as a government measure and entrusted to myself as its manager in its course through parliament, and in that way I became fairly familiar with the provisions of the act and with its general application. I do not know, from the wording of the present motion, whether it is the desire of my hon. friend who has brought this matter to the attention of the House whether in his opinion the act should be actually repealed, or merely amended. There is a great difference between the two proposals. I submit to my hon. friend that the principle of a uniform bankruptcy law for the Dominion of Canada is a proper principle. It is possible, and it is also probable, that many of the details of the present act might well be amended, but I submit that we in Canada should have one uniform bankruptcy law to be applicable throughout the whole Dominion of Canada. What was the position in Canada prior to the passage of this act. We had nine provinces in Canada, each having provincial legislation which was virtually bankruptcy legislation although the several provincial governments had no constitutional power to pass such laws, they came as close to the constitutional limit as it was possible for them to come in their respective provinces, and in the nine provinces of Canada these laws exhibited very great variety and entirely lacked uniformity. There was great difficulty in finding out just what the law of this, that or the other province was. The House will agree that trade and commerce is essentially a national question, just as much a national question as our railways, or our banking system. It is just as important to have a law pertaining to our trade and commerce uniform in regard to bankruptcy as it is to have uniformity in regard to railway law or in regard to the laws of banking and commerce. One difficulty arose almost from day to day by reason of the large amount of interprovincial trade that is done in this country. The difficulty was this. A man in Nova Scotia sold goods to a man in Manitoba, the man in Manitoba became unable to pay for his goods; and the question was, what was the man in Nova Scotia to do to collect his bill? He did not know the Manitoba law, it might differ very materially from the law of Nova Scotia. The same thing might happen in regard to British Columbia, Saskatchewan, Alberta or Ontario, because the laws of all these provinces varied, and in some instances varied very materially. There was no uniformity, and there was a vast amount of uncertainty and of ignorance in regard to the exact situation even in our country. What about the foreign trade of the Dominion? We were doing an enormous trade with the United States and with Great Britain and with a great many other countries and it happened that of all the civilized trading countries in the world Canada and China were the only two that did not have a modern and uniform bankruptcy law. Complaints came to Canada from time to time from representative commercial bodies of other countries, from representatives of boards of trade and chambers of commerce in other countries, as well as from exporters of goods from other countries to Canada complaining of the unsatisfactory state of the bankruptcy law of this country. Foreign firms were in some instances averse to extending mercantile credit to Canadian merchants by reason of the uncertainty which prevailed in regard to bankruptcy legislation in Canada.

The only legislative authority in Canada having constitutional power to pass a bankruptcy law is the Dominion parliament. This is settled by the express terms of the British North America Act. And the question arose whether this parliament should attempt to remedy the difficulty and pass a uniform law in regard to bankruptcy and insolvency throughout the whole Dominion, or whether we should permit nine attempts to create bankruptcy legislation in the various provinces of the Dominion none of which had any strict constitutional right to pass such enactments. Parliament took the view that it was proper to have a uniform law upon the subject. The framers of the British North America Act in 1867 thought the Dominion parliament was the proper legislative body to deal with such a question, and power was given expressly to this parliament to do so. This parliament in 1875 passed such an act. That act was only in operation in Canada some five or six years at the most and then, in the judgment of parliament, it was repealed. It was held that the administration of that act had not proved satisfactory; and if one will read the debates in parliament at that time he will see that the chief complaint against the administration of the act of 1875 was the charge that the trustees or, as they called them in those days, the official assignees in insolvency, were incompetent men, also that they were irresponsible men, that

time and time again the estates of a debtor had gone into the hands of an assignee and that was the last heard of it—the assignee through himself and his friends, managed to eat up the whole of the estate; there was nothing left for the creditors. That was the chief ground of complaint against the act of 1875. The act was repealed. We had no bankruptcy act in Canada from the year 1880 down to the year 1919 when the present act was passed.

The bill which became the act of 1919 was introduced into parliament in the year previous. A special committee of this House, upon which sat representatives from every province of the Dominion, worked, and worked diligently, upon this whole question. Twenty-four meetings of that committee were held; I had the honour of presiding over the committee and I know whereof I speak. We worked long and we worked late, and at the end of the session we were able to bring in a bill which was in the nature of a draft measure. In order that parliament and the country might have time to digest it, the bill was only allowed to go to its second reading. An enormous number of extra copies of the bill were ordered to be printed so that they might be circulated from one end of the Dominion to the other. Copies of the bill were sent to all the provincial legislatures, to the law officers of the Crown in all the provinces of Canada, to all the mercantile bodies of standing in the Dominion, to all the boards of trade, all the chambers of commerce, all the legal associations, to the banking associations, to labour organizations, to the wholesale and retail associations of traders; and I may tell the House likewise that representatives of nearly all of these bodies appeared before the committee and submitted their views, and I do not remember that any single individual, or any body of individuals, offered any objection to the principle of the bill—that is, that we should have a uniform Bankruptcy Act in Canada. Of course we differed—differed very radically from time to time—as to many of the clauses of the bill. In 1919 the bill again came before parliament. During that session the legislation was threshed out in this House clause by clause, item by item. Amendment after amendment was offered, and amendment after amendment was accepted. The desire of parliament was to secure the best bill and the most uniform bill that it was possible to secure in order to meet the varying conditions throughout the Dominion without infringing more than was absolutely necessary upon the local enactments of any one of the provinces. We considered that we had been able to report a fair and reasonable measure under all the circumstances—not by any means a perfect measure; no one dreamed that a perfect measure could be produced in either a year, or two years, or three, or four, or five years, and so experience has shown since the act was passed. Imperfections have developed from time to time. In Great Britain the bankruptcy act is frequently amended. So also in the United States, and I assume also in the countries of Europe where they have had bankruptcy legislation for generations back. I do not believe that any great measure of general application can be passed at a session of this House and remain as a perfect model of legislation for any number of years to come; it will have to be amended and altered from time to time. I find that during the last twenty odd years the Dominion Lands Act has been amended, I think every year; the Railway Act has been amended almost from year to year. Not so with the Banking Act, because we revise that every ten years; but I believe the present Bankruptcy Act will have to be altered from time to time for the next one hundred or the next one hundred and fifty years; it will have to be amended to meet changing requirements, the changes in our conditions, and the changes in our methods of trade.

5 p.m.

Now, if my hon. friend who introduced this motion desires to get any concrete results from it, what I submit to him is this: He should bring in his proposals in the nature of a bill to amend the act. He has gone over the act from end to end; he has criticized it here, criticized it there, and criticized it in the other place; but he has left us no concrete proposal as to its amendment. If he would merely come before parliament—perhaps he could not this session but at any rate next session—with a bill to amend the act in the various sections concerning which he seeks amendment then the House, I think, will be in the position to discuss the question intelligently. But I am satisfied from what I know of the bill, from what I know of the temper of the House and the views of hon. members, that the House will agree, by a large majority, that the principle of the legislation is good and should be maintained. Although the details of the act may require a large amount of amendment to make it more workable there is this to be noted, that outside of the province of Quebec I do not think there has been any serious objection raised to the act itself. We had the advantage of advice from the province of Quebec with respect to this act, when it was before the committee in 1919. We had the assistance of the Bar Association;

and many eminent and well known men from that province also advised the committee upon various questions. We had resolutions from chambers of commerce and boards of trade in the province of Quebec as well as from all the other provinces, and the committee endeavoured as best it could to put the ideas of those experienced bodies and able legal minds into legal form in the various sections of the act as they now appear upon the statute book. I have heard considerable criticism regarding the administration of this act in the province of Quebec, the criticism that my hon. friend has voiced to-day—that there are too many trustees in that province. I heard it stated within a few hours—not by my hon. friend but by another hon. member of this House—that there are ever 170 trustees in the Quebec district alone—

Mr. JACOBS: In the city of Montreal.

Mr. GUTHRIE: In the city of Montreal alone. Well, that is far beyond what anyone expected when the act was passed. We took particular pains in regard to the question of the appointment of trustees. We thought we safeguarded that branch of the act pretty well. We provided that no man should be appointed a trustee unless he possessed qualifications which would fit him for the office. In addition to that he was bound, in the first instance, to give a bond for $10,000 before he was appointed at all. In the next place there are provisions which safeguard the estate and creditors and compel the trustee to give bonds for every dollar that goes into his hands. These were clauses which were added in view of the experience which we had under the act of 1875; and the main idea was that only outstanding, capable, qualified men, who could give this security would be appointed to this office of trustee, as well as trust companies which had been incorporated in Canada for the purpose among other things of acting as trustees in the case of insolvent estates. I was amazed to-day to hear that there are some 170 or 165 trustees in the Montreal district alone. I was under the impression that if there were twenty-five or thirty that number would be quite sufficient to do the whole business of that district and do it well.

It has been intimated by the mover of this resolution that in the province of Quebec abuses have sprung up in the matter of fees on the part of trustees and also of the legal profession. If this is true it is in direct contravention of the provisions of the act—

Mr. JACOBS: Hear hear.

Mr. GUTHRIE: And some one should be brought to account. That act prescribes what trustees and lawyers may take lawfully. If they take more, they take it unlawfully and they should be prosecuted for so doing under the terms of the act itelf. The terms of the act in this respect are as plain and express as language could make them. The act fixes the percentage which may be taken for the cost of administering an insolvent estate, and if these particular sections of the act are transgressed in the province of Quebec as intimated by my hon. friend it is the only province with respect to which I have heard such a complaint made. My hon. friend in his address this afternoon had good ground, I fancy, for the statement he made, but I personally have not yet heard of any charge of this nature being made in any other of the provinces of Canada. I know there has been criticism in regard to the various details of the act from almost all the provinces of this Dominion. The Department of Justice may have received many complaints which have not come to my knowledge. If my hon. friend because he has evidently made a study of the act and knows whereof he speaks, would devote some of his time to preparing an amending bill with the assistance of the law officers of the Crown, and would introduce it into the House we would then have concrete proposals as to amendments, and the House could intelligently deal with the whole subject. I agree with him that the subject is big and important enough to take up some of the time of this House, and if the act can be made more workable, more satisfactory in Quebec, Ontario, and the rest of the provinces, by all means let us try to make it so. But I do not think my hon. friend has made out any case for the repeal of the enactment, greatly as he has impressed upon hon. members the necessity for some important amendments. I congratulate the mover of this resolution for the very able and painstaking manner in which he has presented this somewhat intricate and involved question to the House.

Mr. JOSEPH ARCHAMBAULT (Chambly and Vercheres): Mr. Speaker, when the Bankruptcy Act was introduced in 1919, I believe I was the only member of this House to protest against the passing of such legislation. My protest at that time was based on five main reasons. The first was because I thought it would open the door to fraud and dishonesty. The second one because I was of opinion that it would disorganize trade and commerce. My third reason was because

the law was made applicable to non-traders, and I thought at the time it was bad legislation to apply a law of bankruptcy to non-traders. My fourth reason was because it was an infringement on civil rights. And my last reason was that I was afraid that the government would practically destroy the benefits of the law by appointing political partisans as trustees.

The experience we have had with this law for two years and a half confirms the fears that I expressed at that time in the House. The law has been in force for a little over two years. Parliament has already made ninety-two alterations; complaints are coming from all parts of the country, and for the same reasons as I gave in 1919 against the adoption of the law, I support the resolution of the hon. member for Charlevoix-Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain). I do not say that I would go as far as to repeal the law in its entirety. If the other provinces of confederation are willing to keep the law in the statutes, let them keep it. We have had on our statute books and we still have a law existing from 1880, or over forty years, a law on abandonment of property, a law which has been tested and which has been found to be a good law. It has been practically abolished by the federal Bankruptcy Act. We want to go back to that law. There is no necessity for uniformity in a bankruptcy law. The hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) who spoke before me stated that he was in favour of the principle of a uniform bankruptcy law, but I did not hear him give any good reason for that. The reasons he gave were that we needed a law that would be applicable in all the provinces, so that merchants in any province would know what kind of law existed throughout Canada, and they could reach their creditors. If his reasoning was good, we should say that most civil laws should be the same in all the provinces. Why? The civil laws are very close to trade and commerce. Trade and commerce is within the purview of the federal government, I will admit; but most civil laws are applicable to trade and commerce in every province, and when for instance a trader or a merchant in Vancouver or in Winnipeg sells to or buys from a merchant in Montreal, he is under the civil laws of Quebec as regards his sale or his purchase. If uniformity of the law is a matter which is absolutely desirable, we should make it applicable, not only to the bankruptcy law, but to all the laws

[Mr. Archambault.]

Mr. GUTHRIE: The framers of our constitution boldly stated and enacted that bankruptcy should be applicable to the whole Dominion, and they gave this parliament the only power to deal with the subject.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: That may be true; but my hon. friend will also admit that under section 92, subsection 13 of the British North America Act, civil rights are within the purview of the provinces. My hon. friend will also admit that in enacting a bankruptcy act, he can scarcely avoid touching on civil rights.

Mr. GUTHRIE: That is right.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: I believe I can show to the House that many of our civil laws have been touched and altered by the Bankruptcy Act.

Mr. JACOBS: Does the hon. member not know that under the British North America Act the provincial authority has no right at all to legislate on bankruptcy?

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: That may be true in principle; but the act has been on our statutes for forty years, and if it had been such an infringement of the British North America Act, I am sure the matter would have been raised before. The law has been on our statute books since 1880, and the question has never been raised. The reason why it was never raised was because bankruptcy matters were too close to civil laws and civil rights.

The hon. member for South Wellington also stated that, with the exception of China and Canada, there was no country in the world which did not have a uniform bankruptcy act. My hon. friend will admit that in all those countries, if there is a uniform Bankruptcy Act, it does not apply to non-traders. Outside of Canada, there are in the world only two countries at the present time, where a bankruptcy act applies to non-traders, and those countries are Britain and the United States. In France, Belgium, and all the other countries of the world, there is a certain bankruptcy law which is not at all dissimilar to ours; but it does not apply to non-traders. It is illogical to apply a bankruptcy law to non-traders for whom credit is not essential. My hon. friend (Mr. Guthrie) also stated that the chief complaint against the law of 1875 was that the assignees, who are now called the trustees, were charging too much, and that therefore the law was abrogated. We have the same complaint to-day. I have in mind a case in which the total assets payable to the creditors amounted to $700 while the costs came to $1,600. My hon. friend went on to say that there was no complaint

outside Quebec, which was the only province whence there came any word against the Bankruptcy Act. I might read to the hon. gentleman what Mr. Detchon, the manager of the Canadian Credit Men's Association, has to say on this subject. He is the gentleman whom I may call the power behind the throne, the one who inspired the member for George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs) and my hon. friend for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie). Speaking in Winnipeg on October 4, this gentleman stated, as reported in the Montreal Gazette of that date:

> The law as it exists at present is on the side of piracy, it is claimed, by the men who have been close to its operation, and the manoeuvres of a portion of the trading community who have been quick and sharp to take advantage of its weakness. Where one class of the retail trading community can buy in their own stocks at fifty cents on the dollar or less, it is extremely difficult for the efficient, honest trader to continue to compete with any fair degree of success.
>
> "Gentlemen, take 45 cents on long term payment or you get nothing," is the word passed by the wholesale traders in many instances. Along with the report on a long list of cases it is pointed out that 9 per cent of the men reported on have bought fine residences, run high-priced motor cars, and many keep their families at the beaches for the summer.

This complaint does not come from the province of Quebec; it comes from the manager of the Credit Men's Association, who lives, I believe, in Winnipeg, and who, practically speaking, is the father of this legislation. After having studied the act and the way in which it has operated, he finds just what I have quoted him as having said. The other comment offered by my hon. friend for South Wellington was that there were too many trustees. He told the House that he did not know that there were as many as 145 or 130 trustees in the city of Montreal, and added that during his administration good care had been taken to name as trustees only men who were reputable. Well, I have here a return to an order of the House dated April 26, 1921. I had asked this question:

> What are the names of the trustees under the Bankruptcy Act for the district of Montreal? When were they appointed, and what were their respective occupations before their appointment?

In reply to this question I find, to my amazement, especially after the statement of the hon. member for South Wellington, that from July 6, 1920, to December 26, 1921, the old administration had appointed in the district of Montreal alone 118 trustees. I do not believe, therefore, that my hon. friend's statement, that he thought there should be only 25 trustees and that we should take good care to name only men of good reputation, is worth very much.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Does my hon. friend know of any case where an application was refused when the applicant was prepared to put up a bond of $10,000?

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: No, I did not inquire into that; I did not investigate. But the fact remains that we have the statement of the hon. member for South Wellington that 25 trustees would be sufficient for the district of Montreal, and as opposed to this we have the proof that during the administration of the late government, of which he was a member, they named 118 trustees for that district.

Mr. SHAW: What is the objection to the appointment of any number of trustees so long as they qualify under the provisions of the act? Is there any more objection to that than there would be to the appointment of a large number of justices of the peace?

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Yes, there is an objection, because there should not be too many trustees appointed to take care of a limited amount of business. It is obvious that if there were sufficient business for five or ten trustees, say, and you appointed only that number, they would not try to obtain all sorts of business; by all means they would not go after people and try to make them assign. The state of affairs in the province of Quebec, whatever it may be in any other province—and I do not know that it is not the same—is simply amazing and outrageous. The other day a reputable lawyer of Montreal, Mr. Calder, in an address before a business men's association on the Bankruptcy Act, produced partnership agreement which he showed to his audience and the last paragraph of which read as follows:

> In case of bankruptcy profits will be divided equally.

I could bring before the House many typical cases, and especially one in the district of Montreal, where the trustee went after a certain person in a rural district against whom there was a judgment. The trustee wrote this man a letter and in reply the gentleman came to Montreal to his office. The trustee told him that he knew the person who had the judgment against him and that he could probably make a settlement or obtain a certain delay for the payment of the debt or the satisfaction of the judgment. Here the party who came to the trustee was not a very well educated person, he was ignorant of the law and was under the impression that this trustee was really trying his best to get a settlement for him with that creditor. The trustee inquired into the man's busi-

ness, and after getting from him a list of his creditors he requested him to sign a paper authorizing him, the trustee, to interview the principal creditor who had taken judgment. A few weeks later the man found that he had signed a demand in bankruptcy and that a petition had been made on that demand.

Mr. BOYS: Was the assignor in that case actually insolvent? If so there was no great harm done.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: No. But even if he was insolvent I submit that harm was done him.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Was the so-called trustee prosecuted under the criminal code?

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: The case is pending in court. I will read to my hon. friend the letter which the man received. This is a translation of it:

Dear Sir,—At the present moment we are going through a very difficult crisis and we find that a great many business men who have been in business a number of years are forced to make certain compromises with their creditors in order to maintain their business. Probably you, as do many of your confreres, need somebody to settle your affairs with your creditors. Do not be afraid to come and see us. If you want to maintain your trade at its maximum and to also maintain your previous standing, you have to avoid failure or bankruptcy. We are making a specialty of arrangements of all sorts between creditors and debtors. If the matter interests you, you can come and see me, or I will come and see you myself and give you a full explanation regarding this proposal.

Well, naturally this man, having done his best to obtain some delay from his principal creditor and having failed, was delighted to receive such a letter. He went over to that party, who was not a trustee, and was directed by him to the trustee, but he was always under the impression that the trustee who spoke to him was the party who had written the letter. He went over and, as I related before, he was made to sign a demand of abandonment. A petition was made by the court, and a few weeks later a meeting of his creditors was called. I may say that this man came to see me and told me his story, and I directed him to another lawyer. This lawyer made a contestation, which is now pending in court. No doubt criminal proceedings could be taken, but I do not think it would be wise to do so before judgment is delivered on the case in the civil court.

My hon. friend for Charlevoix-Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) has covered the ground pretty well and there remains little further to be added so I will shorten the remarks I had intended to make. He stressed a point which in my opinion is very important. Under the Quebec law, as he stated, which we had for forty years, a debtor could never get his discharge. He was allowed to resume business after settling with his creditors for 50 or 75 per cent, but the creditors could take a judgment for the whole amount of their debts and collect if they desired to do so. The result was that after having made a compromise with his creditors, if on a second venture he made money these creditors could collect the balance owing them. But the present law is a direct encouragement to gambling. The merchant or manufacturer takes all kinds of chances, he may indulge in the wildest speculation, but he need not care if he does not make good, because under this bankruptcy law he can settle with his creditors for 40 or 50 per cent and start all over again, as many times as he likes.

My hon. friend for Charlevoix-Montmorency has also mentioned the various clauses in our Bankruptcy Act which infringe on the Quebec act. As I stated in my opening remarks, I do not contend that this parliament has no power to legislate on bankruptcy, but I do submit that when the law of bankruptcy is so closely related to civil rights, the Dominion parliament should be very chary about legislating in this matter. For instance, we had our old law governing the relations between lessor and lessee. Under the Bankruptcy Act the lessor has practically no protection when his lessee becomes bankrupt; all he is entitled to is three months' rent due. The trustee can take over the store, sublet it to a third party, even if there is a clause forbidding same in the lease, and the lessor has simply to acquiesce in the action of the trustee. Under the old act of Quebec, the fact of a lessee becoming bankrupt or abandoning his property automatically cancelled his lease, and the lessor was entitled to twelve months' rent due, if it was in arrears for that length of time; he was entitled further to damages for four months where the failure occurred four months before the expiration of the year, and to damages for twelve months if not.

As I said before, it may not be necessary to abrogate the law in its entirety. If the other provinces are satisfied with it, we have no objection to their taking that view. But as I have pointed out, for forty years we have had a very complete law, a law that has been tested and found good. The present federal law was passed upon the demand of the western provinces, and I believe it should be amended at least in such manner that it will not be applicable to the province of Quebec.

Mr. L. J. LADNER (Vancouver South): Mr. Speaker, I think the importance of this resolution demands the attention of all hon.

members of the House. The proposal is double-barrelled in its character; it asks for an amendment and it alternatively asks for abrogation. It is apparent from the remarks of the proposer (Mr. Casgrain) that he desires that the law should be abrogated.

It is not my intention to repeat any of the arguments or observations that have been made by previous speakers, but I may say that from the point of view of the people of British Columbia—and I believe the same idea prevails very largely in the prairie provinces—we are much better off with the Bankruptcy Act than we would be without it. The purpose of the act, as I understand it, is not to enable debtors to go through crooked forms of liquidation, but to preserve the assets of crooked debtors for the benefit of honest creditors who have lent them money or given them credit on goods. In just cases the law is such that through the courts and the ordinary administration of justice it is possible to enable perfectly honest debtors who, through unforeseen circumstances or other causes entirely beyond their control, have got into difficulties, to obtain a discharge from the courts and to start afresh with a new hope and a new opportunity, whereas the old law made the debtor under such circumstances a slave to his creditors and his community and the victim of unforeseen or unwise acts. Not only does the bankruptcy law preserve the assets for the creditors and ensure a larger measure of justice to the debtor, but I believe it is the best method of liquidating the estate of a debtor at the least possible cost. Then again, the bankruptcy law maintains uniformity and makes for stability in trade and commerce.

That the present law needs amendment is apparent to any lawyer who has had practice under it. But what have we as an alternative? As hon. members seeking to discharge the responsibility of legislators and not catering to whims or to votes—and we do not do such things—I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if you abrogate the bankruptcy law you revert to the legislation which is still on the statute books in many provinces. I will take the case of British Columbia, because I am familiar with that province, and I would ask hon. members who are interested in this bankruptcy law to give attention to the remarks which I will make with respect to conditions prevailing before the Bankruptcy Act came into force. In British Columbia, if a man found himself in serious financial difficulties, three courses were open to him. He might sit down and allow his judgment creditors to rush in and sell him out, with others tumbling after as fast as they could. Or if it were a company, it would go into voluntary or involuntary liquidation under the Companies Act. Or if it were an individual, he might take advantage of the Creditors and Trustees Act whereby he would assign all his goods, all his property real and personal, to a trustee, who would handle them for the benefit of the creditors. The result was that men who took charge of estates were often in league with the debtor, were often not competent, not honest, not qualified to handle the assets. Then, the expense was great; the fees for liquidation and for legal services ran into enormous sums. I cite to the House the case of the Dominion Trust Company, with which many hon. members may be familiar, in which in one year, I believe, the law fees—not for litigation, but merely in connection with the liquidation of the estate—ran up to $28,000 or $30,000.

Under these old provincial acts we also have uncertainty so far as the position of the debtor is concerned. He could never be discharged from his liability; even if he were an extremely honest man he may have been confronted, as sometimes occurs in the lumber business, with an unforeseen and unpreventable disaster—for instance, a fire sweeping his timber areas and destroying everything he possesses from the business point of view. He puts himself in the hands of his creditors being obliged to do so from no fault of his own. What is his position? He is condemned for life so far as his activity in the business community is concerned; he can never get on his feet except behind the skirts of his wife or under the guise of an incorporated company. And even then he would not be safe; he has a hopeless future. Now, the purpose of the bankruptcy law was to give the honest man who is the victim of circumstances an opportunity to commence his business life over again.

The hon. member who proposes this resolution drew attention to certain abuses in connection with it whereby it was made easy for a man to avoid his obligations; whereby trustees facilitated liquidations under the Bankruptcy Act with the result that there were crooked and dishonest transactions. Well, my contention is that that would happen no matter what law you put into force in connection with bankruptcy. Where men are willing to be dishonest, where they have no respect for their character or their reputation and will employ crooked methods, then the law does not count for very much, unless it be the criminal law,—and it will be found that in the Criminal Code the attempt at

fraud to the advantage of the perpetrator, either as affecting money or credit, is amply covered. So that really, so far as the principle of the law is concerned, the contention of the hon. member that the act enables people to do crooked things is hardly a good argument, because they will carry out dishonest actions in other ways.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe this resolution should be rejected by the House, first because the resolution is confusing. If you adopt it, you make it possible for the law to be broken. I think the suggestion of the former Solicitor General, the member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) is a good one, that a measure of this kind, to be dealt with intelligently by the House, should be handled by the hon. member bringing in his amendment in specific form, so that we may know exactly with what we are confronted. If we are to vote on the principle of doing away with the Bankruptcy Act or not doing away with it, I suggest to hon. members, apart from the reasons I have given, that they look in their own constituencies and see whether or not the business, the industrial and commercial interests of. those constituencies, or the responsible people of those constituencies who are interested in the business of the district, are asking for the repeal of this act. I do not think there are many portions of Canada where you will find that such a feeling exists, and where there are difficulties existing, I believe Mr. Speaker they can be overcome by an amendement and not by a complete abrogation of the law.

Mr. PAUL MERCIER (Westmount-St-Henri): Mr. Speaker, I rise with pleasure to support the resolution of the hon member for Charlevoix-Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain). Indeed, as aforesaid, the bankruptcy act of 1919 and its amendments do not give to the people of our country the expected results, that they constitute a source of complaints on behalf of industry and trade, and that, at last, it is desirable to abrogate them or, at least, to greatly modify them. Before starting to study certain principles, the principal basis of this law, Mr. Speaker, let us glance over the judiciary administration, with regard to its laws and its connections with trade and industry, during the epoch that has preceded the year 1919. A bankruptcy law existed in each province of confederation. Creditors and debtors recovered in the proceedings as ordered by the provincial courts of justice. These local bankruptcy laws have been carefully studied, amended when required, by the provincial legislators and were giving, indeed, legal satisfaction. Moreover, this legislation had been enacted according to provincial necessities and customs, further resembling, as much as possible, the remaining laws in force in such and such a province. On the other hand, we had the Winding-up Act applying to the whole Dominion of Canada with regard to incorporate trading companies in liquidation. Everything appeared provided for and then we believed the legislators were very wise. The creditors, always dissatisfied when becoming connected with a bankruptcy, accepted their lot without bad grace in virtue of the dividend sheet prepared by the curator or the liquidator. We, for example, in the province of Quebec, were satisfied on our part. The confusion in which we are at present confirms the past and obliges us to prefer our former situation. Our law, called "Assignment", comprising articles 853 and following, of the Quebec Civil Code of Procedure, was excellent. Any unlucky trader found justice, and the community found efficient protection. We remember, Mr. Speaker, the day when a proclamation of the Governor General, dated December 31, 1919, announced to the Canadian citizens that the Bankruptcy Act, to-day in force, and of which as enacted, we complain bitterly, would come into force on and after the first of July, 1920.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if we examine this act, it is interesting to remark that, from the first of July, 1920, to June 28th, 1922, it has suffered eighty-seven amendments. In fact, it was born before its time, and its numerous amendments have served it as an incubator. And, after all, how could it be otherwise? For, constructing a bankruptcy act for the whole Dominion, without consulting the provincial attorneys-general and the legislatures directly interested in the approval and the application of this law that superseded a bankruptcy system already established in every province, was an extremely difficult move. As an experimental act, it has embraced too much. Its construction has been badly calculated, and it has had need of many braces. It now approaches three years since that law was brought into force. During this period has it given the expected results? Together with the interests of trade, of industry, with the chambers of commerce and the public in general, we do not hesitate to answer in the negative. It has disturbed the commercial population of city and country. It encourages neglect and the breach of honest and frank commercial customs. It has diminished the urban and rural credit. It contributes, finally, as applied or tolerated, to the lowering of the honesty and morality of some individuals. The blindfold partisans of the Bankruptcy Act would answer: "But the principle of the

law is good; it was asked for in 1919 by various commercial institutions of the different provinces. we will remedy the abuses shown to exist. We will amend the act so as to satisfy any just claims which may be advanced by the public."

Very well, Mr. Speaker, let the act remain in our statutes, if such is the desire of the majority of the members of this House and also of this government, in which I place my trust, but, let us receive, without further delay, the wishes of the commercial and industrial world who have for more than two years watched carefully the exploitation of this unfortunate act, and suffered its disastrous effects, and this, nowithstanding the after-war crisis through which we have just been passing. Therefore, I say, let us amend the act during the present session.

The abuses come from the disposition of the act itself giving an opening to all kinds of modern procedures. It has been abused enormously, Mr. Speaker. A change is needed to reinstate confidence and good faith, on the whole, in all bankruptcy matters. And we will reach that end by applying this act only to the tradesman who has ceased his payments. In the interest of the agricultural class, it is not convenient and it is unnatural that by the general law the farmer should fall under the operation of this act.

We understand that the tradesman has some risks to face. A reduction in price takes him by surprise and the effect on his business is such that he is sometimes thrown on the street. The war suddenly stopped—happily for the nation; the immediate result for the tradesman was, for example, the collapse of prices in silks, woollens, lumber and many other articles from sixty-five to seventy-five per cent. By its very nature, trade is very often risky in peace just as in war, in spite of the good name and the capital of a well-established firm. This is why a bankruptcy act is necessary to trade.

On the other hand, the farmer—and I am speaking now of the real cultivator of the field who has farmed from generation to generation, who likes his work and acquires experience with each succeeding harvest—is established permanently. Although he encounters some risk, although he has to face bad weather, he is almost never completely wiped out.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, continuing my remarks, I would add that this act, in offering to the agriculturist the opportunity of assigning, is a barrier to agriculture, hindering realization of the ideals of attachment to the land, annulling the effort of the farmer to balance his budget. The attraction of the city is then very bright. The farmer has no longer the same credit at the bank; discount is often refused to him. Even those who habitually lend money on farm property dare not lend to the farmers. Since these last have the right to assign, a privilege which they sometimes use, lenders prefer to buy debentures or shares in incorporated companies, more or less good, from salesmen who invade their neighbourhood. To-day, many people prefer a scrap of green paper, nicely engraved, to the value of a farm. This is how the act is at present affecting the solvency of the farmer.

Anyone who has studied our Bankruptcy Act will agree that it is a commercial tragedy. It brings on the scene five actors who play the principal parts. These are the assignee, the authorized trustee, the creditors, the registrar and the judge. As a finale, by way of apotheosis, when the curtain falls, there is the discharge, the rehabilitation in business. We have listened, Mr. Speaker, since July, 1920, to daily representations of this tragedy throughout Canada. We are now entirely justified in asking its withdrawal or, at least, in making necessary amendments, erasing certain sections which give rise to abuses respecting trade and the general public.

What are amongst thousands, the outstanding grievances against this act? First, the assignee ought to be a recognized tradesman; he should make his assignment in the district in which he is doing business, and in the hands of one of the trustees appointed for that district. Thus the creditors would have knowledge of the failure at its beginning, and trustee and assignee would be carefully watched during their work. Too much facility of procedure in bankruptcy is to be avoided. It is surprising to note that, according to the present law, the province of Quebec—and the same is true as regards the sister provinces—forms only one district in bankruptcy matters. Any person doing business and residing at Montreal can, as he sees fit, assign at Montreal, or at Quebec, or at any other centre in the province. Really, this fact is laughable. The petition should contain the honest assent of a serious creditor, and it

should not be returned except after notice has been given to the assignee. To-day the trustee always finds reasons which he judges sufficient to return the petition without notice. This manner of procedure must stop for the advantage of everyone. Moreover, under the old law, the tradesman must have kept a cash book; or otherwise, no discharge was granted. We should oblige business people to keep books according to the usages and customs of commerce. The title and privileges of trustee should be conferred only on those who are really competent. A deposit of $2,000 to the federal treasury could be required from each trustee when nominated, as a guarantee of good faith, and this, in addition to the ordinary security exacted by the said act.

The business of bankruptcy, Mr. Speaker, is, in these times, very lucrative for the trustees. We are informed by creditable persons, sometimes the victims of these fakirs, that there exists a type of bankruptcy beggar who annoys honest people who have no intention of assigning, under the pretext of advantageously liquidating their stock. A federal inspector should be appointed to supervise the operations of trustees and to examine their books. The trustees, most of the time, do not have their bills of costs taxed. This inspector would see to this matter. Each province should be allowed to formulate a table of costs and supervise its just application. If the trustee so desires, according to the law, he may have a bankruptcy sale of immovables by the sheriff of the district in which the said immovables are situated. But he is not obliged to do so. He may also sell them himself after proper notice. It is needless to add that this is the usual manner of procedure. The sheriff's sale is a notable exception. In the future, an amendment made to the act would oblige all immovables to be sold by the sheriff. In any event, the sale of immovables by the trustee should be made only after the permission of the judge has been obtained. In addition, the trustee should tell the judge why the sale is necessary.

In the application of this act, two trustees often quarrel over the possession of a bankruptcy stock. It is delightful, Mr. Speaker. We should avoid these morbid discussions by leaving to the first trustee in possession the right to look after the bankruptcy stock until such time as it shall be otherwise ordered by the judge. Besides, the nomination of a crown prosecutor to supervise the bankruptcy cases and the filing of claims, sometimes false and simulated by shady creditors, would do good work towards the cleaning. The discharge would not be so easily obtained, for the increase of claims is beneficial to those who ask the discharge. To this effect, services are rendered to the assignee at the expense of oath. Fraud would then be punished by justice in the name of the state and at its expense, because fraud punished at the cost of the individual is never punished. It is the duty of the state to be directly interested, and France gives an example to many other nations on this point. The registrar, in my humble opinion, has too much power. He refers to the judge only contested cases. All procedures, after the assignment, should be presented to the judge to be ordered as law. What an enormous amount of dishonest proceedings would thus be avoided, discovered and rejected. This would be a protection for the actual creditors who are nearly always victimized by the tortuous procedures allowed under this act.

This act is based on English law; precedents form the law. In Canada, the act of 1919 gives an absolute discretion to the judge. The matter depends on him; it is the absolutism of the judge. For instance, who decides on the discharge offered by the assignee? The judge alone. It is not the act itself which decides or prescribes the procedure. No positive law text exists on this subject. This is a grave oversight which must necessarily be remedied. If an amendment is passed in regard to the manner of obtaining, and the requirements for discharge according to principles established and stated, judges themselves charged with the administration of the present law would be very well pleased, because the law as at present constituted gives them too great a responsibility. The immovable foundation of states, says the Greek poet Pindar, is justice. The grievances of the industrial and commercial world against the Bankruptcy Act are undoubtedly true and receivable in law as in fact. This cause is just; and when a cause is just, it must sooner or later triumph. I am assured, Mr. Speaker, that it shall triumph.

Mr. BOUCHER (Yamaska) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, I unreservedly approve the resolution of the hon. member for Charlevoix (Mr Casgrain), and I deem it my duty to rise in this House so as to further give him my full support. The question brought up by the hon. member is one of the most important subjects that have been debated during the present session and I hope that the House will give it their most serious consideration, which it really deserves. It purports to a law which affects the financial interests of a large number of people in this country, and the application of which has up to now given the most fatal and disastrous results.

Mr. Speaker, the principle of the Act is defective and unjust, because it aims to limit, restrict, even to do away entirely with obligations legitimately contracted. To my mind, I have always considered and more than ever do I now believe that the legislator exceeds his powers, when he adopts legislation having for effect to liberate the debtor from his debt without having entirely discharged it. There is but one person who can remit a debt and that is the creditor. It is his privilege, his right, and any parliament which, through legislation, foils the creditors of that right, abuses its powers and is guilty of a denial of justice. I am therefore opposed, as a matter of principle, to all bankruptcy laws, and I think that the late government was ill advised in enacting the one of 1919. If I may judge from the protests which arise a little everywhere, and especially in my province, against the pernicious effects of this act to every point of view, I think it should be immediately struck off the statutes of Canada. I shall not, however, venture as far as to ask for its repeal, but I am strongly of the opinion, and, my own personal experience convinces me every day the more, that it should be radically amended.

The Bankruptcy Act as understood and applied fosters dishonesty. I will go further, I shall add that it is unjust inasmuch as it protects especially the debtor, to the detriment of the creditor which it leaves at the mercy of numerous annoying and costly procedures which, in practice, prove illusive. I contend that a bankruptcy act should have for its aim to protect first the creditors, and that the right to instigate bankruptcy should exclusively belong to them. I am therefore especially opposed to section 9 of the act which allows every person without any discrimination, whose debts are over $500, to make, of his own accord, an assignment of his property to the benefit of his creditors. This section makes no exception. Everybody is permitted to make an assignment of his property; the professional man, the artisan, the farmer, the ordinary beggar—as it has already happened—may avail themselves of the provisions of this section. It only requires to be indebted to the amount of $500 or more.

I represent a rural county, Mr. Speaker, and, I am proud to say, it is one of the finest counties in the province of Quebec. In my riding there are no large industries, nor any powerful business corporations, but fertile farms dotted here and there with beautiful villages where simple virtue survives, and I believe that the principal grievance we have to make against the Bankruptcy Act comes from the section just cited. I have not the slightest doubt that if members of this House were aware of the working of this Act in rural counties, they would without hesitation amend it in such a way as to comply with the aim the legislator had in mind when it was enacted. My knowledge is based on experience. I have seen this law in operation in my district and I am sure of not exaggerating when I say that it is most depressing and demoralizing. Not only is it harmful to those who wish to take advantage of it, but it is especially injurious to the farming class whose credit it ruins, and there is a general hue and cry against what is known almost everywhere, pardon the expression, Mr. Speaker, the "damn" Bankruptcy Act.

Who are the culprits? First, I have no hesitation in pointing out the trustees of bankrupts. I am aware that there are conscientious, competent and honest trustees, but they are in the minority. I sympathize with the latter and do not refer to them. I am alluding to the majority who, lacking the virtues or qualities that I have just mentioned, do not take into account that the trustees are appointed to apply the law but they imagine and end by really believing that the Bankruptcy Act is administered for their benefit. It then becomes a race, an organized campaign in search of victims to sacrifice on the altar of authorized assignment. The trustees are on the look out day and night; they have recruiting agents and the moment they have an inkling of a person seeming somewhat financially embarrassed, they find means of meeting their intended victim, having him interviewed, proposing all kinds of schemes, verbally assign him so to speak and finally convince their victim that he had better make a clean slate of it and begin life anew, and wipe out all obligations contracted up to date. The debtor first listens, then on the spur of the moment or feeling somewhat depressed gives in, allows himself to be convinced and signs an authorized assignment. His creditors did not demand an immediate payment, they were willing to give him time; but not being consulted in the matter, they learn of the accomplished fact through a notice of the trustees requesting their presence at a meeting. In most cases, the debtor regrets his haste; he would be differently disposed a few days or even a few hours after, but the thing is done, the winding-up follows its course, the debtor's property is sacrificed, the creditors receive a year or two later a dividend of 10 or 20 per cent, when there would have been enough to settle in full with them, and the trustees who, in most cases, hardly earned

previously, $1,000 or $1,500 per year, now are in receipt of cabinet ministers' salaries.

Does this description, Mr. Speaker, seem too much exaggerated? It is not. It is the true narration of the application of the Bankruptcy Act in the rural country, at least in my district and the neighbouring ones.

In my own village I came across the following case: A certain person signed an authorized assignment under the same circumstances that I have just mentioned, the transaction had hardly taken place when the person discovers his mistake; two hours later he arrives at the trustee's home to inform him that he had changed his mind, and, would he be kind enough to return the assignment. After a long discussion over the matter, the trustee consents, demanding, however, an indemnity of $200. Was it to recoup himself for the work done? No, it was to indemnify himself for the fees he would lose if this assignment was not carried out. I can name the person in question. The trustee is still in office. I intend to ask for his dismissal and I hope that it will not be refused.

Is this, Sir, an isolated case? I contend that it is not. Cases of this kind are numerous; it is the general rule. On three different occasions, when the assets of the bankrupt comprised only a property mortgaged to its full value and that the inspectors had authorized an assignment in favour of the last creditor, subject to said mortgage, I was witness to trustees demanding in advance fees amounting to $400 and $500, simply for his signature in connection with the assignment. Still there are more glaring instances. In another village of my county, a merchant, immediately after the Bankruptcy Act came into force, took advantage of it to request a composition which was granted to him, and, naturally, it is almost the invariable rule in the composition that it is followed up by an authorized assignment. The latter was not yet settled when he again made—this happened only a few months ago—another assignment and this with the same trustee. Four long years under the rule of the Bankruptcy Act. Consequences: the merchant in question has just left the village without a cent to his name. The trustee is now the registered owner of both the property and trade of the bankrupt which he is disposing of, and, I am not aware that the creditors have received a cent.

It may be said that the act provides for such abuses as I have just mentioned. In theory perhaps, but in practice it is but a disillusion. How is it possible for a creditor interested in ten, fifteen or twenty bankruptcies, to be present at all the meetings, follow the procedure, protect himself before the courts and thereby incur considerable expenses. It is not done and not possible. The trustees and the debtor are practically the masters of the situation, and the creditor has to be contented with what is handed to him, and he may consider himself lucky if he receives anything.

By keeping track of the nature of transactions which, as a rule, take place in rural districts, I am convinced that the Bankruptcy Act will be found to be the cause of serious prejudices to creditors without being of any benefit to debtors, for the simple reason that in 80 per cent of the cases, without taking into consideration the considerable charges that the trustees demand, the debtor could pay 100 per cent in the dollar if a judicious winding-up was carried out.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the abuses that I have just mentioned would greatly be reduced if all of Part II of the Act were repealed.

The highest authorities in my province have denounced this legislation, men whose names I mention in this House with a certain pride and admiration, and moreover, I feel certain of meeting the unanimous approbation of the House in saying that they are amongst those who incarnate what is most noble and best in the French-Canadian race. The Hon. Alexander Taschereau, Premier of the province of Quebec, and the Hon. J. B. Perrault, Minister of Colonization, have in the course of the last session, at the Legislative Assembly, condemned this act in the clearest possible way, and in my estimation their word is authority on such matter.

Somebody suggested exempting the province of Quebec from the application of the Bankruptcy Act. This is the best solution and I would welcome with pleasure an amendment to that effect. Up to this day the people of Quebec have been noted for their loyalty, honesty and integrity. They wish to remain loyal to their traditions and in no way do they want to be legally exempted from paying their debts. Should it not be possible to adopt this amendment, I think it would be to the purpose and beneficial to amend the Bankruptcy Act as follows:

1. That Part II of the act be so amended that the authorized assignment and the composition will no further apply;

2. That the Bankruptcy Act be only applicable to trade as in the act of 1875;

3. That the scale of fees of trustees be more clearly defined;

4. That trustees' fees be only levied on the proceeds of the sale of movables and that the immovables contribute to the extent of

the costs only of sale and awarding of moneys resulting from said sale;

5. That a penalty be imposed upon trustees who, directly or indirectly, induce a person to go into bankruptcy, divide their fees or split a commission.

I do not state, Mr. Speaker, that all is defective in the present act. I am willing to admit that in certain spheres and in special cases its existence is warranted and may be useful, but I think it is capable of being amended and that these amendments impose themselves to answer to the needs of those who I have the honour to represent in this House, these fellow citizens with whom I am proud to share both their ideals and aspirations.

Mr. W. A. BOYS (South Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, the resolution contemplates two things: First the abrogation of the Bankruptcy Act; second, its amendment. From what I have heard so far I would not think there is any intention, even on the part of those favouring the resolution, that the act itself should be abrogated, but rather that certain amendments should be made thereto.

There seems to be a difference between the law in the province of Quebec and that in the province of Ontario prior to the passage of the Bankruptcy Act of 1919. If I understood aright what has been said, in the province of Quebec, farmers, for instance, were not entitled to the benefit of the Assignment Act —I am not giving it its proper name under the Quebec Code. I would point out to my hon. friends from that province that in Ontario farmers have always been entitled to the benefit of our Assignment Act. Its door was not closed to anyone in financial difficulties. At any time prior to the passing of the Bankruptcy Act anyone could make a voluntary assignment for the benefit of his creditors, and the same results were obtained as under the present act, with the one outstanding difference relating to discharge.

So far I find four main objections are made to the act. The first is that it is not confined to traders and merchants as in Quebec; second, that it was born too soon; third, that assignee's costs and fees are excessive; and, fourth, that there should not be a discharge.

Why anyone should want to withold the provisions of this act from a farmer I cannot see. Happily we do not as a rule, in the province of Ontario at all events, have assignments by many farmers. But if a farmer should get into financial difficulties why should not he be entitled to make an assignment under this act just as well as anyone else, be he merchant or otherwise. On behalf of the farmers—and I regret to say that during the hard times of the last two years there have been in my own county to my knowledge four or five assignments by farmers—I am glad to think they can avail themselves of the provisions of this act and giving a proper account of their dealings with their estate and satisfying the other provisions of the act get their discharge and start off again with a clean sheet and with a new lease of business life. Under our former act this was not the case. If a man failed, and his creditors wanted to pursue him, he was up against it. The only way he could start business again was by trading in the name of a fake company or in the name of his wife.

I think it was my hon. friend from Westmount (Mr. Mercier) who said that this practically was an eight months' child—that it was born too soon, because there were too many amendments. I happen to have in my hand the Statutes of 1921 and I observe that our criminal code contains for that year twenty-four amendments—about half as many as this act. The criminal code has been the law of our land for many, many years, and if at this stage it is necessary to put through twenty-four amendments to this long established law, surely it is not going too far to put through twice as many amendments to new legislation.

In regard to assignee's costs and fees, I was very much struck by the case cited by the hon. member for Chambly and Vercheres (Mr. Archambault). The assets were only $600 and I think he said the assignee's fees were about $1,500 or $1,600. I am not sure whether I have repeated the figures correctly or not.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: The amount that remained to be distributed among the creditors was $700, and the fees were $1,600.

Mr. BOYS: What were the gross receipts?

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: I could not tell my hon. friend.

Mr. BOYS: Of course, it is that feature which governs. In the case referred to there is ample remedy provided by the act. Under the section dealing with trustees' fees a trustee is limited to five per cent. Solicitor and counsel fees are governed by stringent provisions contained in section 67. If the estate referred to by my hon. friend amounted to only $600, the assignee's fees would be limited to $30 and the solicitor and counsel fees, even if they secured the unanimous consent required by the act, would be limited to ten per cent, or $60—a total, all told, of $90. If any assignee in the province of Quebec or his solicitor retained $1,600, or indeed any-

thing over $90, there is ample remedy under the act and it should have been invoked, and I cannot conceive of the creditors acquiescing in these excessive charges.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: The amount included all expenses, advertising and so on.

Mr. BOYS: I am, of course, only dealing with the commission and fees. We must add to those the disbursements provided for by the act. I do not think any estate of $600 would involve disbursements of more than $75, or $100 at the outside. So this was a case of gross fraud, and I am at a loss to understand why the creditors interested did not take steps to protect themselves, for the act provides against any such extortion.

It was also argued that the act is prejudicial to the interest of creditors. I cannot see how it has that effect. Certainly it does not in Ontario, for beyond the question of discharge there is no difference between our previous law and this law. As I said before, anyone can assign and get the benefit of the act. The only difference is that under the former procedure he could not secure a discharge.

In regard to discharge let me deal with some of the provisions that have to be complied with. A bankrupt will not be entitled to his discharge unless his assets are sufficient to pay 50 cents on the dollar, except in the special circumstances referred to in the section; if he has failed to keep books of account he cannot get his discharge; if he has continued to trade after knowing himself to be insolvent, he cannot get his discharge; if he has failed to account satisfactorily for any loss or deficiency of his assets or to account for his liabilities, he cannot get his discharge; if he has contributed to his bankruptcy by rash and hazardous speculation he cannot get his discharge; if he has given any undue preference to his creditors, he cannot get a discharge; if he has made a previous assignment, he cannot get his discharge; and last, and perhaps most important of all, if he has been guilty of any fraud or fraudulent breach of trust, he cannot get his discharge. There are other provisions that I have not even read. When one views those provisions it is hard to see how any man who has not dealt fairly with his creditors, who has not been honest, can secure a discharge. If he has been honest and dealt fairly with his creditors, and through misfortune has failed, is there any member of this House who wants to see such a man go through the balance of his life as a debtor pursued by his creditors? Is it not better that when he shows he has acted honestly he should get his discharge and get off to a fresh start in life? Those were, as far as I could see, the main objections to the act.

While I am on my feet I want to say a word or two regarding amendments. I have heard it suggested that the Minister of Justice is going to introduce a bill providing some further amendments to this act, and I certainly think there is room yet for amendments. I want to refer to one or two.

In the first place, the provisions regarding the preferential claim of a landlord for rent do not seem to me to be reasonable or fair. Under the Assignments and Preferences Act under which we formerly operated in Ontario, a landlord in case of failure, if he had been considerate of his tenant—who may have had a crop failure and the landlord may have given him an extension—if there was a year's rent in arrear and a failure took place, the landlord was given a preference for one year's rent immediately preceding the time of failure. Now it is limited to three months, so if a tenant wants an extension from his landlord and there is any danger, he cannot get it for the landlord would stand to lose at least nine months' rent, and the tenant suffers accordingly. That is not fair or proper. I cannot see why if a landlord is considerate enough to give his tenant time and the tenant has the misfortune to fail, the landlord's preference for at least one year, which was the law in Ontario before, should not still prevail.

Then, under the act he is only entitled to a preference for three months under the acceleration clause, and I would like to point out to the minister the effect that has. Suppose a farm lease is dated the 1st of March, rent not payable in advance, and a failure takes place say on the 1st of June. The landlord can secure three months' rent immediately preceding failure. If the assignee retains possession, the landlord, of course, can receive rent for whatever time possession is retained, but he can only secure three months' preference after the assignment. The crops are in the ground. He could not even get them. The most he could get would be six months' rent. The crops could be taken by the assignee and for the balance of the year, namely six months, the landlord would go without his rent, for a new lease would not be effective till the following spring. If there is any thought of introducing amendments, I would strongly urge on the minister a consideration of the section dealing with the preferential claim of the landlord, both for his protection, and that of the tenant.

There is another feature to which I would refer, and that is the powers of the registrar. In the province of Ontario we have one regis-

trar. A failure might take place in Fort William, yet practically everything you want to do in connection with the assignment has to be done in the city of Toronto where the registrar is. I am offering no criticism of the registrar at all. We have one of the most capable officers of the courts in Ontario as registrar, but I would suggest to the minister that there should be some change there. Why we should not have our assignments registered and dealt with in the first instance in all ex parte applications—simple proceedings such as examinations and so on—in the office of the local registrar or local master in each county, just as is done in connection with supreme court proceedings, I cannot see. Where we have more difficult matters to deal with we have two judges to dispense the law. If you want even to examine the debtor, who might live in Windsor, or Kingston, or Fort William, the provision of the act requires the debtor to be examined in Toronto before the registrar. Surely that is not reasonable. I want to protest against the centralization of the operation of this act in one or two large cities in any province. Let us bring the provisions of this act as close to the door of the failure as possible, because the people interested in the failure are generally within that county. I am aware that in the case of merchants perhaps, most creditors would be in Toronto or possibly Montreal, but outside of that this change that I suggest would lead to the convenience of the people interested. If there is any thought of amending the act I would therefore suggest that that feature be taken into consideration also.

For my part I heartily approve of the Bankruptcy Act, and would be very sorry indeed to see it abrogated. I do not fear that for a moment, but by all means let us get all the suggestions we can for its improvement, and in the end I have no doubt an act will be worked out which will be complete, which will be convenient, and which will be less costly than the proceedings required by the act at the present time, and will be just as fair to all concerned.

Mr. S. W. JACOBS (George Etienne Cartier): I would not have entered this debate were it not for the fact that my name has been mentioned by several speakers who have preceded me, and I feel that in justice to myself I must say a word or two in support of this Bankruptcy Act for which I am given the credit.

I may say this to my friend the member for Chambly and Verchères (Mr. Archambault), who I think referred to the fact that the act perhaps was bad because it was introduced originally by the Union government.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: I never said such a thing.

Mr. JACOBS: It may have been the hon. member for Charlevoix-Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain). I do not think everything that the Union government did was bad. In fact, I think the best thing they did was when they retired from the government of this country.

Mr. BOYS: Or when they accepted your act.

Mr. JACOBS: The discussion this afternoon from this side of the House, and the essays which were so beautifully read by the members from the province of Quebec, would almost lead one to conclude that they were written in the office of the Nationalist sheet, Le Devoir. I have read these statements for the last two or three years. Le Devoir has always been opposed to this measure, and the reason they claim is, that it is an encroachment upon the civil rights of the people of the province of Quebec. It is claimed by Le Devoir and its supporters that the Bankruptcy Act is an attempt on the part of the English-speaking people of the other provinces to impose upon the province of Quebec, English law; that this is the thin end of the wedge, and that before very long we may have the whole English body of law imposed upon the province of Quebec. That is frankly what is at the back of this agitation to repeal the Bankruptcy Act. I know whereof I speak, because I am a very diligent reader of Le Devoir. I do not think I have missed a number since it came out originally in 1910.

Mr. GAUVREAU: You have never improved on account of that.

Mr. JACOBS: I have improved on account of it. I always like to know both sides of the question. I like to know what the other man is saying and what he is thinking. I have given the reason for the opposition to this law. If I thought that this Bankruptcy Act was the beginning of an attempt to impose English law on the province of Quebec, I would be the very first to oppose it, for the reason that if I know any law at all the only law I know is the French civil law of the province of Quebec, and if English law were imposed on that province I would be at a loss to know what to do, because I would have to go out of active practice. It is wrong for our people in the province of Quebec to say that the act which the parliament of Can-

ada has a right to impose on the whole of the Dominion of Canada is an attempt to take from the people of the province of Quebec their civil rights and their civil law. The British North America Act gives to the federal power the right to legislate in certain matters for the whole of the Dominion of Canada. The Bank Act, for instance, is a federal act, and the Merchant Shipping Act, the Criminal Code are also federal acts. Not only the present Bankruptcy Act but those that preceded it are federal acts. If the residents of the province of Quebec, or if the legislature or the lawmakers, or if the Fathers of Confederation from the province of Quebec, felt that a law of this kind would eventually mean that their law would be superseded by the law of the other provinces, why did they not in explicit terms say that these federal laws should not apply to Quebec? Here is a statement made by serious minded members of parliament, and eminent lawyers like my hon. friend for Chambly and Verchères (Mr. Archambault) and my hon. friend for Charlevoix-Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain), to the effect that this law should not be made to apply to the province of Quebec. For my part I have this to say: that I would rather see the act completely repealed and abrogated than to have it apply only to provinces other than Quebec. This is something which the federal parliament has the right to impose, and so long as we have that right I say that we ought to exercise it, inasmuch as it is a measure for the general advantage and benefit of Canada.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: What about prohibition?

Mr. JACOBS: My hon. friend for Chambly and Verchères (Mr. Archambault) always thinks in terms of prohibition. One would imagine that, with his visits to Montreal once or twice a week, he would be able to forget his troubles between those visits. What is the trouble with the Bankruptcy Act as shown by the discussion to-day? One is that the costs of the attorneys and trustees are extortionate, and another is that there are too many trustees. That is a matter which can be very easily changed by an ordinary amendment. I myself believe we have too many trustees. We have in Montreal about 150 trustees. Now 150 men cannot live in the city of Montreal on the business provided in that city or in the district of Montreal.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: How many of those trustees were appointed at the request of my hon. friend?

[Mr. Jacobs.]

Mr. JACOBS: I will take the responsibility of saying that I suggested five or six to the Union government. Their names were carefully examined by a committee of the government which, I think, consisted of Messrs. Ballantyne and Blondin, and the appointments went through. Since our government came into power not one man I suggested was appointed. They told me they already had a sufficient number and I think perhaps they were right. As I said before, we ought to curtail the trustees to a reasonable number I should think in Monteal fifteen or twenty would be quite enough. I understand in the city of Winnipeg where they have 250,000 population and a very large district surrounding it, there are four or five all told, to take care of the needs of that district.

Mr. LADNER: On what principle or reasoning would the hon. member limit the appointment of trustees, seeing that practically all the trustees engage in other business besides that of handling liquidation?

Mr. JACOBS: I do not think they should be engaged in other businesses, but that they should give their entire attention to this work of insolvency. It is impossible for 150 men to live on the business provided in Montreal, and it is just possible that when a man cannot live honestly he perhaps resorts to other means. The complaint has been made that many of these trustees go about from place to place, particularly in the farming districts, and they seduce the righteous farmer from the path of virtue. It is an easy matter for the farmer to fall, they claim, particularly in the province of Quebec. I do not know why that should be, but it seems to me that the method has been resorted to. I say that no respectable trustee, or no man who deserves the name respectable, should resort to that sort of work. If we had fifteen or twenty proper trustees in Montreal, they would see to it that the law was properly observed, and if it were not properly observed the trustees would find themselves removed from office.

Now with regard to the question of these extortionate charges, hon. members who just preceded me referred to the statute but they did not refer to those sections which say explicitly that no trustee and no attorney shall receive more than 5 per cent of the proceeds of the estate. For the benefit of my predecessors who spoke on this resolution, and some of whom I am afraid have not even read the act, I would refer to sections 40 and 67 of the act, which provides that no trustee or no attorney can charge more than 5 per cent. If they were restricted to that rate, I do not

think there would be any cause for complaint, and if the number of trustees were further restricted both these causes would be removed.

On the question of the unconstitutionality of the act, it is all very well for hon. members to rise in their seats and tell us that this act is unconstitutional. I would refer them to a number of privy council cases, where it was held that the Bank Act, the Bankruptcy Act and other federal acts which were deemed at one time to,conflict with provincial jurisdiction were found to be quite constitutional. It is not for this House to sit in judgment and declare whether the act is unconstitutional or not. If it is unconstitutional, or the House thinks it is, let the courts be applied to, and if the courts say it is unconstitutional, that is an end of the act. I know that Mr. Taschereau, the Premier of the province of Quebec, has declared that he will stake his reputation upon the unconstitutionality of this act. Well, I was very much surprised indeed to hear that statement made by the Premier of Quebec. He is one of the ablest lawyers in our province and a great constitutional authority, but I think when he made that statement he was talking more as the Premier of the province of Quebec than as a lawyer of the standing everyone knows he has reached.

A further complaint has been made against that act—not this afternoon, but I have seen it mentioned in the press and elsewhere—in regard to the loose way in which it is drafted. They claim the English in the act is not what it should be, that no person is able to understand it, and that it is so confusing that no one can make out its intent. All I can say in answer to that is, that this act is a replica of the English Bankruptcy Act passed about 40 years ago, with its amendments. All of us who practice law know that there are no better draftsmen in the world than the English in matters of legislation, and if these men who complain cannot understand what the real meaning of the act is, it is not the fault of the English in the act, but perhaps it is due entirely to themselves. I know that often there is difficulty in clearly understanding the meaning of a new statute, but it is only a question of time when these sections of the law will be interpreted by competent authority, the judges on the bench, and in due course the law will be as clear to them as it is to those who practise in England. This Act, I submit Mr. Speaker, ought to be given a chance. It has only been on the statute books about two years and a half. We cannot see yet how it is going to work out. If we find that there are abuses, later we may take steps either to repeal or to amend the act. At the present time, I submit, it should be given a chance to function, and those who are trying to administer it should be afforded the opportunity of giving it a fair show.

Another complaint that was made, was that the act is being amended all the time It is being amended, that is true, quite often, but for the purpose of improvement. The law must keep abreast of the advancing tide of public opinion. What may have been good three or four years ago may not be good to-day. We did not claim that this bill when it was draughted and submitted to the judiciary, when it was submitted to the trustees, to the trade and to others, was perfect, or that there were not certain defects in it when the measure was brought before the House. From time to time the law was amended and, as I said before, it was amended in order to improve it and not otherwise. I do not believe that the fact that the law has been amended is in itself a proof that that law is bad; the amendments made to it are for the purpose of improvement.

Now, my hon. friends who have spoken here to-day on this side have no concrete suggestion to make with regard to this act. They say that it is a vicious act and that it produces fraud; they say it is productive of dishonesty and consequently it ought to be abrogated. In what sense does this act induce fraud and dishonesty? Do my hon. friends know that there are about seventeen or eighteen sections of this act which deal particularly with fraud and dishonesty on the part of debtors; sections which practically cover every case of fraud and dishonesty. It may be that these are not invoked as much as they should be. I know what the tendency is in insolvency matters. When a bankruptcy takes place the desire of all the creditors is to get as much as they possibly can out of the wreck, which is only human, and instead of prosecuting a fraudulent debtor and sending him to prison, as perhaps they should do ethically, they are anxious to get what they can out of the estate, and that is why these people are not prosecuted. We have heard statements made here to-day by gentlemen who would seem to be acting more as attorneys for creditors, but we have not heard a single word about the debtor's side of the case. Surely the debtor has some rights also. The debtor says, when he has handed everything he owns in the wide world over to his creditors, when the estate is wound up and

he has nothing further—not even enough to start with again—because no privileges are given to the debtor—and no fraud of any kind can be charged against him, "I have a right to be given another show to start off again afresh." That is the theory of the act; but my hon. friends here say "No. Once a man has gone into insolvency he should be made to pay a hundred cents on the dollar, and until he does that he cannot go into business again." The rule of the old Roman law, was that the creditor should be able to sell his debtor into slavery. If a man is not able to start off afresh and earn a living for himself and his family, but is constantly in danger of being persecuted, by the creditors, then I say, we are lapsing back to the condition under the old Roman law, and our civilization of two thousand years amounts to nothing at all.

My hon. friends on this side also say that we ought to go back to the provincial code of civil procedure, which is a law that worked for many years and worked harmoniously and successfully. Do my hon. friends not understand that under the British North America Act the provincial legislatures have no power whatever to pass any bankruptcy act; and the so-called Insolvency Act to which they refer simply consists of a scheme whereby the debtor's assets are disposed of by auction or tender and the proceeds distributed to the creditors. It is not a bankruptcy act at all; it is merely a scheme of division. The only authority that can deal with the question of bankruptcy is the parliament of Canada; and if we repeal this act then we go back to the old system whereby a man, as I said before, will have to remain under cover practically all his life unless he has satisfied his creditors to the extent of every penny that is due to them.

Now, in connection with the discharge of the debtor. My hon. friends, I trust, know that no discharge—no matter whether it is for fifty cents on the dollar or over—can be granted unless the judge examines carefully into the entire state of the debtor's affairs. My hon. friends say that this act induces fraud; that a debtor throws his assets into the hands of a trustee; he obtains a settlement or a compromise and starts off afresh. That is not a fact. Every scheme of settlement, every scheme of arrangement or compromise must be submitted to the judge. Notice is given to every creditor who is interested to appear on a certain named day before the judge to show cause why this debtor should not be given his discharge. If any person appears before the judge and points out that some fraud mentioned in the act has been committed—and there are scores of these mentioned in the act—then the judge must deny to the debtor the right to obtain his discharge. So that we have here a distinct division made between an honest debtor who obtains his discharge and the dishonest debtor who does not obtain his discharge. If this act were repealed or abrogated they are all thrown into the same category; the honest and the dishonest debtor are refused their discharge and we are just as we were before. I say, Mr. Speaker, we have now arrived at that stage in our national development where we want a bankruptcy act similar to those laws which they have in every other country in the world.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Is my hon. friend ready to state that only honest debtors get their discharge under this law?

Mr. JACOBS: If the debtor is able satisfactorily to answer the questions put to him by the court on the day fixed when all the creditors are there—and very often they are there with an array of counsel to back them up—if the debtor is able to run that gauntlet, and the judge declares he is honest, it is not for us to sit in judgment on the debtor or on the judge, but we will have to assume and presume that he is honest.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Did not my hon. friend say a minute ago that the creditors were more anxious to get money out of the debtor than to punish him if he is dishonest?

Mr. JACOBS: I say that in certain cases it is so.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: In most.

Mr. JACOBS: In certain cases; but why should we protect, or attempt to protect, a creditor who does not want to protect himself? If the creditor is willing to accept a certain sum on the dollar and does not wish to prosecute the debtor, who can prosecute him? If the creditors had in their possession information which would lead to the conviction of the debtor and they refuse to prosecute him they cannot call upon us for protection. They make their own bed and must lie upon it, and it is not for us to interfere.

9 p.m. At the same time there is plenty of machinery in this act which will enable a dishonest debtor to be sent to prison.

Now, with regard to the question of the rights of the lessor, and other rights referred to in the Bankruptcy Act, which seem to have been changed from the law as it existed before the act came into force, I may say that the entire question is now before the courts to determine as to whether the parliament

of Canada has the right to interefere with the lessor's claim against the trustee and against the debtor. That is a matter which will eventually find its way to the judicial committee of the Privy Council. In fact all these questions—that is the rights of the parliament of Canada as against the provincial legislatures to legislate in matters of bankruptcy—will in due course come before the judicial committee of the Privy Council and will be dealt with there. If it is found they are unconstitutional it will be so declared and we will be where we were before; but it is not for us, sitting here as the parliament of Canada, to ask that the law be repealed while these questions are before the courts. The reason of much of this controversy is that in Quebec the law prior to this act differed so materially from the law of the other provinces that it is a bit of a shock to most of us in Quebec to find that our law in these particular matters should be overruled, as it were, by the federal authorities. But as I said before, the right was given to the parliament of Canada to do this, and until that right is taken away we are only exercising that right in a logical and constitutional way by enacting a law of this kind.

Many of my hon. friends were in this House in the parliament of 1917; they will remember that resolutions were passed by every board of trade in the country, with perhaps, one or two exceptions, by public bodies throughout the entire land, by the board of trade of the city of Montreal, the most important body of its kind in Canada, by boards of trade of Toronto and other cities, in fact, even by the board of trade of the city of Quebec, beseeching us to enact a law of this kind, and we were simply concurring in the views of the vast body of the people at the time when this law was passed. I care not for the odium which appears to have been cast upon me by certain people in Quebec for my part in putting upon the statute books this particular act. My friends will probably come to see a little later on that I was right when I advocated a law of this kind for the entire Dominion. The suggestion, as I said before, of contracting the province of Quebec out of this act will meet with my uncompromising opposition, and I would much rather see the act thrown into the waste paper basket holusbolus than agree to any scheme which would put Quebec into one class and the rest of Canada into another. Such action does not make for nationhood, concord or harmony. It is true that we have on the statute books certain acts which permit Quebec in specific matters to pass its own laws. The one I have in mind is the Lord's Day Act; but surely we cannot begin to make any comparison between the Lord's Day Act and the Bankruptcy Act. The Lord's Day Act is an act for the observance of Sunday, and of Saturday, if I may say so. The act of Quebec is the most fair-minded and broadest of its kind in the whole Dominion. It declares that any person who keeps Saturday as his day of rest may work on Sunday, and that the laws and customs of Quebec as regards the observance of Sunday shall remain in force notwithstanding the federal Lord's Day Act. I should be the last one to complain about the Lord's Day Act in Quebec, because I had something to do in seeing that the proviso as regards Saturday observance was inserted in that act. You cannot compare an act which deals with the trade and commerce of this country with the Lord's Day Act. Trade and commerce is the same in every part of Canada; the other act is a matter of religious principle and observance, and we cannot think for a moment of placing the Bankruptcy Act in the same category as the Lord's Day Act. For these reasons, I shall vote against the resolution which was introduced by the hon. member for Charlevoix-Montmorency.

Mr. J. J. DENIS (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, I always listen with a great deal of interest to the hon. member for George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs) and again to-night, I was charmed to hear his eloquence as he spoke on —may I say?—so difficult a subject as the Bankuptcy Act. There is however, a point as regards which I cannot agree with my hon. friend, and there is at least one assertion which he has made that I must challenge. He seems to think that Le Devoir is the guiding influence of hon. members from Quebec. In that respect, my hon. friend is altogether wrong. We read Le Devoir at least, I do; I take what good there is in it and what I think is wrong, I leave out. In this particular case, it just happens that Le Devoir has been conducting a campaign against this law, and I think Le Devoir is perfectly right in doing so. That is the reason why to-day we stand with Le Devoir. I wish also to say to my hon. friend that in opposing this law, we rest our opinions on its merits only. We are not afraid by any means, nor are we prejudiced by the fact that the English law might be introduced into this country, and more particularly into Quebec. We want laws which are just and right to be introduced into this country; but we are opposed to laws that are unjust and vicious and, in our opinion, this law is both unjust and vicious. Rightly or wrongly, I am one of those who have always opposed this law. I have made strong

representations, and I have brought protests to members of this government and the preceding government. Some amendments have been brought up; but I do not think this law is subject to amendment in order to make it right and just, because the fundamental principle of the law is, in my opinion, wrong and bad. The hon. member for George Etienne Cartier thought, doubtless, that he had driven a very strong point when he said that this law was simply a replica of an old law that was passed in England about forty years ago. If there is a reason why I would not have this law in Canada, it is because it is a replica of an English law, passed some forty years ago. We have had too much copying of English laws in this country. We have this law which is a copy of the English law; we have another law, which in my opinion, is bad in many respects, which is also to a large extent a copy of the English law, and that is the electoral law. In many respects the electoral law has given us sad experiences. That law, in my judgment, was drafted by pseudo-experts or reformists, whose lack of experience and ignorance of conditions that prevail in this country are exceeded only by their arrogant self-appreciation. These men have shackled and fettered the electorate of this country with a cumbersome and, in many respects, unjust law imported from England where conditions are totally different from those which prevail in this country, and to bring a law of this kind into Canada, the best argument that they have given us so far, is that it is a copy of the English law. Conditions in this country are altogether different from conditions in Europe and it is not because this bankruptcy law and this electoral law are copies of English laws that I object to them; I object to them because they are not suited to the people of Canada. I would object to them just as strongly if they had been imported from France.

While I am on this subject, I might have a word to say to my friends of the party angularly opposite. I have just said that the electoral law is bad in many respects. I will ask them what they think of that law when they consider the results that have just taken place as regards the contestation of the constituency of Moose Jaw? Is it not a fact that the hon. gentleman who was recently disqualified had, during the conduct of the election, committed no crime? I am sure many hon. gentlemen thought what that hon. gentleman did was absolutely correct and lawful. But this law, borrowed from England, has been drafted in such a way that it requires highly trained legal minds to understand and apply it. And, so long as the law stands as we have it members of parliament will, quite unconsciously, do things that are not lawful; they will be liable to find themselves disqualified for having committed acts which are unlawful, although they may not have had the least idea that what they were doing was wrong. The electoral law must be modified in many respects if this condition of things is to be remedied. I mention this only by way of comparison in reference to the argument brought forward by my hon. friend from George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs), who declares that the law we are at present discussing is good because it is an English law.

Mr. JACOBS: Perhaps my hon. friend will permit me an explanation. I said that the language was English and therefore there should be no complaint as to the form in which the law was drafted.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The grammar is good.

Mr. JACOBS: Yes.

Mr. DENIS (Joliette): The grammar may be good but the law itself is mighty hard to understand, even when a clever lawyer tries to construe it.

Mr. LADNER: I do not know whether my hon. friend is a lawyer or not.

Mr. JACOBS: He is.

Mr. LADNER: But does he say that because the Bankruptcy Act happens to have been drawn on the lines of the English act, it is therefore incorrectly drawn?

Mr. DENIS (Joliette): My answer is that the act as presented to us is so terribly involved that it was declared impracticable, not later than three or four months ago, by the Court of Appeal in Montreal in the case of Danforth and Riordon. Both the English and the French judges expressed the view that it was unwieldy and that, if it was not repealed, at least it should be amended in accordance with common sense. That declaration was made in Montreal by Mr. Justice Greenshields, an English judge, and it was sustained by the French judges present. I was there when the statement was made. As I have just said, this law is incomplete, imperfect, and involved. It is difficult, and in some sections impossible, to understand it. But that is not the greatest of its faults.

I said a moment ago that I was opposed to the importation of laws from England, and I will go further and add this, in regard to which I do not think I shall be contradicted·

it is the cardinal function of any government to give good laws to its people. I submit that this law as presented to the people of Canada, and as it stands to-day, is not a good law. When it was submitted by my hon. friend from George Etienne Cartier the late government were very busy doing other things. My hon. friend for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) rose this afternoon and spoke in defence of the law, and I can quite understand his doing so if he assumes a share of the responsibility for it. It was passed practically without any discussion, and although I want to believe my hon. friend for South Wellington when he tells us that it was studied by the government at the time, I greatly doubt it. The government at that time had something else to do. For instance, they were negotiating loans for the Balkan states; they were buying railways; they were building the Canadian Government Merchant Marine. In short, they had other things to do; and this principle of giving the people good legislation was their least consideration. The Bankruptcy Act therefore passed practically without consideration. The late government, having assumed the responsibility for it, must of course defend it. They have adopted the child and naturally it is their duty to defend it and—

Mr. BELAND: And nurse it.

Mr. DENIS (Joliette): Exactly. Now, back to the act itself, I shall be very brief. I believe that it should be limited to traders and that people who are not traders should not be allowed to fail. Reasons have been given on this point, and I will not repeat them. Then the proceedings under the Bankruptcy Act should be held at the place of the domicile of the insolvent. It is absolutely ridiculous, as at present, to allow a man living in Ottawa to go and fail in Toronto, or a man living in Fort William to fail in Ottawa. And this condition of things exists in Quebec; these anomalies have been observed.

A third point: I would object to property which has been given as security being sold to pay the costs of an insolvent estate. In other words, where property has been given as security it should stand as such, and the liquidator or the trustee should not have the right to take the proceeds of secured property to pay the fees of liquidation. Further, I submit that there should be inspectors for each province. There is no question that several trustees have violated the law. Well, hon. members say, go after them; why do you not take action against them? Now, Mr. Speaker, it is not every day that a man is willing to lose his money in an insolvent estate, and then spend more good money taking an action against trustees. In that way, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred the trustee gets away with it. I would also have the number of trustees limited. However, this is a point on which we are not all at one. As to the tariff, I think it is not clear enough. The costs are far too high, too, and the tariff should be so drafted as to avoid such cases as have been cited this afternoon.

There is another point which has not been raised, and it is this. Under the act any trustee can go before a judge and ask for an ex parte ruling. I submit that that is not right or proper. It is absolutely contrary to the laws of procedure and justice that a person interested in a bankruptcy case should go before a judge and obtain such a ruling, because no matter how just and honest the judge may be he knows the facts from one side only when an ex parte case is submitted to him, and in many cases injustice has been done. Moreover, we have seen cases in which the judge having rendered an ex parte ruling, the party who was dissatisfied with it has appeared before another judge and obtained a second ex parte ruling, overruling the first one. I say that the law is fundamentally wrong when it permits a debtor to evade his creditors. Perhaps I might mention on this point something that was said to me not later than three or four weeks ago by a Montreal lawyer. I do not know whether my hon. friend from George Etienne Cartier knows him, but I will not divulge his name. What he told me is worth listening to. Speaking in regard to this law he said: "A few days ago a client came into my office. On entering he requested me to close the door. I did not know what the crime meant. I closed the door. Thereupon my client said, 'Now we are both together I have something very important to say to you. I want to commit insolvency.'" In those few words you have the gist of the situation. Here is a man who wants to "commit" insolvency. Of course, there is something in the proceeding for a great many people. By "committing" insolvency some people think they will benefit themselves to the prejudice of others. No wonder this client wanted the door closed before he asked his lawyer's advice.

Mr. JACOBS: I suppose my hon. friend does not know that that is an old threadbare joke?

Mr. DENIS (Joliette): Well, I met it for the first time three or four weeks ago.

Mr. JACOBS: It did not reach Joliette until then?

Mr. DENIS (Joliette): It is such an apposite case that I thought it well worth mentioning here. Of course, my hon. friend may have heard of similar cases in his practice and that is why my story is so familiar to him.

Now, Mr. Speaker, very strong objections have been raised to this law being made applicable only to such provinces as wish to avail themselves of it. I do not see the strength of these objections. Irrespective of whether or not the parliament of Canada has authority to pass a bankruptcy law—and my hon. friend from Yamaska (Mr. Boucher) quoted the opinion of the Premier of Quebec that this parliament has no such right—irrespective, I say, of this right, why not let every province profit by the adoption of this act if it chooses to do so? But do not force it on the province of Quebec, which does not desire to accept this legislation. If the province of Ontario is satisfied with the law, let the authorities there retain it; the same with the province of British Columbia and with any other province which is satisfied to have this law. But when opinion in the province of Quebec is practically unanimous against this law, which is not suited to the requirements of its people, for the life of me I cannot see why hon. members should insist on forcing it on my province in direct opposition to the strongly expressed wishes of the people there.

Mr. LADNER: Would the hon. gentleman apply the same principle to all the subsections of section 92 of the British North America Act placing certain matters under the jurisdiction of the Dominion government?

Mr. DENIS (Joliette): My hon. friend knows quite well that the question he is asking me is not a fair question. Section 92 of the British North America Act is far too wide for him to expect me to answer his question offhand. But in any event my answer is, no. I do not pretend that everything contained in that section should apply in this case, but for nearly forty years before the Bankruptcy Act of 1919 we got along very well in the province of Quebec without any special bankruptcy law. Indeed prior to that time we had a bankruptcy act but it proved so unsatisfactory in operation that it was eventually repealed. Now the present bankruptcy law does not satisfy a large section of the people of this country. Leaving all technicalities aside, why not let us try to give satisfaction to all the people? I submit that this end can be served by letting those provinces which are satisfied with this law retain it, giving the same liberty of action to other provinces which are dissatisfied to reject this legislation.

This is a very serious question. As the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) stated this afternoon, complaints against the unsatisfactory operation of the act have been received from all the provinces. The hon. member said that these complaints were not against the principle of the law but against the amendments. Therefore I say again that when these complaints are so general, that when the law is so doubtful in its constitutionality, and when in the opinion of the people of Quebec it is bad in principle, why should it be forced on any province?

I have said that in the province of Quebec nearly everybody is against this law. I have before me an article which was published in the Montreal Gazette on the 5th December last. I shall not take up the time of the House by quoting it at length, but, generally, it states that the legislature of the province of Quebec was seized of the question and that the premier and all his cabinet had declared themselves against the Bankruptcy Act.

In my opinion this act should be repealed. But I would not take from my hon. friends any benefit which in their opinion this law confers on them, and, on that account, failing to have it repealed I would have its operation confined to those provinces that desire to retain the benefits which they feel they derive from its provisions. But, conversely, I insist very strongly that this law should not be imposed on a province that does not want it.

Mr. LADNER: Why should the Bank Act be imposed, then?

Mr. DENIS (Joliette): We are satisfied with the Bank Act. Moreover we have no law to replace the Bank Act in the province of Quebec, while for nearly forty years we had in the code of procedure of our province a law which served us very much better than the Bankruptcy Act.

Mr. MORIN: Did the old law provide for voluntary assignment?

Mr. DENIS (Joliette): Under the code of civil procedure there is no voluntary assignment and there is no discharge. I am not going into that subject now. Finally, in the event of this law not being repealed, or not being made voluntary in its application to each province, I would urge very strongly on the government to have the act thoroughly revised—not by the same experts who drafted it originally, but by other authorities on the law and practice of bankruptcy and in col-

laboration and consultation with representatives from all the provinces. I hope some results will accrue from this discussion and that we shall see a stop put to the squandering of the many millions of dollars which has gone on since the enactment of this legislation by those who have taken undue advantage of its provisions.

Sir LOMER GOUIN (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, it will soon be a century since the legislatures of this country started trying to give to the people a satisfactory bankruptcy law, and from what I have heard during the course of this debate, which I have followed with great interest, I am led to believe that we will have to spend the balance of the century in efforts to arrive at the desideratum.

Prior to confederation the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Ontario had at different periods legislated in regard to insolvency. None of these provinces ever passed any bankruptcy act. The province of Prince Edward Island had various statutes about insolvency, and in 1868 it adopted a regular bankruptcy act providing for the discharge of the debtor. The colony of Vancouver Island and the mainland colony of British Columbia always referred to the English law on insolvency and bankruptcy matters until they came into this confederation. It was the old province of Quebec, then Lower Canada, which was the first colony to legislate on bankruptcy. In 1839 it passed an ordinance entitled "An Ordinance concerning Bankrupts and the Administration and Distribution of their Estates." It was administered by commissioners. It applied to traders only. It provided for the discharge of the debtor, and it was based on the English law.

In 1843, under the Union, another bankruptcy act was passed. It repealed the ordinance of 1839. It applied to traders only of the two Canadas, and provided for the discharge of the debtor. Twenty-one years later, in 1864 an insolvency act, which was a bankruptcy act was passed. It applied to the traders of Quebec and applied also to all persons in Ontario. It provided for the discharge of the debtor, and was administered by official trustees.

Under the confederation the first statute passed on that subject was adopted in 1869. That statute repealed the Insolvency Act of 1864. It was a consolidation, an assimilation, of all the insolvency and bankruptcy legislation of the four provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec and Ontario. It repealed all the acts or parts of acts inconsistent with the legislation of 1869. The statute of 1869, as well as the statute of 1864, provided for the discharge of the debtor. In 1875 another bankruptcy act was passed. By that statute the legislation of 1864 and of 1869 were repealed; also the statute of Prince Edward Island of 1896 was repealed. So with the legislation of Vancouver Island of 1862, and with the British Columbia legislation of 1865 which were repealed with all the amendments.

From the very start of the operation of that legislation of 1875, there was an agitation in the whole of this country, an irritation which became so acute that the law had to be repealed in 1880. As you have heard many times to-day, in 1918 the hon. member for George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs) introduced into this House a bankruptcy bill, which was very carefully studied, and distributed to the public after it had been reported from the committee, and we may properly say that this bill of the hon. member for George Etienne Cartier was the genesis of the statute of 1919.

This, Mr. Speaker, is to show and to establish that we have had many experiences in insolvency legislation and bankruptcy matters. This experience of ours, our neighbours have had. They have been working for nearly a century to arrive at the legislation which they have now, and which seems to be accepted by the people of the United States. Their first legislation was passed in 1800. It was repealed in 1803. A second bankruptcy act was adopted in 1841 and repealed two years after, in 1843. Only twenty-three years later, in 1867, a third statute was adopted, which endured until 1878. The law now in force in the United States was adopted in 1898.

This, Mr. Speaker, I repeat, establishes that we have had the same difficulties in Canada that they have had in the United States on this very important question of bankruptcy. But, after listening to the very able speeches which we have heard to-day, at what conclusion can we arrive if not this, that the best we can do would be to amend the statute on bankruptcy which is now on our books? The people of Canada, I repeat, for nearly one hundred years, not only in the western provinces and the eastern provinces but in Quebec as well, have been trying to get a satisfactory bankruptcy law, and as I have told you, it was the province of Quebec which was the first province to legislate on that matter. The social and economic needs of this country, I would say, demand that we should have a uniform law on bankruptcy, and if I am a good judge of public opinion I believe that a

majority of the people of Canada, Quebec included, are in favour of a bankruptcy law provided it is a fair bankruptcy law. If we were to repeal the law that we have to-day, which has been in force since 1920, on account of the abuses which have been cited to this House, then immediately after this session, or within a year anyhow, an agitation would be started in all the provinces of this Dominion to have in Canada bankruptcy legislation, as all the civilized people of the world have it. This same irritation, this same dissatisfaction which we have witnessed, would certainly result in the passing of a new law. But the day must come when in this country we shall have only one law on bankruptcy matters.

The proposition was made to the effect that we might perhaps keep on our statute books the bankruptcy law that we have, but make an exception of the province of Quebec. Is that practical? Is that advisable? Would it be wise? Would it be advantageous to the people of the province of Quebec?

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Would the British North America Act permit that very thing?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I would not like to give an answer on that. Perhaps it may be possible, and perhaps not. At any rate I wish to say that the province of Quebec has in its territory some of the best traders of Canada. We have many important manufactures. We deal not only in the province of Quebec, but we deal all over Canada, and even supposing that we would accept the proposition put before the House, that the province of Quebec should not be under the Bankruptcy law, that law would nevertheless affect the manufacturers, merchants and all the creditors in the province of Quebec in their dealings with merchants, manufacturers and others residing in the other provinces and who might take advantage of the bankruptcy law, and I do not see really, even if we consider only the interests of the population of Quebec, what advantage we could find in accepting such a proposition.

I have listened with great attention to all the arguments brought forward in the course of this debate. I have noticed all the objections offered against the law as we have it to-day, and I must say none of these arguments, none of these objections, appeals strongly enough to me to convince me that we should repeal that law.

Mention was made of the fact that in the province of Quebec there were bills of costs which were extraordinarily high. It is possible the same thing may have happened in some of the other provinces of the Dominions, but it seems to me this is not an objection sufficient to justify the repeal of such an important law. I think it would be easy to find a remedy for such a condition. As to the right or the privilege which has been granted to the farmers in this country to take advantage of the law, even supposing the majority of this House would be disposed to accept this proposition, and to say the farmers should not be allowed to assign, this is not an objection against the principle of the law itself. Speaking for myself, Mr. Speaker, I must say that the moment that we adopt in this country a law of bankruptcy—that is to say, the right of the debtor to assign and the right of the creditor to force the debtor to assign, a law which provides for the administration and the liquidation of the estate of the debtor and provides for the discharge of the debtor under certain conditions—I cannot see very well how we could say, "because you are a merchant, because you are a manufacturer, you will have the advantage of that law, but the farmer will not; the farmer will not have the right to obtain his discharge if he is unhappy, if he has bad debts or is passing through bad times." On that point we are disposed to treat all our citizens alike. It seems to me we should not give any preference or any privilege to any class of our countrymen. We are told that some of the trustees have acted in a fraudulent manner, and that for that reason we should repeal the law of 1920. You have already been told, Mr. Speaker, that it would be very easy to find a method by which a trustee could be punished and placed in a position where it would be impossible for him to repeat the fraud. I have heard with pleasure hon. members who addressed the House and complimented the province of Quebec on the legislation we had regarding assignments. They were right. By experience I know that our law of Quebec gave full satisfaction to our people, and it was approved by all the citizens of Canada who knew of it. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, we could succeed in amending our law of 1920 in such a manner that we would give to it the good character which we find in our Quebec law, and the good provisions which made it so acceptable to our population. I feel confident that the hon. members who spoke against the law of 1920 would be disposed to accept it. For my part the great source of all these troubles in the administration of our bankruptcy law is to be found in the manner in which the trustees are appointed. There are two modes of the administration of the estates of bankrupts. One is by trustees who are officially appointed by the state, responsible to the state and the state responsible for them, and the other

mode is trustees unofficially appointed by the creditors, for the benefit and the advantage of the creditors. Under the law of Quebec as we had it, we had no official trustees. There was no restriction as to the number of those who wished to become trustees. Any citizen in Quebec had the right to act as a trustee. The trustee was chosen and elected by the creditors. If we could arrive at the same system which prevailed in Quebec for so many years, and which proved absolutely acceptable to the people of Quebec and to all the creditors all over Canada, I think we would have found a solution of the troubles we meet to-day. Mr. Speaker, that is the system that they have in England. I read from Duncan, Law and Practice of Bankruptcy in Canada.

> The system under the English act is a compromise between official and unofficial administration. The act provides for official receivers who act under the board of trade. Pending the appointment of a trustee the official receiver is interim receiver of the debtor's estate. He summons and presides at the first meeting of creditors; reports to the creditors any proposal which the debtor may have made with respect to the mode of liquidating his affairs; investigates the conduct of the debtor and takes part in the public examination of the debtor. After thus as it were, getting the bankruptcy proceedings under way the official receiver hands over to a trustee appointed by the creditors.

That is what we have been doing in Quebec for over twenty years, and if we were to adopt that in our act I think, Mr. Speaker, that it would give satisfaction to all the provinces of Canada. It has been suggested that instead of centralizing the administration of the Bankruptcy Act we should decentralize it. If we were to adopt the system they have in England, and that we had in the province of Quebec, we would be carrying out decentralization. The debtors would assign to the prothonotary or at the court house, and this would harmonize with the proposition which is put before the House.

I do not know what the hon. member for Charlevoix-Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) will say in reply. I hope, however, that he will not insist on pressing this proposition to a vote. Even after listening to his very able address, and to all the other speeches which were delivered to-day, it seems to me that very few members would be perpared to take the responsibility of asking for the repeal of the bankruptcy law that we now have. Most of us—I will say every one of us—in this House are agreed as to the necessity of the law being amended. If the hon. member struck out the last part of his resolution and simply asked that the law be amended I am sure the resolution would then pass unanimously. For my part I would be happy to vote in favour of such a resolution as amended. At any rate, after the remarks which have been made during this very interesting debate I may say that the government is disposed to submit to the consideration of the House during the present session some amendments to the act. We will try and make them as complete as possible so that all the provinces of the Dominion will be able to say, after those amendments have been made, that the law on bankruptcy matters is acceptable to them.

Mr. W. G. McQUARRIE (New Westminster): We have all, no doubt, listened with much interest to the speech of the Minister of Justice, and particularly to his resumé of the evolution of the Bankruptcy Act. I must say, however, that I do not feel that I can accept the suggestion which he made to the mover of the resolution, or rather I do not feel that if that hon. gentleman accepted the suggestion of the Minister of Justice I would be prepared to vote for the resolution in its amended form. My reason for taking that stand is, that if the words "or abrogated" were eliminated from the resolution its wording would still be very indefinite. It would then read that the Bankruptcy Act should be amended. That does not mean anything at all. It might mean amended by striking out one word, or it might mean amended by striking out the whole of the act except one word. It seems to me that we should have something more definite from the minister, that we should have some concrete proposition before us for our consideration before we could vote intelligently on any resolution of this kind.

I think the mover of the resolution was quite justified in bringing the matter to the attention of the House. I realize the fact that conditions as to the administration of this act in the province of Quebec cannot be very satisfactory. As to that, of course, I do not know the details other than what have been given here to-day. That same conditions do not obtain in all the other provinces so far as my information goes or, I should say, at least, not in the province of British Columbia so far as I am aware. We have found there that the act is being administered in a fairly satisfactory manner. To the best of my information those who were appointed to act as trustees in British Columbia were men or companies who were responsible parties, and who attempted to carry out the provisions of the act in a fair and reasonable manner. It may be that in the province of Quebec too many trustees have been appointed.

I listened, too, with a good deal of astonishment to the remarks of the hon. member for Chambly and Verchères (Mr. Archambault). Sometimes the hon. gentleman tries to be serious but usually he is quite the reverse, and I was at a loss this afternoon to know whether to take him seriously or otherwise. He made the statement that the appointment of trustees in the province of Quebec had been made through the exercise of political patronage. I asked the hon. gentleman if he knew of one case where an application for appointment as trustee, properly supported by the necessary bond, had been refused and he said, "no", and that he had not made an investigation into that feature at all. But he had a lot of cases that he referred to in other connections, and it seems to me that if there had been such a case the hon. gentleman would have known about it. My information is that appointments were made in all cases where the trustee, or the proposed trustee, would provide a bond for $10,000 to properly administer his duties. I had occasion, I remember, at one time to make inquiries as to what the requirements were to obtain an appointment under the act, and I was told that there was no restriction whatever, absolutely none, but that anyone who applied and put up this bond could be appointed. Well, that principle may be objectionable, and apparently it has worked out in the province of Quebec in such a way, according to hon. members who have spoken, that too many trustees have been appointed. But it is not a case of political patronage at all, there is no political patronage about it, and I was very much surprised to hear the hon. member make the accusation on such a flimsy foundation.

I listened with some interest to the remarks of the hon. member for Joliette (Mr. Denis). I always listen to the hon. gentleman with interest. I feel that invariably he is sincere and in most cases I have found him to be reasonable. The hon. member is always fair in his arguments, is usually rather convincing, and generally has grounds for every proposition that he submits. I was therefore surprised to-day to hear the argument that he advanced against this act. He stated that the act should be repealed because it was draughted along the lines of an English act. He seems to wish to have the House think it was a good and sufficient reason for asking for the repeal of any act, that it was made in England, as it were, or that it was modelled after an English act. That is a very surprising proposition to me. I thought in this country we got most of our good models of law from England; that they were always safe guides for us to use. Indeed, I think both my hon. friend and myself found in our practise of law that the English law is pretty good; that English cases are pretty sound; that English precedents are very reliable, and that when we follow them, we are usually on safe ground. The hon. member departed somewhat from his customary course, and he got lost in the fog, or something of that kind, when he touched upon that subject. I see that he is smiling now; I am sure that he has come to his senses again, and that if he had opportunity to do so, he would withdraw that as a ground of opposition to this particular law.

10 p.m.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Has the hon. member ever heard of the Code Napoleon?

Mr. McQUARRIE: The hon. gentleman sees fit to be facetious again.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: No, I am most serious.

Mr. McQUARRIE: That is hard to tell. My hon. friend, rightly or wrongly has earned the title of comedian of the House.

Mr. BOIVIN: He has a few rivals.

Mr. McQUARRIE: One always expects something funny from him. He has some qualifications which are, perhaps, superior to those of other hon. gentlemen in this House. We have all heard of the great comedian who would stand up before an audience, and the audience would immediately, before he had said anything, burst into a roar of laughter. My hon. friend, possibly, has a qualification such as that, and we are glad to hear him. Everybody enjoys seeing him in the House, and everybody enjoys his little jokes.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Will the hon. member answer my question?

Mr. McQUARRIE: He is very funny I know.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: My hon. friend does not know what the Code Napoleon is. I am glad to know that.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Perhaps my hon. friend would like to hear some more recommendations of himself, but I am afraid I have complimented him enough for one evening. I entirely agree with those hon. gentlemen who have stated their adherence to the policy of uniformity of laws in this Dominion of ours. We must all appreciate the movement which is now on foot, in which you, Mr. Speaker, are playing some part, which is tending to-

wards bringing together the people of Canada for the welfare of this great Dominion. It would be a mistake, particularly as regards such an important matter as this, to have one law in Quebec and another law for the other provinces. Some hon. gentlemen, and particularly the hon. member for Joliette (Mr. Denis), put this query to the House: Why should we in Quebec be forced to take something that we do not want? Of course, that would be a hard question to answer if his facts were correct. After listening to the remarks of the Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin), I am forced to the conclusion that it would be going a little far to say that the people of Quebec, as a whole, are asking for the repeal of this particular enactment. I do not think that can be shown, because, if I remember correctly, the act was originally introduced by a Quebec member, and when it came up during the last parliament and prior to its being passed, there was plenty of time for objection to be made to it. If I remember correctly, the province of Quebec was not as a whole opposed to it in fact, I do not remember that there was any very strenuous opposition from Quebec. But in Quebec, as in other places, there were strong and urgent demands for the passage of such a law. That is as far as my memory goes. I know there were strong demands from other parts of Canada, and those demands were based on the fact that there was so much diversity in the matter of assignments and the winding-up of estates by reason of insolvency, that business concerns which did business in a big way, were unable to tell, with any degree of certainty, exactly what the real conditions were.

I am not going to go over the ground at any length; but I think I am safe in saying that there was on the part of the business people of Canada a very strong demand that there be a uniform bankruptcy law, and this law was passed as a result of that demand. Why should we repeal the law altogether? Why cannot we rather have put up to us in concrete form some amendment or amendments which will meet the difficulties which have been encountered, so that they may be considered, and then I am sure it will be possible, as the Minister of Justice says, to work out an act that will be satisfactory to the province of Quebec? Why should the act be repealed? Personally, I am opposed to its being repealed, and I am also opposed to voting for a resolution which calls for the amendment or the repeal of an act. We should either have certain amendments or the repeal of the act proposed; then either proposition would be open for anyone to vote on, and I would certainly vote against the repeal of the act.

Something has been said about the costs being excessive, and it may be that in some cases the costs have been excessive. But, as I say, that is also a matter that can be remedied. If the costs are too high surely we can put into the act a schedule of costs that would be satisfactory to those who are complaining. But it seems to me that the real objection to the act, so far as the province of Quebec is concerned, is that too many trustees have been appointed, and that these trustees have been endeavouring to get business for themselves, and consequently have created difficulties which have given rise to this agitation. Well, that also is a matter that can be remedied. It would be possible, surely, to revise the list of trustees appointed for the province of Quebec, and more particularly for Montreal, if there are too many there, and reduce the number. To my mind that would meet the situation. I believe that after the courts have had time to interpret the act, after the law has become settled, and after the necessary amendments have been made, we shall find that the act will work smoothly enough and that it will be more satisfactory to have one uniform bankruptcy law for the whole of Canada than that there should exist such a condition as we had prior to the passing of the act.

Mr. H. A. STEWART (Leeds): I wish to speak briefly on the resolution, and in doing so I shall approach the subject from my limited experience of the working of the act in the province of Ontario. I hope, however, that in dealing with it I shall not consider it from a provincial standpoint, but that whatever I may say will have reference to the matter upon the national scale and with a view to the benefit of Canada at large. Now, the resolution makes two attacks on this piece of legislation, and it appears to me that these attacks are somewhat inconsistent. First, it suggests the repeal of the act; and then, as if the mover were not confident as to the advisability of that, it proposes an amendment to it. There is considerable inconsistency in the proposition outlined in the resolution itself. We cannot overemphasize the importance of uniformity in our bankruptcy law in Canada. Our commerce has become very widely extended, and in my own limited experience I have found great difficulty in advising a creditor with respect to his rights when he was carrying on business in all the nine provinces of the Dominion under the old system. In the case

of insolvency in one province, his rights would be governed by the laws of that province, and in another province his rights might be altogether different. The result was that we had nine different rights in the Dominion of Canada, all in connection with one situation, that of insolvency. We have been endeavouring through our Dominion Law Association to bring about uniformity in the laws relating to matters of this kind, and this surely is one in regard to which it is very important that there should be that uniformity which this statute provides. I cannot understand any reason why all classes of the community should not be free to take advantage of the act; I cannot see why the farmer should not be as free to assign and get a discharge as is a trader and do not think that anything has been said in support of that contention that requires any answer. I submit that after listening to the clear, complete and concise review of the situation by the Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin) the answer to the resolution has been provided, and nothing can be added to what he has said. This legislation was not hurriedly introduced; it was preceded by a long campaign of education, and after representations had been made from different parts of the country in favour of a Dominion insolvency law. The act has many advantages. It has the advantage of uniformity, and a creditor knows his rights to be the same in all provinces. It has made a good beginning and has worked well in the province of Ontario. No person contends that it is perfect; it does need some amendment, and the weakness of it is particularly striking in its tendency to centralization. That was pointed out by one of the preceding speakers and a remedy was suggested. If there are any features in the law of the province of Quebec, as it existed prior to this act, that are better than the law we now have, or that are an improvement upon it, then by all means let us have them and embody them in the act. There will be no objection to them on the ground that they come from the province of Quebec, for we wish to make the law as perfect as we can. I am sure that it makes for a common citizenship to have a law of this kind. I am strongly opposed to the repeal of the act, but am in favour of its amendment in every respect that will make it more workable, that will improve it, and that will meet the defects which experience from time to time shows that it possesses. For that reason I am opposed to the resolution in so far as it asks for the repeal of the act, while I am in favour of the suggestion of the Minister of Justice that it be amended.

[Mr. H. A. Stewart.]

Mr. CASGRAIN: Before the debate is concluded I might offer a few remarks. I should not like the resolution to be voted upon without putting before the House this fact, that the resolution is not submitted because the province of Quebec, from which I come, is afraid of any invasion of English law under the new system. But the debate that has occurred to-day must have shown conclusively to every hon. gentleman that there are undoubtedly real defects in the law; and as was pointed out by the hon. member for George Etienne Cartier, the act is nothing but a replica of the English law. We are not afraid of having certain provisions of the laws of other countries embodied in our law, provided that under all circumstances the rights of each and every province of this Dominion be properly safeguarded and protected. And that is why in the remarks I made this afternoon before closing my address I requested the hon. the Minister of Justice to see to it that in all cases the laws of the province of Quebec should be respected, and the rights of the people adequately protected. In view of the clear address of the minister and the sound views he expressed regarding the question of the abrogation of the law, and his opinion as to what should be done under the circumstances, I have no objection to accepting his suggestion. I would therefore move to strike out the last two words of the resolution. So that the motion will not now be to the effect that in the opinion of this House the law as it stands at present should be amended provided, as the Minister of Justice pointed out in the course of his remarks, that it be in such terms as shall be in the best interests of the whole community.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must inform the hon. member that he has no right to amend his own motion without the unanimous consent of the House. As the debate is closed, and no one can move an amendment to the motion, it must be taken as it appears on the order paper. Of course, with the unanimous consent of the House the hon. member may move to amend by deleting the last two words of his motion.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Dropped.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that the hon. member shall have leave to withdraw the said motion?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Motion withdrawn.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS

Mr. C. G. Power (Quebec South) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the Dominion of Canada should give notice of its intention to withdraw from the League of Nations and forthwith take steps to comply with article 1 of the covenant of the League of Nations by promptly freeing itself from all obligations which it may have contracted under said covenant.

Mr. POWER: Dropped.

Motion withdrawn.

CANADA'S PARTICIPATION IN WAR

Mr. C. G. POWER (Quebec South) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, it is expedient to declare that save in the case of actual invasion the Dominion of Canada shall not be committed to participation in any war without the consent of the parliament of Canada.

He said: Mr. Speaker, lest later on in the course of the debate some hon. gentleman may accuse me of political embezzlement and literary plagiarism, I wish at the outset to plead guilty to both charges. The resolution which I have placed on the order paper is taken mutatis mutandis from Article 48 of the constitution of the Irish Free State. This constitution was ratified by the parliament of Great Britain.

The theories advanced and the arguments adduced in support thereof have been placed before the people of this country on numerous occasions by Mr. John S. Ewart, K.C., of Ottawa. Mr. Ewart, in a manner as able as unselfish, has for a number of years devoted himself to the study of Canada's relations to the Empire and to the rest of the world. He has done this without any hope of financial reward or political preferment. His theory has developed into this: That we in Canada at this stage of our national development should be the moulders of our own destiny, undeterred by any consideration of interest or sentiment, except the interest which we have in matters pertaining to our own country and the natural affection which every Canadian should have for the land of his birth or of his adoption.

Some hon. gentlemen may be of opinion that this resolution is somewhat inopportune. Others may be of opinion that it is unnecessary because by the very fact that no moneys can be appropriated without the vote of this parliament, therefore no Canadian troops can be equipped or put in a state to go to war. It is urged that no government unless it had the support of the House of Commons or was assured of such support, could possibly involve Canada in war.

To the first of these objections, I answer that now is the time, if ever, for us to approve or disapprove of the conduct of the present administration during the Near Eastern crisis of last September, that now is the time, not too soon after the actual event for us to be still under the spell of the enthusiasm and of the glamour of the moment and not too far removed for us not to understand perfectly and to judge impartially as to what occurred on that occasion.

My answer to those who might say that this resolution is unnecessary is that as a matter of fact on the last two occasions on which Canadian troops have taken part in war they were mobilized and prepared for embarkation before even our parliament was summoned. I would say further that the resolution does not pretend so much to discuss the actual participation of this country in war as its commitment to participation. I think that perhaps as I proceed with my argument I can place this point more clearly before the House.

There are in this country two great schools of thought: Those who say—as some hon. gentlemen said last September—that at the moment when Great Britain extended to us an invitation to mobilize our troops for the Gallipoli campaign, we should instantly have answered, "Ready! aye ready!" Others who say "It was well that we had a government in power courageous enough to answer to the invitation of the British Prime Minister: 'Let us see what this quarrel is about—what are our interests—how is Canada's honour involved—is her territorial integrity menaced?'"

Now, Sir, I should like for a few moments to discuss the point of view of those who are willing to ask the Dominion to take part in any and every war wherein the British Empire may be engaged. From what I can gather their arguments—and they are not many—may be classified somewhat as follows: First, what I may call the sentimental argument; next, the moral argument; and last the legal or constitutional argument.

The sentimental argument may be summed up somewhat in these words: We must help the Mother Country—blood is thicker than water—we must answer the call of the blood. To this I would reply: In the first place, Britain is not our Mother Country; France is. It was the French explorers, the French missionaries, the French captains who first laid the foundations of civilization in this country, who first developed and christianized it. It was the French explorers who first opened up this country to civilization, and if we have a mother country at all in that sense, it must surely be France. Now I hardly think that any member of this House will venture to assert that we should go to war on any occasion when France is at war.

There is another argument, too, under the same heading, the argument of the call of the blood. Because the greater proportion of the inhabitants of Canada are of British birth or descent it is urged that we should promptly enter into bellicose and belligerent operations as soon as the Mother Country of these individuals becomes involved in war. We might just as well say that the United States should become involved in war when Britain is at war, because I imagine that the greater number of inhabitants of the United States have ties of kindred or business more or less closely connected with people living in the Old Country. But even admitting that this argument is not a good one, I would ask hon. members whether they think it is fundamentally and morally sound for the majority of the inhabitants of this country, simply because they are bound by ties of blood and sympathy to some nation, to insist that their fellow-citizens of some other nationality or of different racial descent should kill or be killed for the sake of whatever sympathy the first nationality may have. In this country there are people of every race and of every nationality. When they become citizens of Canada they are entitled to equal rights, and particularly to that right and privilege of carrying on their affairs in a manner to become as prosperous as possible, and unless we give them security to pursue their peaceful avocations free from the troubles and turmoil of war we have not carried out our contract with them.

Then we have what is called the moral argument, which might be summed up as follows. As Canadians we owe to the British Empire or to Great Britain that we have been protected by the British army and the British navy, and furthermore we owe to Great Britain our constitutional development and the freedom and privileges we enjoy under the British Constitution.

To that first argument I answer this: We have not, as a matter of fact, been protected to any great extent by the British army. On two occasions on which we became involved in war, when the British army fought on our side, the war was none of our choosing. The war of American Independence was certainly not brought on by Canada or by the citizens of Canada. With the war of 1812 we had little or nothing to do, and the least that those who undertook to carry on this war could do was to protect their own base. Canada on both these occasions was the base of supplies for the British army in their attacks against the United States and in their defence against attacks from that country. Furthermore, if British troops have for a long time garrisoned this country, I submit that it was because it suited the convenience of the Imperial authorities and not because it suited our convenience. In that connection may I quote the opinion expressed by the Duke of Newcastle before a select committee of the British House of Commons in 1861. He was asked the following question:

> Since 1854, the time when the arrangement of which you spoke was made, it appears that the force in the North American Colonies has not been in a state of progressive reduction, but rather fluctuating.

His reply was:

> I have already stated in answer to some questions in the early part of my examination that that was done without any communication with the colony, and for Imperial purposes. It was a convenience to us to send those troops there; they were not required by the Colony and beyond the towns and villages in which they were placed, which no doubt derived advantages from the commissariat, I do not think that the colony wished a single man.

Further on in the same inquiry, Earl Grey states that the troops were in Canada, but they were here because they cost very little more than they would at home. I have a number of other quotations on the same subject, but as the hour is growing very late I shall not weary the patience of the House by giving them.

With regard to naval protection, it has been said frequently in this House and outside of it, where would Canada be if it had not been for the protection of the British navy? The same argument applies also to the navy with regard to the war of 1812 and the war of American Independence. With regard to further protection, may I quote further from the evidence given before that same select committee of the British House of Commons? Rear Admiral Erskine states:

> We are at a certain expense in defending Canada; but supposing Canada were incorporated into the United States, would our expense be increased or diminished in time of war?

His reply to this was:

> Your expense must increase, because you must have your territory protected in the event of the Americans committing any aggression upon your trade, which now there is no apprehension of.

The Duke of Newcastle in the same inquiry states:

> Halifax is not kept up for the benefit of Nova Scotia; but rightly or wrongly according to the particular views which men may entertain, it is kept for military purposes; it is still more important as a naval station, inasmuch as by its natural capabilities it is certainly one of the finest, and in all probability the finest harbour in the world.

I go further, and I say that not only has the British navy not protected us, but it has on several occasions intervened to our disad-

vantage. I quote now from Canada and British Wars by John S. Ewart, K.C., Ottawa, who, at page 10, says:

> Observe, next, that, so far from having enjoyed British protection, there have been but two occasions upon which the British navy has gone into action in connection with our (I include Newfoundland) quarrels, and in each case, although we were indubitably in the right, the British fleet acted against us. The first occasion was in connection with the seizure, by the United States cruisers, of our sealing ships on the open ocean. . . . The second occasion was when, in defence of an absurd claim of the French, a squad of British marines destroyed the lobster factories of Newfoundlanders on Newfoundland territory. In both of these cases, not only was it the opinion of the British government that our opponents were undoubtedly wrong, but, in the international arbitration in the one case, and in the British Privy Council in the other, our contention was authoritatively declared to be right.

So we may conclude from these quotations and from our own experience that so far from our being protected by the British army or the British navy, we have in a large measure protected ourselves, and in some instances if we could we would have protected ourselves more strenuously against them.

It is urged also that our constitutional development, the constitutional freedom and rights and privilege that we now enjoy are due in a large measure to what I may call the benevolence of Breat Britain. Let us see what these blessings are.

The first important document in our constitutional history was the Constitution of 1791. That was granted to us shortly after the American Revolution. The reason given for advancing us so far along the path of freedom is somewhat as follows. Lord Grenville in a letter to Lord Dorchester about 1790 asks for his opinion on this question.

> —by what means, the connection and dependence of Canada, on this country may be so preserved and cultivated, as to be rendered most beneficial to Great Britain during its continuance, and most permanent in its duration.

The Colonial Office accompanied these suggestions with the hope,—

> —that they would afford a juster, and more effectual security against the growth of a republican or independent spirit, than any which could be derived from a government more arbitrary in its form or principles.

So that our constitution in 1791 was granted to us, not so much for our benefit as in order to keep us the longer under the more direct control and subjection of the Imperial authority. The next important step in our constitutional development was taken in 1841. I do not think it is necessary for me to dwell at any greater length on that portion of our history. We obtained a constitution in 1841 as a result of the rebellion in 1837. If we were granted certain freedom it was because it was found impossible to govern Canada, a country so far removed from Great Britain, unless certain concessions were made, and before the concesions were made the colonies had broken out into open revolt. The next step in our constitutional history was the proclamation of 1867. I do not think there is any question of doubt whatsoever in the mind of any hon. member but that the motive which swayed the British government in granting us the British North America Act was in order that we would build up, under the auspices of the British gevernment, on the North American continent a country strong enough and big enough and having sufficient strength to resist any encroachment which the republic to the south of us might be able or willing to make on the British naval or military power. May I say further still on this subject that it is true that we obtained freedom and our present free institutions while under the protection of Great Britain, but I submit, Sir, there is no copyright on freedom. We could just as well have obtained that freedom and developed our own free institutions under the protection of any other power, or we could have obtained it even had we been free and independent. We owe every gratitude to the Mother of Parliaments for having so far developed parliamentary institutions, but there was no copyright, as I said before, and no law which prevented us from copying these institutions and applying them to our own circumstances.

To conclude this portion of my remarks, let me make a passing reference to our experience with British diplomacy when we were represented in foreign affairs by the British authorities. Every one in this House is familiar with the fact that after the war of the American revolution we lost a large portion of the territory that rightfully belonged to us and which now makes up a portion of the United States of America. Every one knows of the Hay-Ashburton Treaty by which we lost Maine. Every one knows of our fishery dispute, and every one knows of Sir John Macdonald's report when he was acting with certain British diplomats at Washington. He found they were not so much interested in Canada as they were anxious to get home with a treaty of some kind in their pockets. During the whole course of our empire when we were in early youth and in young manhood, we were protected, firstly—if we were protected at all—in order to suit the interests of the Mother Country, and as soon as it no longer suited their interests we were made the butt of their diplomacy in order to placate

and to please the Americans on every possible occasion. In making these remarks I wish not to be misinterpreted. I do not think there is any one on this side of the House, or on the other side of the House who shares this view with me wishes, for one instant, to decry the British Empire or its achievements. We are proud that we have taken part in some of these achievements. We are willing to admit that probably no empire in the world or no country in the world has done so much for the advancement of the human race, but at the same time we would like it to be clearly understood just what our obligations and what our views on this question are.

Before closing this part of my argument allow me to discuss what might be called the legal and constitutional viewpoint. It is I think fairly well understood that during the whole course of British constitutional history, so far from the colonies being obliged to defend or to help the Mother Country, it was the duty of the dominant partner to extend aid and assistance to the colonies. We have but to contrast the state of affairs which existed on the North American continent during the wars which took place here between England and France to see what the distinction was between the two colonial policies. The French in Canada marched to war at the command of the King. The British in America marched to war, sent their troops to the frontiers, and granted supplies only when the American colonial assemblies voted such supplies. And so a contrast can be made through the whole course of British and colonial history. So much did the colonies have control of their own funds, and of the question of defence, that when it was attempted to tax them, they for purposes purely of their own defence rebelled, and during the course of that rebellion the British House of Commons decreed—

> The King and parliament of Great Britain would not impose any duty, tax, or assessment whatever, payable in any of His Majesty's colonies, provinces and plantations in North America or the West Indies, except only such duties as it might be expedient to impose for the regulation of commerce; the net produce of such duties to be always paid and applied to and for the use of the colony, province or plantation in which the same shall be respectively levied, in such manner as other duties collected by the authority of the respective general courts or general assemblies of such colonies, provinces or plantations were ordinarily paid and applied.

Furthermore it has been stated by the foremost British authorities that the relation of the colonies to the Mother Country was not such that the Mother Country could not call on the colony for aid and assistance. On the contrary the Duke of Newcastle, in the same inquiry which I have already mentioned, states in answer to questions:

> Q. May your opinion be stated in these terms, that the mother country having assumed the government of a colony, takes upon itself all the responsibility of its defence?—A. Certainly.
>
> Q. No responsibility given to a Colony gives it the responsibility of declaring war?—A. Certainly not.
>
> Q. The power, therefore, of declaring war imposes upon the government the responsibility of protecting the Colony from the cost of war?—A. Certainly.

So that even during the time of our colonial status there was no question of doubt in the minds of British statesmen but that we were not under any obligation whatsoever to furnish it assistance.

Now, let us see what happened later on when we developed still more; when we lost the status of a colony and became a self-governing dominion and later on a nation. It was found and it was stated distinctly by our leaders, that the question of the defence of the Empire had now become a matter of treaty obligation and no longer a matter of any kind of obligation. Sir John Macdonald, at the time of the Soudan war, stated in a letter to Sir Charles Tupper, the High Commissioner in London, dated 12th March, 1885, in refusing to furnish a contingent for that war:

> Our men and money would therefore be sacrificed to get Gladstone and Co. out of the hole they have plunged themselves into by their own imbecility. Again the reciprocal aid to be given by the colonies and England should be a matter of treaty, deliberately entered into and settled on a permanent basis.

And then he goes on to say further:

> The spasmodic offers of our Militia Colonels anxious for excitement or notoriety, have roused unreasonable expectations in England and are so far unfortunate. I dare say that a battalion or two of venturous spirits might be enlisted but 7 d. a day will cool most men's warlike ardour.

Again, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, at the time of the despatch of the South African contingent said:

> I claim for Canada this, that in the future Canada shall be at liberty to act or not to act, to interfere or not to interfere, to do just as she pleases, and that she shall reserve to herself the right to judge whether or not there is cause for her to act.

This, Sir, I think is the present state of the case. We are not bound to take part in Britain's wars unless we have some kind of a treaty which would bind us to do so. This was the position last September. We had no treaty at that time. We were under no written obligation or, as I have shown, moral or legal obligation to send an expedition to the Far East, so that the government of this country, in acting as they did, I think acted constitutionally, acted within their rights, acted with perfect justice, and for that reason

deserves the thanks of the House and of the country.

That crisis having been safely passed let us see what shall be our policy for the future. I have said that in my opinion—and if the argument which I have pursued so far is right such is the case, any question of participation in Imperial wars should be a matter of treaty of arrangement. This resolution reads that no such treaty or arrangement be entered into without the consent of the parliament of Canada. In case it should be said that it would be impossible to enter into any such treaty or arrangement without the consent of parliament, allow me to give you an example of a case in which a country became involved in war without the consent of the people, or even the consent of parliament. In making these remarks I do not wish to ascribe any blame of those concerned in Great Britain. To my mind Great Britain entered the last war from the purest of motives, and after she had made every effort to avoid that calamity. She was, it is true, bound by no treaty obligation, but she was obliged to support France owing to a series of arrangements, conversations, and diplomatic interventions which allowed France to hope that in any case in which she should be assailed Britain would promptly come to her assistance. The obligation was, I say so strong that the parliament of great Britain—though it had no knowledge of these conversations or these arrangements—could not without besmirching the national honour, refuse to take part in the war. In 1904 Great Britain and France came to a sort of friendly arrangement whereby these two nations settled their difficulties throughout the world. One of the conditions was that France agreed to give Britain a free hand in Egypt and Britain agreed to give France a free hand in Morocco. In 1905 arose the first Moroccan incident. May I quote here the words of Sir Edward Grey from the Parliamentary Debates, British House of Commons, Volume 65, page 1,181:

> Now I must make this question of obligation clear to the House. I must go back to the first Moroccan crisis of 1906. . . . when a general election was in progress, and ministers were scattered over the country; and—spending three days a week in my constituency and three days at the Foreign Office—was asked the question whether if that crisis developed into war between France and Germany we would give armed support. I said then that I could promise nothing to any foreign power unless it was subsequently to receive the whole-hearted support of public opinion here if the occasion arose. I said, in my opinion, if war was forced upon France then on the question of Morocco—a question which had just been the subject of agreement between this country and France, an agreement exceedingly popular on both sides—that if out of that agreement war was forced on France at that time, in my view public opinion in this country would have rallied to the material support of France.

He says, further on, that the French officials approached him saying: "It is all very well to state that you will support us in the case of war with Germany, but had we not better have some arrangement, some conversations, between the military advisers of both countries in order, if you find yourself bound to take part in this war, that we will be in a position to make reciprocal arrangements?" He says that he agreed to this arrangement. Then he goes on to say:

> As I have told the House, upon that occasion a General Election was in prospect. I had to take the responsibility of doing that without the cabinet. It could not be summoned. An answer had to be given. I consulted Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, the Prime Minister; I consulted, I remember, Lord Haldane, who was then Secretary of State for war, and the present Prime Minister who was then Chancellor of the Exchequer. That was the most I could do, and they authorized that on the distinct understanding that it left the hands of the government free whenever the crisis arose.

Then he states that another Moroccan crisis arose, that of Agadir—

Mr. McMASTER: When was this speech delivered by Sir Edward Grey?

Mr. POWER: On the 3rd of August, 1914. Then, at the time of the Agadir crisis in 1912, he gave a somewhat similar assurance to the French Ambassador. It can clearly be shown by the diplomatic documents relating to the war that at that time, in 1912, conversations and reciprocal arrangements were
11 p.m. entered into between not only the French general staff and the British general staff, but also the Belgium general staff and the British general staff. It is true that at that time the French Ambassador, at the request of Sir Edward Grey, gave him a letter in which this was stated:

> We have agreed that consultation between experts is not and ought not to be regarded as an engagement that commits either government to action in a contingency that has not yet arisen and may never arise.

Other English statesmen, however, took a different view of those engagements from that which Sir Edward Grey took. It will be remembered that, at that time, owing to negotiations which had passed between the British and the French governments, the British fleet retired to the North sea and the French fleet retired to the Mediterranean, leaving the British fleet to undertake the defence of the North sea. Lord Crewe, on August 6, 1914, says:

> The direct effect of that understanding was the weakening of the French maritime defence in the channel and the corresponding weakening of our

maritime defence in the Mediterranean. Your Lordships will see that the result was inevitable, without any formal arrangement between the two powers that one should fill the gap left by the other.

The Marquis of Lansdowne, speaking on the same day, August 6, 1914, states:

I do not think anyone can have failed to be deeply shocked by what I can now describe as the cynical attempt made to bribe this country, and not this country alone, into a disregard both of its treaty obligations and of those other obligations which are not less sacred because they are not embodied in a signed and sealed document. . . . To the other category belong our obligations to France —obligations of honour, which have grown up in consequence of the close intimacy by which the two nations have been united during the last few fateful years.

Bonar Law is of the same opinion in a letter which he wrote to Mr. Asquith, Prime Minister of England, on August 3, 1914. Lloyd George, in defending his policy in August, 1918, four years afterwards, stated that there could be no question of doubt but that an obligation of honour was imposed upon the British Empire to intervene in any war in which Germany should be the aggressor. I have said before that it is possible for obligations of this nature to be entered into without consultation with parliament and without the knowledge and consent of parliament. I have had in my hand a book entitled, How the War Came, by Earl Loreburn, who was from 1905 to 1912 Lord Chancellor, and consequently a member of the British cabinet. I may say that Sir Edward Grey, in the course of his speech, after stating that he had informed Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman and others, states:

The fact that conversations between military and naval experts took place was later on—I think much later on because that crisis passed and the thing ceased to be of importance—but later on it was brought to the knowledge of the cabinet.

This is what Lord Loreburn says:

He does not say when. . . . but one of Sir Edward Grey's then colleagues may be permitted, in view of his statement about withholding the information from the cabinet, to offer certain criticisms. Sir Edward Grey's phraseology rather conveys that his selection of confidants was casual, but Mr. Asquith and Lord Haldane were with himself vice-presidents of the Liberal league, a continuation of the Liberal imperialistic movement which had supported the South African war and opposed Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman on that subject.

He says further:

There was no difficulty whatever in summoning the cabinet during the election to consider so grave a matter. A good many members of the cabinet were in London or within an hour of it, while those whom he consulted were at a distance. And there are railways and post offices in Great Britain. The cabinet met in January, 1906.

And then he goes on further to say that all during 1906 and later he, as a member of the cabinet, was not made acquainted with these conversations which had taken place with the French and Belgian officers. Further, he asked the question—When did the war come, and how did they bring us into it? Speaking with regard to the action of the ministers of the Crown, he says:

The answer to this question, in a single sentence, is that we were brought into the war because Mr. Asquith and Sir Edward Grey and their confidants, by steps some of which are known while others may be unknown, had placed us in such a position toward France, and therefore also toward Russia, that they found they could not refuse to take up arms on her behalf when it came to the issue, though till the end they denied it to parliament, and probably even to themselves.

Mr. McBRIDE: Does the hon. gentleman suggest that England was in honour bound to go and support France when she went to war, and that Canada is not in honour bound to go and support England if she got into difficulties.

Mr. POWER: I suggest that owing to this series of conversations and arrangements that took place between England and France prior to the last war, without there being any written treaties or conventions with the consent of parliament thereto, and without the knowledge of the whole cabinet, Britain found herself so involved that, without loss of honour, she could not stay out of the war. As I proceed further with my argument, my hon. friend will see that it is to avoid any such contingency arising in Canadian politics, that this resolution is being brought down this evening.

Mr. LADNER: May I ask the hon. gentleman a question which is relevant to the present theme of his discussion? Was the government of Canada justified, in August, 1914, at the time Great Britain entered the war, in pledging Canada's active military support to Britain without securing the consent of the parliament of Canada?

Mr. POWER: I am under the impression that owing to some more of those conversations, for instance the interchange of officers between the British general staff and our exchange of officers, and also owing to a certain resolution passed unanimously in this House of Commons in 1909, we were practically pledged to go to war in case the British Empire was forced into war through aggression on the part of Germany. It is to prevent any such contingency in future without the knowledge and full consent of parliament, that this resolution is being introduced.

Before closing that portion of my remarks relating to how Britain entered the war, let me read Lord Loreburn's appreciation of Sir

Edward Grey's speech on the 3rd August, 1914:

> This remarkable speech began with an elaborate effort to prove that the House of Commons was perfectly free to determine either for peace or war. It ended with a passionate declaration that this country would be disgraced if we did not declare war, and the reasoning of the speech proved that Sir Edward Grey had committed himself irretrievably.

As I said before, this is a case where a great nation, the greatest nation on earth, a nation which has amongst its statesmen those who should be most familiar with everything that goes on in international politics, a nation the members of whose House of Commons probably study international politics more than those of any other similar bodies in the world, found that it had restrained its liberty of action in case of an aggressive war on the part of Germany to such an extent that it could not remain out of the war without, as I said before, besmirching the nation's honour. If such a thing can happen with regard to England, how much more so could it happen with regard to this country? Our leaders, much as I admire and respect them, will be, I think, the very first to admit that they have possibly not the training in diplomacy, nor in the knowledge of old-world events, which the members of the British cabinet and the members of the House of Commons of Britain, before 1914, possessed. As I said before, the general aim and object of this resolution is to prevent this country from being placed in a position similar to that which Great Britain was placed in before 1914. The resolution really only gives a more general application to, and elaborates an amendment moved by the right hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) when he was leader of the Opposition, on April 27, 1921, on the occasion of the departure of the present leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) then Prime Minister for Great Britain to attend the Prime Ministers' conference. The original motion stated that it was advisable to take part in the Imperial Conference, and so forth; and the present Prime Minister moved:

> That the House, while recognizing the propriety of Canada being represented at any Imperial conference or conference of the Prime Ministers of the Empire that may be called, desires to record its opinion that at the coming conference no step should be taken in any way involving any change in the relations of Canada to other parts of the Empire; and that, in view of the present financial position of Canada, no action should be taken implying any obligations on the part of Canada to undertake new expenditures for naval or military purposes.

This amendment was defeated by some thirty votes. But may I say now to the right hon. the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) that, though he considered it his duty at the time to ask his supporters to vote down this amendment, he took to heart the injunctions which had been given him, and by his manly stand and his steadfast Canadianism was able to resist the blandishments of the Imperialists and prevent the renewal of the Japanese Treaty. The principles enunciated in that resolution remain, I think, the principles which guide the Liberal party in its foreign and imperial policy to-day. There can be no objection, then, on the part of the government to accepting the more general statement as outlined in the resolution which I have placed on the order paper. There will no doubt be other imperial conferences; there will be other discussions of the question of imperial defence; and our ministers, when discussions relating to these matters arise, might very well be pleased to be able to say to those who approach them that it is useless to converse, useless to negotiate, unnecessary to enter into undertakings because their hands are tied, they are bound by a resolution of the Canadian House of Commons not in any way to commit their country to any participation whatsoever without previously having consulted parliament. This, I submit, would be in the best interests of the ministers themselves; it would make the matter clear for everyone; and it would be following out the adage of which so much was said during the war,—open agreements, open covenants, openly arrived at. I can conceive of the case where it might be necessary for two nations which are combining against the aggression of a third party to keep secret the negotiations and even the result of their combination. It might be that this very combination might be sufficient to urge the third nation into making an attack before the plans of the other two parties were completed. But in this country we need no such precaution; we need have no enemies on this continent; and we have no right to make enemies for ourselves on any other continent. Any arrangements which the representatives of the people of Canada may arrive at should be arrived at in the broad light of day and be freely published, so that every citizen of the Dominion may know just to what he is obliged and under what circumstances he may act in such and such a matter. To sum up, I have tried—

Mr. LADNER: Does the hon. gentleman think, in the event of enemy attacking Great Britain and being victorious, that Canada would be free from the penalties of the loser?

Mr. POWER: I am rather under the impression that we would. It has been said

quite freely that in any case in which Great Britain is at war, whether we want to go to war or not, we would be attacked. I think the hon. gentleman knows, and every hon. gentleman in this House ought to know, that it would not be to the advantage of any single nation on earth to make an enemy of Canada if Canada were not inclined to go into war. Almost any nation on earth would carefully refrain from attacking a country which could put 500,000 of the best fighting troops in the world in the field at practically a moment's notice.

Now, I have tried to show that at the present moment our slate is clean in so far as international or imperial obligations are concerned. I have tried to show also that there is a way of keeping that slate clean. The passing of a resolution such as this is one way that would keep us from undertaking any entangling alliances or engagements. It remains only for me to close my observations by stating that my motives in bringing forward this resolution are not anti-British any more than they are anti-American. They are simply Canadian. I am Canadian, purely and simply, and I place the interests of this country before those of any other country no matter how closely we may be related thereto. A number of hon. gentlemen in this House may have arrived at the same conclusions as I have reached, but by following different paths. With these I have no quarrel, any more than I have any quarrel with those who think I am utterly and absolutely wrong. This is a matter of opinion. The question of our relations to the Empire is, I think, one of the greatest questions now before the people of Canada. It is certainly one question on which we can have a definite line of cleavage, at any rate. At the present time, for instance, with regard to the tariff, we have free traders and protectionists on this side of the House, and we have protectionists and so-called free traders on the other side. And we have private ownership and public ownership advocates sitting cheek by jowl on either side of the House. On almost every single question it is possible to cut clear across party lines. But on this question the time is fast approaching when every citizen of Canada will have to decide whether he is a Canadian first or a Britisher first. And when that question is placed before the people of Canada, without any extraneous circumstances to dim their vision or prejudice their judgment, then I think every member of this House will have to make his choice one way or the other. I think from what I have said to-night the House knows where my choice will lie. It will be said perhaps that the views which I have expressed this evening are selfish and narrow. To their selfishness I plead guilty; I think we should be selfish with regard to our country. We should so take the interest of our country to heart that we have little time or occasion to be worried over the fortunes of any other country.

It will be said too, that my views are narrow. But how can views be narrow which take into consideration the problems of the miner from Nova Scotia, of the farmer from Alberta and of the fisherman from British Columbia? We have national problems great enough to exercise the minds of our ablest statesmen. We have class problems—the problem of the employer, the problem of the worker, the problem of the farmer, the problem of the manufacturer; we have the problems of race antagonism and religious prejudice; we have economic problems—our railways are on our hands and we have to seek some means of developing our national resources. When we have settled, if ever we do settle, these problems, it will be time enough for us to turn our attention to the woes of the Hindu, to the troubles of the Australian sheep-rancher, to the hardships of the tax-burdened Lancashire miner, to the sorrows of the London coster. But until such time as we have either settled definitely or come to some conclusion regarding the settlement of these great national problems which cry aloud for solution, I say our people should devote their attention to their own national affairs, in an endeavour to make this country more prosperous and better to live in, and indeed a country better than any other in all the world.

Mr. d'ANJOU (Rimouski) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, as it is quite late and considering that my hon. friend the member for Quebec South (Mr. Power) has so ably set forth his resolution, I shall but add a few words in support of this very important motion; I shall, however, dwell long enough on the subject in order to express my views clearly on this question of participating in Imperial wars. It affords me much pleasure to second the resolution of the member for Quebec South, and, I sincerely congratulate him for having brought up this debate, thus affording to members the opportunity of stating their views on a question so vital to the interests of Canada. On that score he certainly deserves the thanks of every patriotic person in this country.

Members sitting in this House and having a leaning towards militarism or imperialism can no more parade as drawing room generals, or seriously cast a shadow of doubt on the

motives which have prompted my hon. friend to take this step. This right is denied to them by the reason of his being one of the glorious wounded of the great war. It is because he was an eye-witness to so many horrors that he wants no more war, it is because he has a true knowledge of its frightfulness that he does not wish his country to be dragged into new conflicts without the people's consent, represented by their members in the nation's parliament.

In 1914, the Borden government decided to throw Canada into the most terrible war which history has ever recorded. They were willing to lay waste the country by sacrificing the last man and dollar to save the Empire, and this without having first consulted the Canadian parliament. Such an act was unworthy of responsible government nor was such a procedure truly democratic. It is this arbitrary and despotic way of settling the destinies of Canada by making light of the rights of the Canadian people that we wish to prevent by asking the House to adopt the resolution which my hon. friend has so courageously and eloquently put forth.

In the month of August, 1914, the people of this country awoke one morning to learn with stupefaction, that the Canadian government had cabled to the Imperial authorities that they were ready to lead the country into the most disastrous bankruptcy to save the Empire. What right had the government of that day to pledge Canada to an unlimited participation in the war? What authority did it possess to cause the blood of thousands of Canadians to flow on the Flanders fields and drain the treasury to save the Empire from floundering. It is under a false notion of liberty that the government directing the destines of Canada, in 1914, offered, without thought, to place all the nation's manhood on the battle-fields of old Europe, for England's benefit. It is only after everything had been settled that the government called parliament together to ask it not to decide if yes or no, we should participate in the war, but simply to approve of its line of conduct after having taken upon itself to decide what belonged to parliament alone to decide.

Since it is the people who shed their blood and give up their gold to the god of war, it is but just that it should be the same people that decide if they should or not take part in the wars of the Empire or in any other war outside Canadian territory, except as the present resolution under consideration demands it in case of an actual invasion of Canada.

The Canadian people were highly pleased to hear on different occasions the leader of the present government state that parliament alone would decide in the future if, yes or no, we should participate in foreign wars or the Empire's wars if you wish to put it that way. The whole of Canada sincerely applauded the noble and patriotic action of our prime minister when, during the Turkish entanglement, he answered, in a dignified manner, the British government who asked for contingents to be sent to Turkey: "The parliament of Canada is the sole judge in the matter and alone it will decide of our participation or non participation in foreign wars, either in Turkey or elsewhere." Europe is actually resting on a volcano. France which suffered the most in the last war, was obliged, so as to obtain the payment of reparations, to invade German territory. The society of nations is a huge joke and the sooner we get out of it, the better it will be for Canada. Therefore, it is of the utmost importance that the Canadian people should control their own destinies and have the last word to say, through its representatives in parliament, when the question again presents itself of pledging Canada to participate in the Imperial wars. The people's duty is therefore to choose representatives whose views are well known in regard to the question of participation, and, who are in favour of previously consulting parliament before pledging Canada to new wars to the exclusive benefit of the British Crown.

Mr. CASGRAIN moved the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I know this motion is not debatable, but I do think it is lamentable that a motion of this kind supported by speeches of the character we have heard should now be adjourned and the whole discussion abandoned. I enter my protest.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MACKENZIE KING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is the business tomorrow?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The first item of business will be the Interim Supply, which was referred to at the beginning of the sitting to-day. Then the Minister of Railways and Canals will make a statement on the railways.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the statement be made in supply or before going into supply?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Before supply. I would like to draw the attention of my right hon. friend to the estimates of the Post Office Department. I have received word from the hon. the Postmaster General (Mr. Murphy) that it is hardly probable he will be able to be back in the House till after the middle of May. I have sent to my hon. friend a letter from his physician which would indicate that he has had rather a serious illness, and under the circumstances perhaps my right hon. friend would consent to our going on with the Post Office estimates to-morrow if an opportunity presents itself.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Prime Minister was kind enough to give me the letter, but I am very sorry to say that I have not read it. I intended to do so, but omitted it for the moment. I will read it and let the Prime Minister know to-morrow. After the railway statement to-morrow, which probably will not be followed by large comment at the time, may I ask what estimates will be gone on with in the absence of the Post Office estimates? Immigration?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No. There are some estimates outstanding of the Department of Defence, Public Works and Trade and Commerce, but I think it is possible that if the estimates of the Railway Department are not proceeded with to-morrow we may take up the estimates of the Department of Labour.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 11.45 p.m

Tuesday, March 27, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

VIMY RIDGE MEMORIAL

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honor to inform the House that I have received the following letter from His Excellency, the President of the French Republic.

Le président de la République.

PARIS, le 14 mars 1923.

Monsieur le Président,—J'ai lu avec une vive émotion le compte rendu des débats de la Chambre des communes du Canada, relatifs au don d'un terrain sur le plateau de Vimy que la République française a fait au Dominion du Canada.

Les idées qui y ont été exprimées par tous les orateurs attestent les liens étroits qui unissent la France et le Canada et qui se resserreront chaque jour davantage.

Veuillez agréer, monsieur le Président, l'assurance de ma haute considération,

A. MILLERAND.

Monsieur le Président de la Chambre
des communes du Canada.

[Mr. Meighen.]

[Translation]

The President of the Republic,

PARIS, FRANCE, 14th March, 1923

Mr. Speaker,—I have read with deep emotion the debates of the House of Commons of Canada regarding the gift of a tract of land on the plateau of Vimy tendered by the French Republic to the Dominion of Canada. The ideas expressed by all the speakers bear witness to the close ties of friendship uniting France and Canada which are daily growing stronger.

Kindly accept, Mr. Speaker, the assurance of my highest regard.

A. MILLERAND.

BANKING AND COMMERCE

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax) presented the fourth report of the select standing committee on Banking and Commerce.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax) moved the adoption of the fourth report.

Mr. SPEAKER: Although the motion is not in writing I will put it by unanimous consent of the House.

Motion agreed to.

INTERIM SUPPLY BILL

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, If I can have the unanimous consent of the House for the proceeding, I should like again to draw attention to the desirability of having an interim supply bill. On the assumption that there will be no objection to my doing so I may say that the procedure which I had asked the House to take yesterday was, I am assured, in accord with the established practice of the House. It had been contemplated that we should move concurrence in all the votes already passed in supply and then ask for a vote of one-sixth of the remainder. Hon. gentlemen opposite suggested that the motion for one-sixth should apply to the concurrence as well. As a matter of precedent, I think my own contention was the right one. But I am much more concerned to get the business done than to stand on any ceremony, and therefore I have asked the officials to prepare the resolutions so that they shall apply to one-sixth of the concurrence as well as to one-sixth of the votes. I have discussed this matter with the hon. ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) who concurs in the motion I am now making. If the House is content that I shall take this course, I therefore move that the Speaker leave the chair and the House go into Committee of Supply in order that I may move the first resolution.

Motion agreed to and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

Mr. FIELDING: I beg to move the following resolution:

Resolved, that a sum not exceeding $36,339,861.93, being one-sixth of the amount of each of the several items not yet voted as set forth in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending 31st March, 1924, laid before the House of Commons at the present session of parliament, excluding the amount of the second item of resolution 141, "Ottawa New Departmental Building, $500,000," be granted to His Majesty, on account, for the fiscal year ending March 31st., 1924.

Resolution reported, read the first and second time, and concurred in.

Mr. FIELDING: I beg to move:

That one-sixth of each of the resolutions reported from committee of supply, from the 20th February last to the 23rd March instant, inclusive, forming a total of $8,385,196.32 be now concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

The House in Committee of Ways and Means, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved:

Resolved that towards making good the supply granted to His Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the fiscal year ending March 31st 1924, the sum of $44,725,058.25 be granted out of the consolidated revenue fund of Canada.

Motion agreed to.

Resolution reported and concurred in.

Mr. FIELDING thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 103 for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service for the financial year ending March 31, 1924.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first and second time, considered in committee, read the third time and passed.

REPORT

Annual report of the Dominion Statistician for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1922.—Hon. Mr. Robb.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST READINGS

Bill No. 92 (from the Senate), for the relief of Emily Margery Chrimes.—Mr. McQuarrie.

Bill No. 93 (from the Senate), for the relief of Lyle Johnson.—Mr. Church.

Bill No. 94 (from the Senate), for the relief of Annie Belle Wilson.—Mr. Church.

Bill No. 95 (from the Senate), for the relief of Henry John Burden.—Mr. Ryckman.

Bill No. 96 (from the Senate), for the relief of Ethel Olmstead.—Mr. Rankin.

Bill No. 97 (from the Senate), for the relief of Edward Lewis Britton.—Mr. Arthurs.

Bill No. 98 (from the Senate), for the relief of Ruby Minnie Stallworthy.—Mr. Porter.

Bill No. 99 (from the Senate), for the relief of Christopher Campkin.—Mr. Maybee.

Bill No. 100 (from the Senate), for the relief of Andrew George Suffel.—Mr. Preston.

Bill No. 101 (from the Senate), for the relief of Joseph Ross Wallace.—Mr. Church.

INTERNATIONAL LABOUR CONFERENCE

On the Orders of the Day:

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I wish to refer to a return brought down yesterday by the Minister of Labour. In the first place, I draw his attention to the fact that the return does not comply with his undertaking of the 23rd and his statement of the return yesterday. Obviously it does not contain all the correspondence. It does not contain the first communication to Mr. Pacaud, now of the High Commissioner's office, asking him to represent Canada. That would be an important element of the return, as it contains the instructions. I would point out also that the request which finally resulted in the appointment of Mrs. Carruthers was received, not late, as stated by the minister, but on the 6th of March, the meeting not being held until the 10th of April, and that the communication asking for Mr. Pacaud was not by cable, as stated by the minister, but by letter. It would appear, therefore, that there was plenty of time for another appointment. But I wish to impress upon the minister the fact that the return is obviously incomplete, possibly the most important letter of all not being included.

Hon. JAMES MURDOCK (Minister of Labour): The right hon. gentleman is entirely right. The letter to Mr. Pacaud dated March 6, which was the date on which the agenda of the next meeting of the governing body was received, is regarded as a communication that it would be inadvisable under the circumstances to lay on the Table. I shall be glad, however, to let my right hon friend read it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not know why I should have special privileges. It is a letter giving the position of the government in relation to this convention, and, I presume, giving instructions. Surely that should not come under the category of secret diplomacy.

Mr. MURDOCK: Not at all. It was written by the Minister of Labour expressing the view of the Department of Labour as to

what was desired in such representation as might be undertaken by a properly qualified person at the sessions of the governing body. There is nothing improper in that communication. My right hon. friend can read it, though, and judge for himself.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not suggest, I never thought of suggesting, that there was anything improper; but as it is the view of the Department of Labour, I do not know why it should be secret. However, that is the minister's position.

BRITISH COLUMBIA FISHING LICENSES

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. J. A. CLARK (Burrard) asked leave, under rule 39, to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely, the giving of a pledge in December last by the Department of Marine and Fisheries to the salmon canners of British Columbia respecting the regulations and conditions under which that industry might be conducted during the season of 1923, and the announcement in March 1923 by the same department that such pledge is not to be honoured, with immediate resultant loss to those engaged in such industry, who relied on the sanctity of the pledge so given.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has followed the procedure and the practice with regard to motions of this kind. Under rule 39, subsection 4, the mover hands a written statement of the matter poposed to be discussed to the Speaker, who, if he thinks it in order, reads it out and asks whether the member has the leave of the House to proceed. The motion is certainly drafted as it should be. I must confess that I have a doubt as to the question whether or not the matter is one of urgent public importance. It would certainly be one of importance in the county which I have the honour to represent, the county of Gaspé, and I know it is a matter of importance in British Columbia. Is it a matter of urgent public importance throughout the whole Dominion? Perhaps so. Indeed, I am inclined to believe it may be a matter of urgent public importance, affecting as it does a large industry, prices, and so on. Therefore I would give the hon. member the benefit of the doubt.

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries): May I say a word? I know this motion is not debatable, but I wish to point out that my hon. friend advised me at a quarter past two to-day—I met him on the way to the dining-room—that he was going to bring up this matter this afternoon. I immediately asked for all the documents papers and records, but they have not yet arrived. I would ask my hon. friend to postpone this matter at least until to-morrow.

Mr. CLARK: It is true I met the minister around noon and spoke to him about the matter, but I had tried during the morning to notify him. I left word at his department and told him what I proposed to do. But the fact is this—

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not wish to interrupt the hon. gentleman but I should like to conclude the remarks I was making to the House in support of the stand I intend to take. The matter must be not only of public importance but also of urgency. On the question of urgency, the hon. gentleman states in his motion that the pledge alleged to have been given by the Department of Marine and Fisheries if not honoured would result in immediate loss to those engaged in this industry. Under the circumstances, therefore, I believe that I should favour the broad principle of freedom of speech and let the hon. gentleman air his grievance, if he has one, before the House.

Mr. CLARK: Last summer a Fisheries Commission was appointed to investigate the fisheries of British Columbia. During the time of its investigations the Department of Marine and Fisheries carried on negotiatons with the salmon canners of British Columbia, and in June last the department assured the canners that irrespective of the decision arrived at by the commission no change would be made in the number of licenses issued, other than white and Indian licenses, beyond the 10 per cent reduction laid down by the department. In December last the Fisheries Commission filed its preliminary report, which recommended a 40 per cent reduction of these licenses. The canners thereupon made an inquiry of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe) who sent this telegram to the Salmon Canners' Association:

> No action will be taken on commission's report that will affect next season. Therefore existing regulations and policy including reduction in Oriental licenses decided upon last June will govern industry next year.

That reply was dated December, 22, 1922.

Mr. NEILL: Who signed it?

Mr. CLARK: The deputy minister. On February 28th the Fisheries Commission filed

its report. Early in March the Minister of Marine and Fisheries intimated that he proposed to bring into effect immediately the 40 per cent reduction. Now the salmon canners, relying on the pledges which had been given in June and December last had gone ahead and made very extensive preparations for this year's operations. I think I could probably best indicate to the House the nature of the preparations made by reading the wires which have been sent to the Department of Marine and Fisheries and to myself. The first is a wire to myself dated 8th March:

As canners informed that recommendations of Fisheries Commission for forty per cent reduction Japanese licenses in district two will be made effective at once, I am instructed to earnestly bespeak your assistance to have former decision of department making a reduction of 10 per cent adhered to. Canners have signed contracts for labor and purchased supplies for entire operations during coming season in accordance with decision of department in respect to Oriental licenses previously positively notified them. It is now too late to enact further drastic reductions for this year as whole arrangements will be paralyzed. This matter is of vital importance.

B.C. Salmon Packers Assn.,
W. D. BURDIS, Secretary.

Following that, on 16th March, I received the following wire, which is really a copy of the wire sent to the minister:

Have wired Hon. Lapointe quote the canners fully appreciate the difficulty you experience in modifying the recommendations of the Fisheries Commission and were and are prepared to assist a policy of graduated reduction stated in your decision of last June. They implicity relied that you would not depart from the definite assurance given December 22nd, namely that no action will be taken on commission's report that will affect next season, and contracted for supplies and made customary advances to fishermen which will result in heavy loss if changes now proposed are enforced. The critical condition of the canning industry owing to Siberian competition demands sympathetic consideration on the part of the government instead of aggravating the situation by handicapping the producer with further drastic changes. Packs must necessarily be reduced as impossible to replace so large proportion fishermen in one year with experienced men who are necessary to successfully operate and take care of expensive boats and gear. The canners only ask fair equitable treatment along business lines and rely that sanctity of pledges given by the government shall be honoured and maintained.

The balance of the wire is immaterial on this particular point. Since that time the minister has indicated that he proposes to follow out the recommendations of the Fisheries Commission on this point, and I have received another wire dated March 22 from the Canners' Association reading as follows:

Many thanks for your favour and enclosure from Mr. Lapointe. The canners realize that some of the changes recommended in report of commission will result in wrecking their business, with consequent loss of invested capital. The minister responsible for the protection and furtherance of the industry admits he declared last June and later confirmed in November and December that this year's operations would not be affected by report of commission. Canners relying on that assurance from the responsible minister, contracted expenditures of hundreds of thousands of dollars now jeopardized by this failure to stand by his own positive declaration of a policy. No political exigencies can excuse such weakness on his part or would be tolerated by the local members interested in the welfare of their constituents. Canners only demand recognition of their rights as Canadian producers to the protection of the government and respect for the sanctity of pledges deliberately given by a Canadian minister, both which they are sure you as an officer and a man of honour would uphold and bespeak your courteous assistance to one of the basic sources of prosperity of this province.

B.C. Salmon Canners Association,
W. D. BURDIS, Secretary.

I am not referring at all to the report of the Fisheries Commission. I have not had an opportunity of studying that report. I may or may not agree with everything in that report, but I cannot understand why these solemn pledges have been given unless it was intended that they should be adhered to, and furthermore, I do not understand why the department carried on negotiations with the industry in British Columbia when a Fisheries Commission was sitting for the purpose of considering these matters.

Mr. L. J. LADNER (Vancouver South): I rise as the seconder of the motion. There is no doubt that this matter is one of great importance to British Columbia. I also have had some communications with the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe) regarding this matter. The salmon industry is one of the largest in Canada. It is one in which the co-operation of the proper department of the government is most necessary owing to the serious competition which the industry has to face from the United States, particularly the state of Washington across the line, and as the hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Clark) has mentioned, from Siberia also.

It seems to me, in a word, that the report of this commission, on the merits or demerits of which I do not propose to make any remarks at the present time, is not the question involved here, but the simple question of abiding by the undertaking of responsible members of the government so that business men, laying out their plans for the year—as cannery men must do—and making their expenditures and their arrangements, will be able to do so knowing that the governmental regulations under which they work will be of a kind consistent with the plans which they have formed. There may be some explanation which the minister has to offer; and I would urge upon the government, and upon hon. members, that this matter be dealt with

dispassionately and fairly, and that the great industries of the country be not hampered or handicapped by action of this kind. There is no reason why they should be; there is nothing to be gained by changing an arrangement or undertaking such as that. Even the political aspect of the question is not one that would commend itself to a minister of the Crown under such circumstances. I trust that the government will see its way clear to make such adjustments, conforming to their own original declarations, as will give justice and fair treatment to those interested in the business.

Mr. WILLIAM DUFF (Lunenburg): I am very glad indeed that both the hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Clark) and the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Ladner) have made such short speeches on such an important question as the fisheries of British Columbia. I will, therefore, endeavour to make my own remarks brief although I have been so loaded up with material on this very important matter during the past six months that I am afraid I shall continue talking all the afternoon and all the evening unless somebody pulls my coat tails as a signal for me to sit down. Now, Sir, if I understand the remarks of the hon. member for Burrard he finds no fault with the decision arrived at by the British Columbia Fisheries Commission, which was composed of members representing all the groups in this House.

Mr. CLARK: I reserve my remarks on that point.

Mr. DUFF: We will be very glad if the hon. member at some time in the future, will discuss the report of that commission; speaking for my fellow commissioners and myself we would be very glad indeed to see that report discussed. However, if I followed my hon. friend's remarks correctly, and also those of the hon. member for Vancouver South, there seems to be some difference of opinion as to whether a reduction of 10 per cent, or a reduction of 40 per cent, should be put into force in the case of Japanese licenses—

Mr. CLARK: No, that is wrong.

Mr. DUFF: Just let me finish my sentence—and because the department finally decided to put the 40 per cent reduction into effect, my hon. friends argue that thereby the industry would suffer very seriously. Personally I do not think there is going to be any serious handicap placed on the canneries of British Columbia by reason of the fact that the government has put a 40 per cent reduction into effect.

[Mr. Ladner.]

Mr. LADNER: If my hon. friend seriously intends to discuss the merits of the question he is not doing so. May I direct his attention to the fact that we make no argument with respect to the reduction of the licenses. The point we are emphasizing is the undertaking given by the government, which has nothing whatever to do with the report in question.

Mr. DUFF: What the hon. gentleman says may be quite correct, but if I correctly understood the argument of his colleague and himself they claimed that the government at a certain time decided to make a reduction of 10 per cent, and later reversed that decision and made a reduction of 40 per cent, and their complaint is that the government should have stuck to the 10 per cent reduction because their later action is seriously affecting the canneries of British Columbia.

Mr. LADNER: No, that was not the argument.

Mr. DUFF: That is just exactly what my hon. friends said and nothing else. The whole thing boils itself down to this, if I understood both hon. gentlemen correctly, that due to the fact that the government, or some official in the Department of Marine and Fisheries, sent word to the fishery interests in British Columbia that a reduction of 10 per cent was to be made, and that afterwards another decision was arrived at and a reduction of 40 per cent effected, those interests are going to be seriously handicapped and affected in 1923, with the result that the men who operate the canneries are going to lose a large amount of money during that year. I am not trying to say that these two hon. gentlemen are in favour of a lower reduction in Japanese licenses; I am not arguing that at all. If that is their fear I will put their minds at rest right now. All I want to argue is this: Whether the department did or did not change their policy with regard to the percentage of licenses that should go into effect in 1923, nevertheless the canneries of British Columbia are not going to be seriously handicapped or affected by that policy. Now, what are the circumstances? It is a fact that salmon fishing in British Columbia does not start until some time in June—the 15th, of June if I remember correctly. Consequently even at this late day, although the 40 per cent policy has been adopted now for over a month, the fact remains that the canners have about five months in which to make their arrangements. Now, what arrangements have they to make? One hon. gentleman said they are going to lose hundreds of thousands of dollars.

Mr. CLARK: May I ask the hon. gentleman what he means by saying that the canners have five months in which to make their arrangements?

Mr. DUFF: If the hon. gentleman will take into consideration the time from the date when it was decided by the department to put the 40 per cent reduction into effect it will not be very much less than five months.

Mr. CLARK: But the department decided to put the reduction into effect before they received the report. The report was filed on the 28th February.

Mr. DUFF: There was an interim report which asked the government to decrease the renewal licenses to Japanese by 40 per cent.

Mr. CLARK: That was on the 23rd December and the department gave its pledge that they were not going to consider it.

Mr. DUFF: Quite possibly. I am not arguing that the department did not change their policy, but evidently the members of the British Columbia Fisheries Commission were able to convince them that it was the right and proper thing to do, not only in the interests of the fisheries of British Columbia but in the interests of the people of the province as a whole; and as one of the commissioners I certainly think the department did the right and proper thing when they decided to accept the report of the commission in that regard and reducing Japanese licenses 40 per cent. Now, Sir, the hon. member for Burrard said that the British Columbia canners had signed contracts for labour and material. Well, even if they have done so—

Mr. CLARK: And made advances.

Mr. DUFF: And made advances. To whom? To Japanese. I hope my hon. friends will not press that part of the question. It is quite possible, as he said, that advances are made to fishermen; but the only advances which the canners make at this early date, or at the time my hon friend said they were made in December, is when they go to the Japanese bosses and engage a certain number of Japanese for the next season. Now there is nothing to prevent the canners from getting other fishermen; they have five months in which they can do it. There is absolutely no reason why, if the canners want to employ white fishermen they cannot go and get them. I say it is about time—in British Columbia or anywhere else—that white people should be employed in the fishing business, and the canners ought to go out and get help of that kind.

Mr. LADNER: Does the hon. gentleman seriously contend that it makes one bit of difference, so far as the honour of the government is concerned, whether the moneys were advanced to Japanese, Chinese, Hottentots or anybody else? If relying on the pledge of the government the canners set out on a certain business course and now the government takes the ground from under them and subjects them to a loss of several thousand dollars, what difference does it make to whom the advances are made?

Mr. DUFF: I am glad my hon. friend has set the loss at several thousand dollars. The hon. member for Burrard said the loss would amount to hundreds of thousands of dollars. I am very doubtful whether the canners have advanced any money to the fishermen in British Columbia up to the present date—very doubtful indeed. It is true, of course, that the canners have to make certain arrangements such as buying cans, tin plate, boxes and other supplies for the fisheries; but what difference is it going to make to the canners of British Columbia whether the reduction in Japanese licenses is 10 per cent or 40 per cent as regards the quantity of supplies which they have to buy for the 1923 fisheries? If my hon. friend will read the statistics of the British Columbia fisheries he will see that in certain years when there has been a smaller number employed than in previous years, there has been a larger catch. Therefore, the man engaged in fishing in British Columbia cannot know the quantity of boxes or other supplies he will require from time to time. He has to prepare himself to handle a large quantity of fish, and, consequently, it is impossible for him to argue that because a certain per cent reduction in the number of licenses issued to orientals is taking place the canners are going to be seriously affected in that regard. I do not wish to argue that the department is infallible. It is as liable to make mistakes as other people, and I might say that perhaps the Department of Marine and Fisheries makes more mistakes than some other departments, but that is no reason why it should be condemned in this matter, and I do not think it is a matter of grave public importance to be discussed this afternoon or that the House should be prevented from going into Committee of Supply. This matter might have been discussed when the fishery estimates were before the House. There would have been ample time to discuss it then, and the only reason I can see why it is brought up now is to make political capital against the department and the government. I contend the British Columbia fisheries are

not going to be affected in the least by the fact that the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Ladner) has said that one of the officials of the department sent a telegram in December last to British Columbia saying that the 10 per cent reduction was going into effect. I think I can say truthfully that, perhaps, I have received more correspondence regarding this matter and other matters connected with the British Columbia fisheries before and since our interim and final reports were filed, than any other man in this House. I have received telegrams and letters upholding the views of the commission, thanking the commission for recommending the 40 per cent reduction, not only from the fishermen of British Columbia, not only from citizens of British Columbia, not themselves interested in the fisheries, but also from gentlemen interested in the fisheries. I do not think there is any very great concern in British Columbia about the 40 per cent reduction, or the loss it will entail upon the canners when it goes into effect. In fact I have a telegram from a prominent canner; I just happened to find it a moment ago. The telegram is addressed to me and quotes a telegram sent to the minister part of which is as follows:

4 p.m.

> We urge your department to put in force the recommendation of the Duff report and immediate application of exclusion of Japanese from seine operations or working on same. Any variation from this, such as 40 per cent reduction, will cause endless worry to those who use whites and Indians and will only lead to endless trouble in the future; there is plenty of good white men and Indians for this work and our company have not for years used any Japs on either herring or salmon seines.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Who is that from?

Mr. DUFF: I will give the name if the hon. member wants it, but perhaps the gentleman who wrote it would not want his name mentioned. I will show it to the hon. member, if he wishes to see it. It is from a prominent canner and is addressed to me. He quotes a telegram which he sent to the minister.

Mr. HANSON: I thought it was from the new Minister of Fisheries.

Mr. DUFF: I did not catch that remark. Now, Sir, the hon. member for Vancouver South referred to the fact that the Canadian canners on the Fraser river had to compete with the American fishermen and canners, and for that reason, I understood him to say, he did not think it was right for the department to change their decision. Everybody knows that the Americans do not employ Japanese in their operations on the Fraser river, and consequently his argument falls to the ground.

I do not think it is necessary for me to discuss this matter any further. All I wish to say is that I think the Department of Marine and Fisheries were fully justified in accepting the report of the British Columbia Fisheries Commission. Nobody is going to be hurt in any possible way, so far as we can see. We went into the matter just as fully as it was possible in the four weeks prior to the date upon which we signed our report. Every member of that commission, practically for every day, was discussing what was best to put in our report, and we gave a great deal of time and thought to this matter, and, with the exception of one of the members of the commission who did not quite concur with us in regard to the 40 per cent reduction, we were practically unanimous on all the other phases of the questions discussed. But I say, from my knowledge of the matter, that the canners of British Columbia are not going to be affected. I do not need to discuss the report, but I wish to say that in that report a great many concessions are made to the canners—more than any other commission ever gave them. I do not think the canners will say that I am not favourable to them and that I do not want to see them get a square deal. I think it is practically second nature to me to be interested in the fisheries of this country. From the time, almost, that I drew breath I have been interested, and my people before me, in the fishing business, and from the standpoint of the fish merchant; so that any particular sympathy which I would have would naturally be with the men who have to invest large sums of money in this industry and who sometimes do not get very large returns. Consequently, I say that the commission did not arrive at its decision with a view of doing anything which would be in any way detrimental to the interests of the canners. We had all these representations made to us by the canners. We were told that the department had first thought of making a 10 per cent reduction. They told us their business would be affected by it. We made every possible investigation we could into the matter before we arrived at our decision, and I think hon. members will agree with me that, with the composition of the commission, the decision we arrived at is in the interests of British Columbia, and in the interests not only of the fishermen but of the men who have their money invested in that industry.

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries): It is indeed of some

interest that we should be attacked for having been too harsh towards a certain class of orientals in British Columbia. There is something queer about this question. There are members who want to exclude the orientals, except those whom they employ themselves, or who are employed by their friends. It reminds me of an incident in my early parliamentary career in this House. The House had been seized with the very question of oriental immigration to British Columbia, and gentlemen had been vehement in their denunciations of the government for allowing these people to come into Canada. After four or five speeches along that line I remember one of their cleverest members of the House at that time, the late Mr. Ralph Smith, in a speech he delivered said: "Now, I want to know who among the gentlemen who have just spoken does not employ orientals in his own personal business?" And he added, "Don't all talk at once." Nobody answered. Well, last year we had a very interesting discussion in this House when a similar motion was considered, and a dark picture indeed was painted of the dangers that were menacing British Columbia. My hon. friend who is moving the adjournment this afternoon made a speech himself, and I may be allowed to cite just a few words from it. He said:

> I submit we must take our stand on this question and take it at once. We must be firm; we must be clear and definite in our policy. If we do that we shall be respected; if we do not, we shall be treated contemptuously.

And the hon. member concluded by saying:

> It is a matter for the white race, particularly the Canadian white race, to consider and deal with now before the menace becomes such that our whole country is more seriously threatened than it is to-day. I am in entire agreement with my fellow members from British Columbia, and I sincerely hope that the House will take the matter firmly in hand without delay.

Well, I thought that perhaps I had taken the matter somewhat firmly in hand recently, and I am now faced with the criticism of my hon. friend who says I have violated solemn pledges and should issue more licenses to Japanese in British Columbia. Now, Mr. Speaker, what are the facts of the case? A committee was appointed to study the question of the fisheries in British Columbia. And with the consent of the House, indeed at the unanimous demand of the House, a commission was appointed composed of members of that committee to go and hear witnesses and investigate all matters concerning the British Columbia fisheries and make a report. Members were selected from every side of the House and I may give the list of them. This commission was composed of the member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff), who was chairman, the member for Nanaimo (Mr. Dickie), the member for Hants (Mr. Martell), the member for New Westminster (Mr. McQuarrie), the member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill), and the member for Skeena (Mr. Stork). Four of the members of that commission are representing British Columbia in this House. The commission investigated every matter concerning the fisheries of that province; they heard witnesses in various parts of British Columbia; and while their labours were still uncompleted they sent in an interim report to the department recommending that the number of licenses of all kinds issued to other than white British subjects and Indians in 1923 be 40 per cent less than the number issued in 1922. They stated that they were still considering the subject and that the final report would be filed later on. At that time, in December last, I was away, but I do not want to evade any responsibility; I accept the full responsibility for everything that was done in the department. The officers of the department, however, said that taking into account the fact that the report was only of an interim character and that there was no finality in the finding of the commission at that time, this provision should not apply to the next season. I admit that this was done.

Mr. LADNER: Was it not the deputy who said that?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes; nobody said it was not the deputy. The commission continued its work until the 28th of February, and it filed another report in which I find the following on page 8:

> The commissioners were absolutely unanimous on all points dealt with in their interim recommendations, with the exception of the one dealing with the closing of Fraser river to sockeye fishing for five years. Two of the commissioners differed from the majority, as will appear later, on the question as to how overfishing was to be prevented after the closed period.
>
> The representations that have been made by the various interests concerned in the British Columbia fisheries, as well as the objections raised by certain officials of the department since the publication of the commission's interim report have been carefully considered by the commissioners before the writing of their final report. Our conclusions and recommendations hereinafter set forth have therefore been reached and agreed upon in the full light of the said further recommendations.

On page 13 the recommendation of the committee appears as follows:

> We therefore again recommend and most strongly urge—

And mark, they say previously that it is in the light of the knowledge they had of what had passed between the department and the interests concerned that they make their recommendation.

—that the number of licenses of all kinds, except trolling licenses, issued to other than white British Columbia subjects and Indians in 1923 be 40 per cent less than the number issued in 1922.

Now, one of the members of the commission, my hon. friend from Nanaimo (Mr. Dickie), did not agree with the recommendation in so far as it reduced by 40 per cent the number of licenses to be issued. He wanted the reduction to be only 25 per cent.

Mr. DICKIE: That referred only to the waters of the Skeena and the Naas, for reasons which I gave to the House; it had no reference to the waters below, where the majority of the fishermen are employed.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Except in the area to which my hon. friend refers, I think he was in favour of a reduction by 40 per cent.

Mr. DICKIE: Yes, decidedly so.

Mr. LAPOINTE: But even in the district of which my hon. friend made an exception, recommending a reduction of only 25 per cent, he agreed with all the other commissioners that the reduction should take effect this year for the season of 1923. So that a commission composed of members of this House representing all sides, four of whom represented British Columbia, considered the question, knowing everything that had passed, and recommended and insisted very urgently that this reduction should be made at once.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the minister say that they knew of the government's pledge of December?

Mr. LAPOINTE: They practically say so:

In the full light of the said further representations.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the minister say that they were informed of the government's pledge, or that their report had any relation in the world to that pledge?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I do not know whether they saw the telegram which my hon. friend construes as a pledge. I must draw his attention to the fact that their recommendation was based on an interim report, while the present decision of the department is based on the final report unanimously recommending and insisting that the department make its decision effective this year. And that is why I have issued instructions accordingly. Now, Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to think that anyone will suffer by reason of that decision. Is it to be said that the white fishermen of British Columbia cannot do their work?

Mr. LADNER: Has the minister any reason to doubt the positive assertion of the canners' association?

[Mr. Lapointe.]

Mr. LAPOINTE: I have had representations not only from the canners but from members of the House of Commons and, as well, from members of that commission. And my hon. friend himself speaks violently in this House against the danger of employing Japanese fishermen. My hon. friend and his associates last year said that British Columbia was confronted with the danger of all its fisheries going to the Japanese. Yet directly the very first step is taken by this department to avert the danger by reducing the licenses to Japanese fishermen, I am accused by those hon. gentlemen of having broken faith with the salmon canners of British Columbia.

Mr. LADNER: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member can only speak by leave of the hon. gentleman who has the floor.

Mr. LADNER: I hesitate to rise a second time, but the hon. minister has touched upon an important point. May I ask him if anything which either the hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Ciark) or I stated can give him the slightest excuse—

Mr. LAPOINTE: That is a matter of argument.

Mr. LADNER: —to say that we alluded to the reduction of Japanese licenses or the oriental question at all?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. LAPOINTE: In conclusion, Mr. Speaker I may say that the licenses will not be issued until next month. And here is a letter of which my hon. friend for Vancouver South (Mr. Ladner) received a copy. In answer to my hon. friend for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) I wrote him on March 14th, 1923, as follows:

My dear Mr. Stevens,—I have your note of the 12th inst., with which was enclosed a telegram addressed to you by the B. C. Salmon Packers Association protesting against the proposal of the department to reduce the number of licenses to Japanese fishermen and asking for sympathetic consideration of the same by me.

You will recall that the special fisheries commission appointed to inquire into fishery matters in British Columbia during the past season, submitted an interim report in the month of September last, recommending inter alia the reduction of licenses to fishermen other than whites and Indians by 40 per cent. In view of the intimation by the commission that a fuller and final report would follow at a later period, the officials of the department after having given the matter careful consideration concluded not to make effective the recommendations contained in the interim report for the season 1923. The commission has in the meantime completed its investigations and submitted its final report a few days ago. The commissioners, with Mr. Dickie dissenting, adhere to the recommendations submitted in the interim report to the effect that these licenses should be reduced by 40 per cent. Mr. Dickie,

in a minority report recommends that the reduction should not be more than 25 per cent. The commissioners, however, are unanimous in strongly urging that these reductions should be made effective during the present season.

Having regard to the fact that four members representing constituencies in British Columbia sat on this commission, I have felt that I would not be warranted in ignoring their views and declining to make this recommendation effective. It was accordingly decided that the reductions recommended by the majority report should be put into effect this present season and the necessary instructions to that end have already issued. If, however, it appears to you that the general interests of the fisheries are in any way prejudiced by the decision of the department in this regard, the matter might well receive further consideration by the House of Commons Committee on Marine and Fisheries.

Why do not those gentlemen take advantage of the committee that has been reappointed for this session, and is actually sitting, to discuss this matter? Then should the committee find otherwise than the commission has found, the question will be still open for further consideration.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, if the issue raised by the hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Clark) is not by this time thoroughly obscured, it will not be for lack of will or of skill on the part of the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr Duff) and of the hon. minister (Mr. Lapointe).

Mr. DUFF: Thank you very much.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What has the House discussed? One would think from the speeches heard from the other side that an appeal had been made by hon. gentlemen behind me against the treatment of Japanese in the province of British Columbia, and urging that more Japanese fishermen be employed, even against the report of the Fisheries Commission that has sat on the subject and made recommendations. No hon. gentleman is so dull as to honestly imagine that that is the issue or that it is relevant to the issue in the remotest way.

The report of the Fisheries Commission everyone understands. We have not all read it. There was an interim report last December; a final report on the 28th February. The final report, in so far as respects the question of license reduction, was the same as the interim report, which recommended that there be a reduction of Japanese licenses by 40 per cent, effective this year. As to that there is no dispute in the world, and no one in the House has raised the question that that report is good or is bad; no one on this side is objecting to its terms. Then why do hon. members rise and read extracts from speeches delivered last session urging that the Japanese be excluded? No one recedes from his position in that regard at all.

Now, what is the issue that we are discussing? It is that this government, in response to an inquiry from the British Columbia Salmon Fisheries' Association last December,—an inquiry made by them in order that they might know how to go about their business, making their purchases, making their advances and making their contracts; an inquiry that had to be answered that they might make these preliminary arrangements—gave a definite and unequivocal answer applicable to all this year's business. On the faith of that the British Columbia Salmon Fisheries' Association went to work and made their investments, they hired their men, they made advances to those men, and they made their purchases. After they have thus prepared themselves for their season's work the government comes along in March of this year and says: We will break every pledge we have made to you and will put you back in the position you would have occupied if we had made no pledge to you at all.

Mr. DUFF: If the right hon. gentleman will allow me to correct him? He says that the British Columbia Salmon Canners' Association have hired their men for this season. They could not hire their men until the licenses are issued for this season, and the minister has told us that these licenses will not be issued until next month.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The canners must make their contracts with the men they engage.

Mr. DUFF: They cannot do it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Of course, in all these matters the member for Lunenburg says the canners have made no losses. Then I wonder what they are complaining about.

Mr. DUFF: I do not know.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member knows their business a lot better than they do themselves of course. He is the self-constituted president of the exchequer court of the world.

Mr. DUFF: Mr. Speaker, of course the right hon. leader of the Opposition can talk either about sewer gas or angels' wings and impute to me knowledge concerning those things, but it is not fair on his part to say that I claim all knowledge concerning the business of the British Columbia salmon canners. I did not say any such thing, and I am not going to allow him to make any such implication. It is not worthy of him.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the hon. gentleman will admit that the British Columbia salmon canners ought to know their own business better than he knows it—

Mr. DUFF: They ought to.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Then that ends the argument.

Mr. DUFF: And you might as well sit down, for you do not know anything about it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If I sit down now and the hon. gentleman sticks to his admission, the government will have to recede. Now, the minister tries to make the House believe that it was some conditional expression of view that his department made last December; that there was some expression of opinion by officers of his department that, as this report was merely temporary or interim, they would not feel themselves bound by it, and that in the face of such a conditional expression of view they were quite justified in March of this year in declaring that the final report would be put into effect. Have I misstated in the slightest degree, have I coloured in any way, what the minister said? The minister took good care not to read the undertaking given. This was an undertaking given by his department in response to an inquiry by business men in order that they might know how they should address themselves to the task of making their engagements for this year. If it was not of any importance, why would they have made the inquiry? Did they make it just for the fun of sending the telegram? It was because it was of business consequence to them; surely every hon. member will admit that—unless he wants to sit above and in judgment over them and declare that he knows their business better than they. The answer given to the inquiry by the Deputy Minister of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, sent from Ottawa on December 23, was as follows:

> No action will be taken on commission's report that will affect next season, therefore existing regulations and policy, including reduction in oriental licenses decided upon last June, will govern industry next year.
>
> A. JOHNSTON,
> Deputy Minister.

The minister would lead the House to believe that in the face of that pledge, as direct, as unequivocal, as inescapable a pledge as ever a department gave or ever a man gave, he is free now to tell these people that the regulations will be changed; that there will be not a 10 per cent reduction as fixed for this year, but a 40 per cent reduction, notwithstanding anything they may have done on the faith of that telegram.

Mr. MARTELL: Does my right hon. friend say that is too much?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman is as far from the point as he was at the beginning, and it is hopeless for me to bring him to it.

Mr. MARTELL: That is no answer. Is my right hon. friend afraid of a 40 per cent reduction of Japanese licenses?

Mr. MEIGHEN: If I stand in my place long enough to bring the commissioner himself to an understanding of the argument, I am afraid I shall impose upon the House. All my efforts so far have been in vain so far as he is concerned, but perhaps that is a credit to my efforts after all. Well, having received that pledge from the department, they ask for confirmation. Here is what they get in reply to their wire:

> Your understanding re reduction oriental licenses including trolling correct. Oriental licenses district 2 are to be attached. Reduction to each cannery to be made on number employed this year, preference being given returned soldiers and residents who are bona fide fishermen.
>
> W. A. FOUND.

Mr. Found, I understand, is Superintendent of Fisheries in the department. So that two leading officers in this department—for whose words and whose undertakings the minister takes responsibility now, and rightly so; he places himself in the position of having signed these telegrams himself—give that assurance to these people, on the faith of which they act. They now come to the government and say. You declare to us that you are not going to abide by that promise; you declare you are going to put into effect a forty per cent reduction. Does the question as to the rightness of the forty per cent reduction come in? Is that an issue now? No hon. gentleman, except possibly one, would ever suggest it was. The other parties to the contract come and say: As the result of the pledge you gave us we have invested hundreds of thousands of dollars; if you break that pledge, we are heavy losers. Now, is it the right of this House to judge whether they are losers or not? Is it the right of the government? I ask the hon. Acting Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) or any member of the government this: Suppose he made a contract with a second party and after the second party had solemnly agreed to the undertaking the minister went ahead to carry it out. Suppose he got his operations well under way and the other party came and said: I cannot abide by the contract; I am going to break it here and now—would he think he had the right or the other party had the right to say whether he was damaged or not? Let us

put the government to the test? Will this government undertake to stand liable for the damages to the British Columbia fisheries if they are established before the Exchequer Court? Will the government in this debate undertake to make themselves liable for any damage these men prove they have suffered as the result of the breach of contract by the administration?

Mr. MARTELL: Who said it was a breach of contract?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Let them establish it, if they can, before the Exchequer Court of Canada; and if they do, will this government pay the damages? Unless they are ready to make that undertaking, then all the talk they have given us in this debate is just so much froth.

Mr. MARTELL: What about your own?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. Hon. members must always ask leave of the hon. member who has the floor before interrupting him to put a question. The only interruption provided for in the mass of precedents is sometimes a mild "hear, hear."

Mr. MEIGHEN: In case, Mr. Speaker, there should be any doubt, let me emphasize that your ruling applies even to the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Martell).

Mr. MARTELL: And it doubly applies to the hon. leader of the Opposition.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Let me emphasize before I sit down that this undertaking does not make any reference whatever to any condition; it is that the commission's report will not be followed for 1923, and it states that throughout that year the regulations that applied last year and the reduction that went into effect as of June of last year will apply for this year. Thus those men were authorized to go ahead on the faith of the pledge of the department. All I want to bring home to the House is this: Those are the terms of the undertaking given, an undertaking which is confirmed by the Superintendent of Fisheries of the department.

Mr. MARTELL: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. MEIGHEN: All these things were known to the minister when on the first of March last he told those engaged in the salmon fisheries in British Columbia—

Mr. MARTELL: Will the hon. gentleman—

Mr. MEIGHEN:—that the government did not propose to abide by that undertaking.

Mr. MARTELL: Will the hon. gentleman permit a question?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I will appeal to the Speaker to bring the hon. member for Hants within the range of the courtesies of parliament.

Mr. MARTELL: I wish to ask my right hon. friend a question.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Perhaps there is some reason for special indulgence to the member for Hants at this particular time. Now, the commission, whether or not any member of it had knowledge of the pledge does not matter, was not asked to report as to what the action of the department should be in relation to any special undertaking of the department; it was asked to report what the policy of the department should be in relation to the conditions in the fisheries industry of British Columbia. That was what they had to base their finding on, and that alone. So far as I know, no hon. member on this side had knowledge that such a pledge would be or was given. I do know that no hon. member on this side, not even the member of the commission, had knowledge of that pledge. I know that he would have repudiated it, or rather would have stated that no such pledge should have been given; that the minister had no right to give it during the pendency of the work of the commission. The report of the commission had no relation to any undertaking of the department, and so far as I know, no hon. member on this side had any knowledge at all of that undertaking. Had he had such knowledge; had the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Dickie) or the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. McQuarrie) had knowledge of the undertaking, they would not have been justified in having regard to it in making their report. I have not the slightest doubt that they would have paid no attention to the undertaking in determining their duty in relation to the finding of the commission. They had to make a finding on the facts connected with the fisheries industry, what they believed to be best for the industry in British Columbia, and were it not for this undertaking which the minister should not have given, but which he has given, every one of them would want the report in force, and in force at once. Now it is very easy for us to stand here and say, Oh, these men have not suffered any damage, they can get white men. Everybody knows another man's business usually except that other man himself. We say that aside from pledges no matter whether it is of damage to them

or not, the public interest must be considered, and that in the adoption of a general policy as to fisheries there must be a reduction of Japanese licenses. If they are told that in advance and are told to make their arrangements in advance, then, whatever loss there may be, that loss is certainly not chargeable to us; we have done the best we could to make it the least possible. But when they are told the very opposite in advance, that no reduction will be made beyond what was made last year, and they make all their arrangements and all their engagements accordingly, surely it is hardly the part of dignity or of honesty for this government to say: You do not know what you are talking about; you think you have been damaged, but you have not been; we will be the judges whether you are damaged or not—we who at the very moment are admittedly breaking the pledge we gave.

That is the case, as I understand it, of the hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Clark), and it seems to me that the matter of the honour and the good faith of parliament and of government is surely yet of some consequence in this country. I know it has been seriously tampered with of recent months. Hon. members on all sides of this House know that. Hon. members opposite have had their own newspapers calling it in their ears month after month since their conduct has been disclosed to the people of Canada. But still it is of some importance. How can we establish courts of justice through the country in order to compel individuals each with the other to keep his contract if we set the example of violating contracts ourselves, callously and with impunity? The first duty of government is to hold to every engagement it makes—to uphold the honour of the state. If we fail to do that, we will soon find the effects in disrespect for parliament, disrespect for government, and a general lowering of morale throughout the whole country.

Mr. ALFRED STORK (Skeena): As a member of the fisheries commission I wish to say that I was thoroughly apprised of the notification issued on the 22nd day of December in regard to the proposal to reduce the number of fishing licenses other than to whites and Indians by ten per cent. I did all within my power to have that regulation become non-operative. I was thoroughly convinced that the industry would not suffer if the reduction were made forty per cent.

In connection with the submission of our report, the majority report and the minority report, one thing was sure, that the desire of the whole commission was that the recommendations should become operative for the year 1923. I presume that I have received copies of all telegrams that have been flooding the capital since this controversy commenced, and I notice that one of the forces used in connection with their argument is the condition in which the canning industry finds itself to-day. Each and every telegram claims that they are suffering loss and are liable to suffer tremendous losses by reason of Siberian competition. The canners, I think, find themselves in this position, that for years they have carried on their operations without hindrance from the people of Canada. They have hired whomsoever they would, with the result that the people whom they have employed for a great number of years in their canneries have learned the cannery business and have gone over to Siberia and established themselves in the canning business there, and they are now competitors in the world's markets. That is one complaint which the cannery people of British Columbia make to-day, of the competition of orientals and foreigners, who, I am free to say, learnt their trade in the shops of the canners of British Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to speak at length. If I got this question right, the issue before the House is this: The department made a pronouncement on the 22nd day of December to the effect that a ten per cent reduction would be made. Recently another pronouncement was made that the reduction would be forty per cent. The hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Clark) and the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Ladner) claim that this is a breach of faith and that the further reduction should not come into operation. If I understood the member for Vancouver South correctly, he said that much loss would accrue to the cannery people by reason of the increased reduction. The minister has pointed out that even as yet there have been no licenses issued. We have made an alteration apparently between December and March. But the door is still open, as I understand it; modification can still be made, and I would ask the hon. member for Burrard and the hon. member for Vancouver South to put their sincerity to the test and to move here and now that the regulations be altered so as to revert to the ten per cent reduction or whatever other proportion they may deem proper and right.

Mr. A. W. NEILL (Comox-Alberni): I would like to begin by confirming the statement made by the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) that American canners do not use Japanese in their fishing industry. I

believe they use some in their canneries, the same as is done in Canada, but not in the fishing industry.

One of the members from Vancouver made the remark that the cannery men were liable to suffer heavy loss owing to having made big advances to fishermen, and the hon. member for Lunenburg challenged him to say with whom these contracts were made, and he made the suggestion that these contracts were made with Japanese. The hon. member for Vancouver demanded proof of that fact. I think I am in a position to give him proof. One has only got to look at the patent facts. The restrictions proposed to be made on these licenses deal only with Japanese. There are no restrictions on Indians or whites. Consequently if the cannery man made a contract with an Indian or a white a month or a year in advance, nothing would happen to them. The cannery man could not lose on these fellows because there is no restriction with regard to them as to the number of licenses to be issued. The only restrictions are as to the number to be issued to the Japanese, and it must follow that it is on contracts with Japanese that they are standing to lose. The matter is a small one and I see no reason why the hon. member should have been ashamed to tell the facts that the cannery men fear they are going to lose something on their contracts made in advance with their Japanese friends.

I know the point made by the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) and also by the hon. member for Vancouver South. The point is in part well taken. They claim that the grievance of the cannery men is not the reduction of the Japanese licenses but the failure to carry out a pledge made by someone in the Marine and Fisheries department. I thoroughly understand that is the point to which they wish to confine the debate, but you cannot confine it to that narrow issue because the cannery men's position is clearly set forth in their telegrams and according to what they say the issue cannot be so narrowed down. If the cannery men stood to make money out of this departure from the pledge given by somebody in the Fisheries department do we suppose they would be coming here complaining? This action is taken because of the cannery men's fear that they are going to lose money, and that is why their cause is being championed here. Therefore it is entirely legitimate for us to consider, in reviewing the whole question whether they are or are not going to lose money in consequence of this alleged change of policy on the part of the Fisheries department.

There is another thing that I would like to point out. While the changes have been rung on the terms "10 per cent" and "40 per cent" that is hardly a fair thing. That only applies to one river, and possibly two—the Skeena and the Naas—it does not apply to the other rivers. Now, the regulations suggested by the department were not that the 10 per cent should apply all over British Columbia, and it is quite unfair to use that as a comparison as against 40 per cent. It is done to create the idea that some sudden, violent, drastic change has been carried out by the department in consequence of the report of the Fisheries Commission. That is not so. The scale of reductions suggested by the departmental officials runs from 10 per cent in one case up to as high as 50 per cent in some places; and while I would not suggest that 40 per cent is the average, because it would not be so, still I wish to press the point that it is not a comparison between the 10 and 40 per cent but possibliy, on one or two cases at least, between 50 per cent and 40 per cent. The 40 per cent is probably more than the average but still there are a number of places where it was graded from 10, 15, 25, 40 and 50 per cent.

Now as to the report of the Fisheries Commission, in nearly every instance the cannery men themselves appreciated the fact that the economic situation in British Columbia was so desperate in regard to the white population that they admitted—reluctantly in most cases but they did admit—that a reduction was coming. They, of course, wanted to make the reduction as low as possible, because they think it is profitable to hire Japanese, but they did in nearly every instance, with the exception of one or two—and we heard some 197 witnesses in all—agree that a reduction was coming, so they lent themselves, at least, to some reduction. Now, the great point stressed in the letters and in the telegrams to the department, some of which were read this afternoon, was that the cannery men would be in a hole on account of this restriction; that they would not be able to get white or Indian fishermen to take the place of those restricted. That is the sum and substance of their argument. Well, I would like to ask those gentlemen who are championing their cause so ably this afternoon if they ever made any attempt to get white or Indian fishermen? It is on record—when speaking on the subject of immigration I quoted from a newspaper clipping stating the fact—that 30 or 40 Norwegian fishermen had passed through Winnipeg on their way to Prince Rupert, where the hon. member for

Skeena (Mr. Stork) resides, to engage in the fisheries industry, induced, no doubt, by the expected reduction of Japanese licenses. Now, if there is likely to be any shortage of fishermen as a result of this reduction in Japanese licenses there is a source from which the canners can get men to take their places. Canners will not get very many fishermen by simply sitting in their offices and sending out telegrams.

There is another point to which I would like to draw attention. The importance of this fight, I may say, centres round the Skeena river because it is there where the department's reduction was 10 per cent and 40 per cent was recommended by the commission. We took ample evidence there. We spent a lot of time on the Skeena river which is a most important river—probably the most important river—in British Columbia now in salmon production and the evidence ran—I have not the figures at present, the debate has been brought on so suddenly—but speaking from recollection I think the united Japanese, white and Indian fishermen on that river last year would be in the neighbourhood of 1,100 or 1,080, of which 600 or 700 would be Japanese, or it may be 680. Man after man, of their own accord, swore in the witness box that the fishing would be much better on the Skeena river, if, and had been much better, when, there were only 800 boats on that river. Some of the cannery men themselves pleaded with us to go back to the old system of restricted licenses and only to put 800 boats on. They said it would be much better for the cannery men, and much better for the conservation of the fish. If a reduction of 40 per cent is made on the Skeena river it will only bring the number of fishermen down to something like the former number of 800, even if no extra whites are obtained. If the records are consulted of the number of salmon taken on the Skeena river during the last ten years it will be found that the greatest quantity was caught when the number of boats allowed was only 800. And possibly therefore the cannery men will not be ruined, possibly they will not be bankrupt, if the reduction to 40 per cent is made, because when there were 800 boats at work the fishery enured to the profit of the canneryman. I am not saying that we should not take the word of the cannery men, but if you were to ask me for my candid opinion of their telegrams, as to whether I thought they were entirely accurate, I would say, certainly not. We had evidence given last year before our Fisheries committee of the House where cannery men came and swore what the results would be if certain action were not taken. One gentleman said: My cannery will not run again if you do not do so and so. I made it my business during the tour of the commission last year to inquire whether the cannery of the gentleman who had made this statement was still running and, singular to relate, I found he was still running his canneries in spite of his statement on oath that if we did not do what he wanted us to do he would close up his establishment. I do not say that the cannery men are less credible than any other body of men engaged in promoting their own interest; it is only human nature for a man who is seeking some favour from the government to exaggerate his case to the very limit.

While our interim report was not given to the department, I find, until December, the recommendation was well known in British Columbia before that.

Mr. DUNCAN: How did it become known in British Columbia?

Mr. NEILL: The information leaked out through some official or officials. Before the commission adjourned we had agreed to keep the matter secret until the chairman had presented the report; but the recommendation became known in British Columbia before he got as far as Winnipeg on his way home. Now why did not the cannery men, if they were sensible business men, after hearing of our interim report, wait a little while until they found out what was going to be done? The minister has dealt with what we might refer to as the December pledge, but there is also what I may refer to as the June pledge. The hon. member for Burrard,—and to-day is the first time I heard of it, in almost the first sentence of his speech used these words: "The department in June assured the canners"—in British Columbia of course—"that irrespective of the report of the commission no change would be made." Now we did not meet until the middle or end of August and yet in June those cannery men were assured by somebody in the department that it did not matter what our report was they were perfectly safe, no change would be made. I think that is the most remarkable and the most important statement that has been made here to-day, and an investigation into that is of far greater importance, in the interests of the fishing industry of British Columbia, than the question that is more immediately before us to-day. Who sent that statement, who gave that assurance, and at whose solicitation was it done? This assurance did not come like a bolt from the blue. I submit it is reasonable to say that

the cannery men in British Columbia asked for that assurance before they got it, and if that is so then I submit that there is—what shall I say—a fraternity that bodes no good to the public weal between the cannery men in British Columbia and some officials in this city or elsewhere. I do not know from whom or where the assurance came. It may have come from Ottawa or from elsewhere, but wherever it comes from, it shows there is too great an association between some of the cannery men and government officials. Long before this commission was in existence we had reason to entertain this idea, and we have had reason to entertain the opinion since. If the cannery men of British Columbia feel that they have any grievance, if they feel that they have not been dealt with fairly, they had better seek redress from those who gave them the assurance they had no business to give, which assurance no right thinking government or minister should support. In other words, let them seek redress from their friends who gave them the unjustified assurance.

There is just one other matter I wish to refer to. The Minister has commented on the difference between the attitude of some hon. members from British Columbia when we were discussing last year in a more or less academic way the subject of Asiatic exclusion, always a popular thing to spread oneself on, and to-day when it came to the practical application of those principles. But I can assure the hon. minister that there is a saving element in the members from British Columbia who are truly consistent in the matter, who neither employ nor affiliate themselves with employers of Japanese. We have nothing to do with them, and poor and weak prophets though we may be, we have not bowed the knee to Baal, nor worshipped at the shrine of the Golden Calf.

Mr. W. G. McQUARRIE (New Westminster): As one of the members of the Fisheries Commission, I presume it would be in order for me to make a few remarks. I wish to be as brief as possible, but I would like to put my position fairly before this House.

In so far as the object of the mover of this resolution is concerned, in drawing attention of hon. members to the fact that pledges were given by the department to the canners of British Columbia, and to the fact that those pledges were not redeemed, I would say this. If it is admitted that the pledges were made, I would agree with the mover and seconder of the resolution that this House should express its disapproval of such undertaking being given under the circumtances. I think when a matter of this kind is before a commission, the commission's report should be received before the policy of the department is enunciated. That appears not to have been the case. I think there is something radically wrong somewhere, and I deplore, with the hon. mover and seconder of this resolution, the fact that these undertakings were given. I am not prepared to admit, however, that great hardship is going to be suffered if the recommendations of the British Columbia Fisheries Commission are carried out. I do not believe for one moment that the canners of British Columbia are not going to be able to secure the necessary men to fish during the coming season. I believe that the Japanese who have been displaced, or who will be displaced, will be replaced by white men and by Indians, and there are plenty of them to do the work. I think plenty of experienced men will be available. I do not think that the cannery men are going to be hurt in that respect, but even if it turns out to be the fact that fewer men will be employed during the coming season than might otherwise have been employed if there had been no reduction in Japanese licenses, then I say that it will be a good thing for the fisheries. There is great need for the conservation of our British Columbia fisheries. I have watched this thing going on for a long time, and I have seen a pack on the Fraser river of 990,000 cases of sockeye salmon in 1913. I saw, in a corresponding big year, namely 1921, about 39,000 cases of sockeye salmon packed. There has been a depletion also in other districts. So far as the Fraser river is concerned, we have various causes to refer to, which possibly were not within our control at all; for instance the slide at Hell's Gate, which filled up the Fraser river in such a way that the fish could not get up to spawn that year. Then there is the fishing done by the Americans on Puget Sound. That is in district No. 1. Those causes possibly were beyond our control. But up in district No. 2 we have ourselves to blame if there is any depletion in our salmon fisheries.

5 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Might I ask the hon member not to discuss any matter other than the motion which is before the House. The question of the salmon fisheries in British Columbia is not at issue on this motion. It would form by itself a subject of a special substantive motion. Therefore, I would ask the hon. member not to discuss that matter.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I will endeavour not to wander, in fact I do not think I was wandering, with all due respect. What I was arguing was this: That even if there were not as

many fishermen employed this year in the British Columbia waters, it would be a good thing for the conservation of the fish, and consequently it would be a good thing for those interested in fisheries, the cannery men as well as the others.

Something has been said as to the information which the members of the Fishery Commission had in regard to the pledges made by the department, and I might say, Mr. Speaker, that I saw in the press of British Columbia some time last winter a statement that no changes would be made during the coming year. I will not contend for a moment that I was labouring under any false impression or any misapprehension as to true conditions. I heard that this statement had been made—at least, it was stated in the press that an arrangement of that kind had been arrived at. So that I came down to Ottawa with my eyes open. I am in the same position as the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Stork), and when we discussed our official report we did so with the information that some such statement had been made. But as far as these definite and concrete pledges are concerned, they were not before us.

Now on the other phase of the question, whether there will be this 40 per cent reduction or not, I must say that I stand by the report of the Fisheries Commission. I think the cut is justified, and I think credit is due to the minister for carrying out the recommendations of the Fisheries Commission. As far as I am concerned, ever since I came to this House—and I was in the last parliament—I have hammered away on this question of the number of Japanese employed in the British Columbia fisheries, and I must say that I appreciated the action of the government and of the minister in referring the question of the British Columbia fisheries to the standing committee on Marine and Fisheries, because that committee up to that time, so far as British Columbia fisheries were concerned, had been dead. I say that the minister is entitled to credit for having given his permission to refer the matter of British Columbia fisheries to the standing committee. He is also entitled to credit for having agreed to the appointment of the sub-committee which went out to British Columbia, because if that sub-committee had not gone out there the fishing interests, and particularly the fishermen would not have been able to place their case before this parliament or before the committee. I feel that the minister is entitled to credit for having appointed that commission, and if he is now going to carry out its recommendations he should also be given credit for that. The British Columbia Fisheries Commission gave everyone an opportunity to be heard. We went into all the different districts and gave every interest a fair chance. Some of the interests that were concerned did not avail themselves of that opportunity; they were inclined to pooh-pooh the commission altogether. Well, that is their fault, not ours, because as I have said everyone was given the fullest opportunity to be heard. Nobody was prevented from giving his evidence; and I will say for the chairman of the commission and the other members of it who are not of the same party as myself, that they carried out their duties in a conscientious manner and treated everyone fairly. So far as I can see they used their best judgment in coming to their conclusions, and I agree with them in the report that they have submitted, except in one particular which has been referred to. I do not wish for a moment to be placed in the position of backing up any misstatement or misrepresentation which has been made, but I do say that I stand by the report of the Fisheries Commission and am of the opinion that it should be carried out. We should make the 40 per cent cut this year, and I do not believe that the canners or anyone else will be harmed thereby. I am firmly convinced that if we make this cut and stick to it, and make other reductions later on as conditions warrant, we shall get the fisheries back into the control of the white men and Indians as it should be. That would be better for British Columbia, I am sure, and better for the whole of Canada.

Mr. L. H. MARTELL (Hants): As one of the members who happen to have been honoured by appointment to the Fisheries Commission, I agree with a great deal of what has been said this afternoon. I do not, however, agree with the right hon. the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen), who endeavoured to take an unfair advantage of the fact that he had the floor. I do not presume to be a modern Pythagoras, like the leader of the Opposition, who sets up a premise of his own devising, the fruit of his own imagination, and arrives at a conclusion altogether irrespective of whether that conclusion is justified by logic or not. So far as the forty per cent reduction in Japanese licenses is concerned, I may say that during the time the commission sat in British Columbia I was probably one of the most strenuous opponents to oriental fishermen being permitted to engage in Canadian fisheries. After hearing all the evidence, however, I concluded that I was possibly too harsh in the judgment which I had previously arrived at, and when we came

to draw up our conclusions, with a view to unanimity the reduction was placed at forty per cent, although I may remark—and I do not think it is unprofessional to do so—that there were members of the commission who wished at one fell stroke to make the reduction 100 per cent. While I did not sign a minority report I was almost compelled to come to the decision that was reached by the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Dickie) that in view of the lateness of the season we were probably taking the canners unaware. The canners, however, were and are well organized and they are in a fit position to look after themselves. In the light of all the evidence that subsequently came before the commission I concluded, therefore, that I could best serve the interests of the country and of the fisheries by agreeing with the majority, who decided that it was time to have a reduction of forty per cent.

I do not believe that I am giving away any secret of the commission when I say that the idea of the majority was not only a reduction of forty per cent but that there should be such a forty per cent reduction at the outset, and a sufficient reduction from year to year looking to the total exclusion of Asiatics from the British Columbia fisheries within a period of five years. So that I think the British Columbia canners have reason to congratulate themselves that they are not faced to-day with a recommendation calling for a one hundred per cent reduction instanter instead of a gradual reduction with a view to the total exclusion of Asiatics from these fisheries within five years. As the report now stands, all that the commission has recommended is a reduction of forty per cent for this year. We are now functus officio so to speak; and our duties have been discharged. Had we recommended to the minister what was in the mind of the majority of the commissioners at the time of the drafting of the interim report we should now be contemplating the total exclusion of Asiatics at once or within five years. I repeat, therefore, that those British Columbia canners who employ Asiatics should congratulate themselves on the fact that they have not to contend with the extreme of what was in the mind of the commission at the time of the making of the report.

Something has been said about what some of the departmental officials stated to the British Columbia trade during the time that the commission was functioning. I have no brief whatever for the departmental officials, but I believe that they were actuated by sincere motives. We may not all agree that the Department of Marine and Fisheries is perfectly administered; but the acme of efficiency is not to be found in any branch of the service, any more than it is to be found in any department of the business world. I believe, however, that the Department of Marine and Fisheries were actuated by the very best of motives. At the time when this letter, which has been read, was given to the people we had put in an interim report. The department had no knowledge of the time when the final report would be received. There was no definitely stated time as to when we would submit that report. True enough, if we had put the country to the expense of calling the members of the commission from British Columbia and from the Maritime provinces to meet in solemn conclave in the city of Ottawa to consider the matter and then make a report, the department would have been in a position to give definite information to the trade in British Columbia as to what they could expect for the present year. But it was not deemed advisable that the commissioners should all come together in Ottawa prior to a session of parliament. Therefore a letter was written to the British Columbia canners informing them that so far as could be foreseen nothing definite would be done for the year 1923. However, pursuant to the promise made by the right hon. the leader of the government (Mr. Mackenzie King), parliament met towards the close of January of this year and the commissioners had an opportunity of coming together. They considered the evidence they had received in British Columbia, together with various matters that had been presented by the canners and others from that province in the way of telegrams, letters and memoranda. However in the light of the evidence adduced and our visit to the locus in quo we came to the conclusion that it would be in the best interests of the country that a forty per cent reduction should be made this year, and we notified the minister accordingly. After a conference with his officials and taking all the circumstances into consideration, undoubtedly the minister concluded that this reduction should be carried out this season.

To my mind the canners of British Columbia have not been in any way handicapped by the action taken. A canner must estimate what his pack is going to be for the next year so that he may be in a position to buy his tin for his containers and all his other supplies. As a result of this forty per cent reduction of licenses to Japanese fishermen he is not restrained from getting the catch that he estimated, because he has the opportunity of employing whites and Indians to make up the

deficiency. Therefore the putting into effect of this forty per cent reduction will not prevent the British Columbia canner from getting his estimated amount of fish. It is interesting to observe that on the basis of the amount of fish the Japanese caught last year the reduction of their licenses by forty per cent will not affect the estimated amount of any canner's business by more than ten per cent and, as I have already said, he can make up this difference by employing whites and Indians, and the consequence will be no loss to the canner and the encouragement of white fishermen.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not leading the government. I have been termed a radical and everything else imaginable almost, but this I know and know full well that I am a Canadian animated with the desire to see justice done to my fellow Canadians. I do not admit that I entertain all the varied views imputed to me, but I do claim to know one or two things about the fisheries in which my forebears were engaged at the place of my birth, and from my experience as an official of the Department of Marine and Fisheries for years—I believe some weeks of which were under you, Mr. Speaker—I truly claim to know at least something about the fisheries and the administration thereof in this country. On the strength of that knowledge I say, in all fairness to my colleagues who were engaged with me in the department, in all fairness to the white fishermen of this country, and in all fairness to the excellent man who is now Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe), that they have done what is right. I do not believe there is a Canadian citizen from Cape Breton to Vancouver Island who will condemn either the report of the fisheries commission or the action of the minister in putting its recommendations into effect. Therefore, before attempting to take any advantage, political or otherwise, from the report—which I believe is in the best interests of this country—any hon. member who stands up in this House and makes allegations should be seized of the facts before doing so, and not make vainglorious declamations against the action of the minister when these allegations are based upon a vivid imagination and ignorance of conditions.

My right hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen), who is not in his seat at the moment, took advantage of the fact that he had the floor and would not permit me to ask him a certain question, for undoubtedly he showed up his pretensions and instead of giving a pertinent answer, seized the opportunity to indulge in some characteristic insinuations. If he were in his place, I would tell him that though he possesses the title of "right honourable," and I am simply a humble hon. member, I would be glad to meet him on any platform or in any forum to discuss the rights of the fishermen of this country.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries has done right in putting into effect what the people have demanded. My hon. friends from British Columbia on both sides of the House stood in their places last year and voted for Asiatic exclusion. My colleagues and I got along most amicably together on the fisheries commission. To this commission I submit must be accorded the credit of having recommended to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and the hon. minister must be credited therewith, the first practical step that has ever been taken by the government of Canada to make British Columbia a white country—something which the people have been fighting for for many years. Consequently when the right hon. leader of the Opposition stands in his place and tries to appease the British Columbia canners by attacking the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries for endeavouring to make that province a white country by putting into effect practical fisheries' regulations—regulations that will not only make the province a better country for the white man but a better country for good fishermen to live in, I say he is doing something which is not consistent either with the best interests of British Columbia or of the Dominion generally.

Hon. J. H. KING (Kootenay) (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I am satisfied that if my hon. friend for Burrard (Mr. Clark) and his seconder, the hon. member for South Vancouver (Mr. Ladner) had realized where this discussion would lead them they would not have precipitated it this afternoon. Personally, and as a representative from the province of British Columbia, I rather regret the course that has been followed by them, for the simple reason that I believe it is the desire of the members from my province to show a united front in regard to orientals. However, I am not going to discuss that phase of the matter.

During the discussion some fairly thin ice has been crossed. The right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) stated that if the fisheries commission which was appointed to examine into the question under discussion, and who made a careful and exhaustive study of conditions last summer in the various ports of British Columbia, had known that these instructions had gone out in December from the Fisheries department they would not have

brought in the recommendations which they later rendered. My hon. friend from New Westminster (Mr. McQuarrie), a member of that commission, stated that it was only known to him through the press or through channels of gossip or conversation that such instructions had gone out. Now, Sir, in order that there may be no misunderstanding in the minds of hon. members in regard to the knowledge that the commissioners had, I would read a short letter dated December 23rd, 1922. It is as follows:

> Dear Mr. McQuarrie,—In view of the fact that the final report of the British Columbia Fisheries Commission, of which you are a member, will not be submitted until after the House meets, and as it is embarrassing to the whole industry to have frequent changes in the regulations and policy governing it, it has been deemed best to await the final report of the commission before reaching decisions on the recommendations contained in the interim report.
>
> Hence those engaging in the industry have been advised that no action will be taken on the report that will affect the season of 1923. This does not involve that there will be no reduction in the number of fishery licenses that will be available to naturalized orientals. The reduction of such licenses that was decided upon last June, before the appointment of the commission, will be effective so far as next year is concerned.

This letter signed by the Acting Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Bureau) was sent to each and every member of the commission, so the commissioners in drawing their final report had knowledge of the action of the department at that date.

Now, what did the commissioners do in the face of that knowledge? In their final report to the minister they say:

> The representations that have been made by the various interests concerned in the British Columbia fisheries, as well as the objections raised by certain officials of the department since the publication of the commission's interim report have been carefully considered by the commissioners before the writing of their final report. Our conclusions and recommendations as hereinafter set forth have therefore been reached and agreed upon in the full light of the said further representations.

So we have this position—and it has not been fairly represented to-day—that the commission which spent last summer investigating this problem in order that we might reach proper conclusions upon it, the fishing interests, were advised that the regulations would continue with the reduction as proposed last June, over 1923, and the commission, in the face of that, recommended to the minister that their report, involving a forty per cent reduction, should be carried out. That change in policy took place in February of this year, some three or four months before the opening of the fishing season. I do not believe there is sound ground for the complaint that is made here to-day. I do not believe this is an urgent matter or one that requires such a debate as we have had here this afternoon.

Mr. GEORGE BLACK (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, I think it must be apparent to the House that the minister has made no satisfactory explanation of his course in blowing hot and cold in this matter. No sufficient reason has been given for breaking what to all intents and purposes was understood by the canners of British Columbia as a pledge. The government's action was not businesslike; it was unfair to the canners. My conclusion is that the minister, or his department, for which he must take responsibility, was too hasty in sending out that first telegram, for which there was no necessity; too hasty in making that pledge by wire. A promise, or what can fairly be considered as a promise, was made; it could not be kept—at any rate, the government determined that it should not be kept, with the consequence that somebody has been injured. Well, that often happens, and the government must take the consequences and pay the damages if there are damages. For myself I have not much sympathy with people who make losses through the employment of orientals. I think it is better to let them take the consequences; they will probably be less likely to employ orientals in the future and will have less to do with them. I do think that the canners might very well have been put on their guard by the wording of that telegram, which was to the effect that irrespective of the findings of the commission there would be no changes in the regulations. That should have been a warning to them that the report of the commission might have the effect of bringing about a change in the regulations. It is true that the action of the minister brings about a result that is most desirable I say, to the great majority of the people of British Columbia, namely, a reduction of the employment of orientals in the industry in that province, and I am sure that no one would be more pleased with that result than the hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Clark) and the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Ladner). No one would be better pleased with that result than they, and I am sure they can congratulate themselves on the effort made by them at the last session, and particularly by the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. McQuarrie) in impressing upon this House and the government the need for action to curb oriental immigration into British Columbia. They can, I say, very well congratulate themselves upon the fact that their efforts have met with some success. But on the other hand I think that the minister

should acknowledge the mistake—that is, the mistake of the department—and not attempt to take refuge behind the popularity of the anti-oriental movement with the idea of covering up his mistake, because that quite evidently is the object of the attempt put forth by him and his supporters here to-day. But, as the right hon. leader of the Opposition, (Mr. Meighen) has said, no member is so dull as to be misled by this old device of drawing a herring across the trail; even though we are talking about fish, no one is to be diverted by that from the point raised by this resolution. The point is that what the canners understood as a pledge was given by the minister, and for reasons which are perhaps well grounded he has seen fit not to carry out that pledge but has rather made a much more material reduction in the number of Japanese licenses. That is the point under discussion in connection with this resolution, not the question whether Japanese licenses should be reduced or abolished. For my part I support any administration that takes action to meet the oriental menace, which is in fact a real one. But as I say, no one should be misled by the putting forward of the anti-oriental question with the view of covering up the mistake made by the government in this instance.

Motion withdrawn.

CODE NAPOLEON

STATEMENT BY MR. ARCHAMBAULT

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. JOSEPH ARCHAMBAULT (Chambly-Verchères): Mr. Speaker, referring to Hansard of yesterday, during the discussion on the Bankruptcy Act, I find that the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. McQuarrie) said, as reported at page 1,587.

> I thought in this country we got most of our good models of law from England; that they were always safe guides for us to use. Indeed, I think both my hon. friend and myself found in our practise of law that the English law is pretty good; that English cases are pretty sound; that English precedents are very reliable, and that when we follow them, we are usually on safe ground. . . .
>
> Mr. Archambault: Has the hon. member ever heard of the Code Napoleon?
>
> Mr. McQuarrie: The hon. gentleman sees fit to be facetious again.
>
> Mr. Archambault: No, I am most serious. . . . Will the hon. member answer my question?
>
> Mr. McQuarrie: He is very funny I know.
>
> Mr. Archambault: My hon. friend does not know what the Code Napoleon is. I am glad to know that.

I fear, Mr. Speaker, I did a great injustice to the hon. member. I wish to apologize to him, because at the time I put my question I was under the impression that the hon. member was a lawyer.

[Mr. Geo. Black.]

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

ANNUAL STATEMENT BY THE ACTING MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Acting Minister of Railways and Canals): Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair I would like to ask the indulgence of the House while I present the statement annually made concerning the railway situation as it affects the government-owned lines. The subject will be very dry—nearly as dry as sock-eye salmon on land—but I wish to place this mass of figures on Hansard so that hon. members may have the opportunity of reading the statement and coming to their own conclusions.

As is generally known, the audit of the railway accounts is continuous and has been practically completed, with the exception of the signing of the balance sheet, which is expected to be reached in the course of a few days. The figures to which I am about to refer may therefore be regarded as final.

I shall have to ask the House to bear with me while I stick very closely to the documents before me. I would scarcely call this statement a speech, but rather a rehearsal of the figures showing the condition of the Canadian National Railways System.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): For what fiscal year?

Mr. GRAHAM: For the year ending December 31, 1922. In referring to the Canadian National Railways, members of the House will bear in mind that up till October last the entities that made up the system managed by the Canadian Northern board were designated the Canadian National Railways. I shall deal with this system first and then with the Grand Trunk.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is the minister not wrong in the date? Was it not up to January of this year?

Mr. GRAHAM: No. I shall have to explain again as my hon. friend again was out.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It was up to January 31 of this year.

Mr. GRAHAM: The statement is up to December 31 of last year. I was referring to the birth of the Canadian National Railways by bringing into force the act of 1919 under which that company was created. First, I will give the operated mileage of the lines

that now constitute the Canadian National railway system (all lines):

Canadian National Railways

Operated mileage—December 31st, 1922

Canadian Government Railways—		
Intercolonial Railway (including Branch Lines)	2,283.44	
National Transcontinental Railway Eastern Lines	1,415.74	
National Transcontinental Railway Western Lines (including Lake Superior Branch)	582.14	
St. John & Quebec Railway	171.80	
Hudson Bay Railway	214.00	
		4,667.12
Canadian Northern Railway System—		
Canadian Northern Railway Eastern Lines (Including Halifax & South West Ry)	2,892.28	
Canadian Northern Railway Western Lines, (Including Duluth, Winnipeg & Pacific Ry)	6,976.38	
Niagara, St. Catharines & Toronto Ry. & Toronto Suburban Ry. (Electric Lines)	126.13	
		9,994.79
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway	2,710.50	
		2,710.50
Grand Trunk Railway System—		
Grand Trunk Railway Canadian Lines	3,611.87	
Grand Trunk Railway Western Lines	991.69	
Grand Trunk Railway New England Lines	172.21	
	4,775.77	
Central Vermont Railway	532.50	
		5,308.27
		22,680.68

Average Mileage Operated

Canadian National Railways	17,351.43	
Grand Trunk Railway System (Including Central Vermont Rly.)	5,314.08	
		22,665.51

As I pointed out a moment ago, I propose first to deal with what was known as the Canadian National railway system prior to October last.

General Conditions throughout 1922

Before dealing with the income account, Canadian National Railways, a word or two concerning conditions and circumstances affecting 1922 operations might not be amiss. The gross earnings for 1922 decreased by $6,866,509.93. Freight, passenger and express earnings were all less than in 1921. The decrease in passenger traffic is a disappointment in view of the improved quality of service provided, and also in view of the fact that the rate for passenger travel in Canada is, generally speaking, slightly below the prevailing rates in the United States. A good year was expected, and provided for, but the traffic did not materialize.

While the tonnage of freight carried was slightly higher, and the average haul and train loading improved, the freight earnings fell off to the extent of $3,901,611.86, and the average rate per ton per mile—ton-mile rate—fell from 1.041 cents in 1921 to .889 cent in 1922, a decrease of 14.6 per cent.

It so happened that the improvement in traffic was largely confined to the final half of the year when reduced rates were in effect. I am offering no opinion as to whether the improvement in traffic was due to the reduction in rates or to a good crop and consequent general improvement in business, but this much can be said: that on account of its widespread mileage in the nine provinces, the traffic movement of the Canadian National Railways is a reliable indication of the state of trade in the country as a whole.

System car loading improved in the early months of the year, and appreciably so from towards the end of April, when, until the crop commenced to move, a daily loading of from two to three hundred cars more than the previous year was maintained. During the crop movement the improvement averaged a thousand cars a day. The all-rail movement of grain, which commenced in October, three months earlier than usual, contributed to the density of freight traffic on eastern lines. It is estimated that the restoration of the Crowsnest rates on grain reduced the earnings during the last half of the year by six and a half million dollars. Notwithstanding this reduction in rates, the earnings exceeded the operating expenses in September, October and November. In each of the other nine months there was an adverse balance, the smallest deficit occurring in May and the heaviest in January, February and December.

In making the statement that the restoration of the Crowsnest pass rates reduced the earnings during the last half of the year by six and a half million dollars, that estimate, of course, is based on the assumption that had the old rates remained the traffic would have been as heavy.

Income Account

The gross operating revenue for the year was $120,135,956.71, as against $127,002,466.64 in 1921; the operating expenses $129,872,274.75 as against $143,222,802.55; leaving a net deficit from railway operation of $9,736,318.04, as compared with $16,220,335.91 for the previous year.

The addition of tax accruals—which by way, are not classed by railway accountants as real operating expenses—brings the total operating deficit for 1922 up to $11,085,081.33 as against $17,805,365.16 for 1921. Non-operat-

ing income—car rentals, rental of joint facilities, express, mails, elevators, etc.— amounting this year to $5,644,217.22, is offset by the usual deductions from gross income—hire of equipment, joint facilities, etc.—amounting to $4,421,180.49, leaving the total deficit before fixed charges $9,862,044.60, as compared with $16,212,063.22 in 1921.

The fixed charges amounted, in 1922, to $41,-241,252.31, of which $32,711,546.22 pertain to the Canadian Northern, and $8,529,706.09 to the Grand Trunk Pacific. These fixed charges swell the total Canadian National deficit to $51,103,296.91 as compared with $56,989,978.82 in 1921.

In the statement which will be placed on Hansard, it will be seen that the 1921 figures do not entirely agree with the figures brought down a year ago. At that time, the operating results of the St. John and Quebec Railway were separately shown. As the St. John and Quebec results have been included in 1922 totals it was necessary to add in the 1921 results to make the figures comparable.

Analysis of Net Operating Deficit.

The net operating deficit was $9,736,318.04, compared with $16,220,335.91 in 1921. The net operating deficit of the Canadian Government Railways is $2,496,721.91 as against $5,714,-732.90 in 1921. Of this, the Intercolonial and branch lines were reponsible for $2,302,703.36, compared with $4,457,035.75 in 1921; the Prince Edward Island District, $634,588.66 as against $617,158.93 the previous year; the Transcontinental—lines east of Armstrong—$875,233.02 as against $1,964,730.23 in 1921; Transcontinental lines—west of Armstrong and east of Winnipeg, including the Grand Trunk Pacific Lake Superior Branch—an operating surplus of $1,488,833, as against an operating surplus of $1,523,547.90 in 1921; the St. John and Quebec Railway, a deficit of $148,078.67 compared with $127,434.15 the previous year; Hudson Bay railway, $24,-951.43 as against $71,921.08 in 1921. I must explain, in reference to the Hudson Bay railway, that the figures are not comparable, as the periods in the two years were not the same. A closer analysis of the figures, using the same periods, will show that the operating deficit of the Hudson Bay railway in 1921 was not $71,921 but rather about $50,000.

The Canadian Northern operating deficit was reduced from $6,475,911.14 in 1921 to $2,-946,729.72 in 1922, but the operating deficit of the Grand Trunk Pacific increased from $4,029,691.87 to $4,292,866.41 during the same period.

[Mr. Graham.]

Decreased Operating Expenses

I will now refer to the decreased operating expenses. I think I might interject that an analysis of the statement will show that the marked improvement for the year 1922 is the result of a large decrease in the cost of operating. If hon. gentlemen have followed me closely they will have seen that the first few statements made concerning the traffic were a little pessimistic on account of decrease in earnings; but the present statement is by no means pessimistic because the management was able to reduce the expenses of operation by a greater ratio than characterized the reduction of traffic. Operating expenses decreased $13,350,527.96, and the results for the year show that the expenditures were well controlled, there being reductions in the cost both of maintenance and of transportation. The management assure me that the condition of the physical properties was improved during the year notwithstanding that maintenance of way expenses were reduced by $2,656,340.92, and maintenance of equipment expenses by $1,225,612.86. As already pointed out, more business was moved, though $11,299,471.65 less in transportation expenses was spent to move same, in addition to the maintenance savings.

Slight reductions in pay for certain classes of employees, a decrease in the average number of employees—to be later referred to—and reduced cost of materials contributed to the improved showing, but the management feel that in the main credit should be given to greater efficiency of freight traffic, handling more miles per car per day and a small increase in load per car mile. The cost of yard operation was also considerably reduced, measured on the basis of the number of cars handled.

Operating Ratio

What is meant by the "operating ratio" is how much money it takes to earn a dollar. Shortly, I may say that when it takes $1.05 to earn $1 there is a deficit; when the earning expenditure is one dollar or less there is no deficit. The operating ratio for the year was 108.10, as compared with 112.77 in 1921 and 129.32 in 1920. The operating ratios of the component parts of the National System were as follows:

	1922	1921
Canadian Northern..	104.85	109.37
Canadian Government..	106.10	113.85
Grand Trunk Pacific..	123.18	124.21

The ratio of 108.10 for 1922 is divided as follows:—Labour 60.74, as against 65.02; fuel 14.01, as against 16.84, and other expenditures 33.35 as against 30.91.

Traffic Results—Steam Lines

The National lines carried 11,331,226 passengers during 1922, or 606,923 less than in 1921. the average haul per passenger was 60.84 miles, compared with 59.87 miles in the previous year, and the passenger earnings were $17,919,-602.17, a decrease of $2,289,218.02 compared with 1921.

The system handled 22,426,403 tons of revenue freight, an increase of 1,164,803 tons. The average haul also increased from 423.19 miles to 449.97 miles, but the freight revenue, which was $89,726,925.51, fell off $3,901,611.86 because of lower rates.

The average earnings per traffic train mile were $3.52 which was 8 cents less than in 1921, and the operating expenses $3.82, which was 25 cents less than the previous year. The average operating revenue per mile of road was $6,885.33, which was $438.16 less than in 1921, and the average operating expense per mile of road was $7,466.23, a decrease of $817.30. The average load per freight train increased from 482.66 tons to 548.34 tons.

Analysis of Operating Expenses

Out of each dollar spent by the National Railways on operating account during 1922, the following expenditures were made: 24.13 cents for maintenance of way and structures; 23.53 cents for maintenance of equipment; 2.23 cents for traffic expenses—soliciting, etc., —46.57 cents for rail line transportation—enginemen, trainmen, yardmen, station employees, etc.—1.42 cents for miscellaneous operations—dining and buffet, hotels restaurants, etc.—2.79 cents for general expenses—general offices, clerical and legal staff, etc.—and 0.67 for transportation for investment—i.e., the movement of materials entering into the property. This split of the expenditure dollar closely approximates the figures for 1921, except transportation costs, which are 3.61 cents less.

The distribution of operation expenses is shown also in another form: labour, 56.19; fuel—locomotive—12.96; other 30.85, total 100.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. GRAHAM: At six o'clock, Mr. Speaker, I was analyzing the operating costs. Now I shall take up the item of labour.

Labour

Out of gross earnings of $120,135,956.71, the management paid out $82,390,245.42 in wages, including betterments, about six and a half million dollars less than the 1921 total pay-roll. Operating labour cost $72,969,378.-48, or almost 10 millions less than the previous year. The ratio of operating labour costs to gross earnings was 60.74 for the system, as against 65.02 in 1921, an improvement of 4.28 per cent. The average number of employees in 1922 was 58,398 compared with 60,315 in 1921, a decrease of almost two thousand.

During the first four months of the year, labour forces were lighter than in the corresponding period in the preceding year. In May, June and July maintenance forces were increased with the general object of having track and other conditions improved for the fall movement, which gave every indication of being heavy. From August to December, inclusive, substantially the same force was maintained as in 1921, although more tonnage was moved.

Locomotive Coal Purchases

Locomotive coal to the extent of 3,053,829 tons was purchased during 1922 at an average price of $5.47 and a total cost of $16,711,355.-22. Of this 2,198,039 tons was Canadian coal, at an average price of $4.83, or $10,621,037.57; 798,330 tons American coal, at an average price of $7.13, or $5,693,783.90 and 57,460 British coal at an average price of $6.90, or $396,533.75 In 1921 the average price of Canadian coal was $5.71 and of the American coal $6.47. During that year 2,505,389 tons of Canadian coal were purchased and 977,696 tons of American. Less coal to the extent of 429,256 tons was purchased during 1922.

Equipment

A statement showing details of equipment on hand, retirements and deliveries during the year, will be included with those to be handed in. Briefly it shows that the Canadian National system had 1951 locomotives and 87,482 cars on December 31, 1922, as against 1,973 locomotives and 88,478 cars on December 31, 1921. Also, for the information of the House, I shall put in a statement of new equipment ordered during the current year, totalling $20,250,600.85. The statement will show the number and type of equipment, the name of the builder, and the price. Unfortunately prices are still very high. For mountain type locomotives we are paying 74,500 and for the Mikado type $66,500. First-class coaches still cost $35,443,

as against $16,586 in 1914., and standard sleepers $49,400, compared with $28,250 in 1915; mail cars, which could be built for $11,500 before the war, now cost $29,650; express refrigerator cars, which cost $4,642 in 1918, now cost $10,550; steel baggage cars, which cost $6,666 in 1915, cost $24,750 now; general service freight cars which cost $1,346 in 1914 and $3,250 in 1920, are now priced at $2,950; box cars which could be bought for $1,150 in 1914 and were $2,950 in 1920, are now $2,555. It is only fair to explain that car equipment purchased from 1914 to 1917, inclusive, was fitted with wooden and steel sills, and from 1918 to 1923 with steel sills and steel framing, and was also of greater capacity.

Betterments

The betterments effected during the year included the laying of 444 miles of new 85 lb. rail and 172 miles of second-hand relay rails, principally on western lines; the putting in of 5,910,014 ties and 1,030 miles of ballast; 50 new water supplies and 11 new water tanks; 432 miles of fencing and 315 sidings and siding extensions; 41 new stations and 16 station extensions; 9 new freight sheds and 9 freight shed extensions; 64 bunkhouses and section houses; 77 other buildings, 15 coaling plants, 406 culverts, 32 bridges and 163 bridges and trestles filled. A statement of the larger betterment items will, as usual, be handed in to Hansard.

New Construction During 1922

With the exception of the Long Lac cut off no new construction was undertaken during the year, and on the cut off only preparatory work was done up to December 31 last. The late minister pointed out a year ago that in the West alone construction had been projected which would entail an expenditure of $25,000,000 to bring to completion, but in view of financial conditions and the impending reorganization of the National Railway Board and management, the betterment programme for 1922 would consist of finishing work in hand as far as track had been laid, leaving the new board free to advise as to further extensions. In accordance with the policy indicated, no new grading or tracklaying was undertaken during the year under review, though considerable ballasting and surfacing was completed and necessary buildings and structures erected. Details of this will be supplied, also as to the 172.3 miles of new lines in the West turned over to the operating department for permanent operation. This mileage was under operation on behalf of the construction department, with restrictions as to speed, at the beginning of 1922 and was merely brought to completion during the year.

So far, Mr. Speaker, I have dealt only with the railway system known up to October last year as the Canadian National, not with that portion of it formerly known as the Grand Trunk.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am confused by my hon. friend's constant use of the month of October. The figures he is giving us, as I understood him all along, were for the entire year of 1922. Is not that correct?

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I thought my hon. friend in the last sentence before I interrupted him said the figures were up to October.

Mr. GRAHAM: No.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Canadian National railway and Grand Trunk railway were run as separate roads up to the end of the year. The order in council which made them one was issued January 30, 1923.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is right. But I was trying to explain at the beginning of my remarks the distinction between what was called the Canadian National Railway system then and now, and I pointed out that the Canadian National Board had been brought into existence in October last by order in council. In other words there was no Canadian National Railway until October last.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is merely a name.

Mr. GRAHAM: Certainly; but until October last there was not really any Canadian National Board; it was the Canadian Northern Board.

THE GRAND TRUNK

Now let me take up the Grand Trunk. To one who, like myself, has lived along the old Grand Trunk nearly all his lifetime the passing of this road from its original status even to become part of our national system is somewhat of a tragedy. We who have known the Grand Trunk so well since our boyhood almost reverence the old line. Of course, now that it has become part of our national system of railways I think I may be allowed to express the view that, given a fair opportunity, it will prove a splendid asset to the Dominion.

The Grand Trunk experienced in a general way the same difficulties as the Canadian National, though it did not come within the

influence of the Crowsnest reduction. It carried fewer passengers, with consequent loss in revenue, and while freight tonnage and freight earnings increased somewhat, the average revenue per ton per mile was 4 per cent less than the previous year. This was stated to be owing to the reductions in Canadian freight rates effective December 1st, 1921, and August 1st, 1922; also to reductions in United States and International freight rates effective January 1st and July 1st, 1922. The system carried 940,000 fewer tons of coal and coke for reasons which are well known; but loss tonnage was more than offset by increases in general commodities, the most prominent of which were lumber and forest products, including wood pulp, building materials, motor cars, flour and iron and steel products. The decrease of $1,668,459.55 in passenger revenue, while contributed to by 1,124,181 fewer passengers, was in part due to a reduction in International fares at the beginning of the year. There was also a slight falling off in express earnings.

Income Account

In 1921 the Grand Trunk Canadian lines were the only part of the system to end the year with a net revenue from operation. In 1922 the New England lines were the only line to show an operating deficit, and that was only $57,090.48, compared with $681,490.29 the previous year. Last year the Canadian lines increased their operating net revenue from $5,678,739.47 to $7,382,205.78; the western lines turned a deficit of $447,925.11 into an operating net of $5,498,226.20, and the Central Vermont similarly converted a deficit of $176,806.42 into an operating net of $1,106,525.57.

The operating revenues, all lines, were $113,975,133.30 last year as against $109,097,557.58 in 1921; the operating expenses $100,045,266.23 as compared with $104,725,039.93 the previous year.

After deducting taxes, hire of equipment, joint facility rents, etc., expenditures which affect the western lines somewhat heavily, income other than from operation brought the net income before fixed charges up to $12,064,827.42..

At this stage the Central Vermont joined the New England lines in the deficit column. Fixed charges amount to $21,213,375.64. Of this sum $4,745,762.61 is due the government and $16,467,613.03 payable to others. Taking into consideration these fixed charges the Grand Trunk net deficit, all lines, was $9,148,548.22, as compared with $15,672,299.34 in 1921, a decrease of $6,523,751.12. The net deficit was apportioned as follows:

	1922	1921
Canadian lines	$5,735,386 48	$7,386,170 97
Western lines	1,277,747 20	4,797,177 55
New England lines	1,398,600 35	1,881,093 84
Central Vermont	736,814 19	1,607,299 34
Total	$9,148,548 22	$15,672,299 34

Allocation of Net Deficit

The net deficit of $9,148,548.22 just referred to was distributed as follows:

Grand Trunk Canadian lines	$5,620,814 37
Ottawa Terminals Railway	113,769 09
Canada Atlantic Transit Company	82,454 25
St. Clair Tunnel Company	231,852 26
Toronto Terminals Railway	203,091 48
Terminal Warehouse Reg. (Cr.)	250,000 00
Canadian Express Company (Cr.)	266,594 97
Grand Trunk Western Lines	1,277,747 20
Grand Trunk New England Lines	1,398,600 35
Central Vermont Railway	736,814 19
Total deficit	$9,148,548 22

The comparison with 1921 figures is shown in the statement of detail.

Grand Trunk Traffic

The operating revenue of the Grand Trunk system was $106,348,507.11, an increase of $4,386,702.59. Of this amount $17,566,692.55 was on passenger account, a falling off of $1,668,459.55. Freight revenue was $79,716,164.68, an increase of $5,712,983.97; other revenue—mail, express, etc.—$9,065,649.88 showed a slight increase.

Operating expenses were $93,525,165.61, a decrease of $3,887,314.84. This decrease was common to maintenance of way and structures, transportation, miscellaneous, and general offices. Maintenance of equipment cost more than in 1921, as also did the traffic department.

Operating ratio was 87.94 per cent as compared with 95.53 in 1921.

Tons of freight carried were 29,942,949, an increase of 2,688,163, though the average ton mile revenue fell off 4 per cent. Passengers carried numbered 12,401,927, a decrease of 1,124,181. There was a decrease of 5 per cent also in the average revenue per passenger mile. An explanation of these decreases in revenue has already been given and the customary detailed and comparative figures will be brought down, also those in connection with the Central Vermont, which do not form part of the Grand Trunk system figures just referred to.

Separately Operated Companies

A number of separately operated subsidiary companies are controlled by the Grand Trunk, the net surplus of which is not taken into the Grand Trunk income statement. These include the Chicago, New York and Boston Refrigerator Company, International Bridge

Company, Montreal Warehousing Company, Limited, Terminal Warehousing Company, Limited, Oshawa Railway, Rail and River Coal Company, Thousand Islands Railway, Montreal and Southern Counties Railway and the Central Vermont Transportation Company.

The net income of separately operated companies was $712,123.24, as against $381,439.05 in 1921. These separately operated companies paid to the Grand Trunk in dividends in 1922, $576,300 compared with $127,000 in 1921, and the undistributed surplus at December 31st last was $151,671.16 against $40,429.07 at the end of 1921. Detailed results of the operation of each of these companies will be included in statement form.

Employees and Compensation

The average number of employees Grand Trunk system was 38,359 in 1922, compared with 39,234 in 1921, and corresponding figures for Central Vermont were 2,763 and 2,859. The average wage, Grand Trunk, was $1,507.96 and Central Vermont $1,566.91, a decrease of 5.49 per cent and 1.93 per cent respectively. The pay-roll expense of the Grand Trunk was $54,016,242.75, or 57.76 per cent of the total operating expense. The pay-roll of the Central Vermont was $4,109,420.19, or 63.03 per cent of the total operating expense. The ratio of pay-roll to operating expense decreased 2.83 per cent in the case of the Grand Trunk, but increased 6.81 per cent in the case of the Central Vermont.

Of each dollar spent by the Grand Trunk 57¾ cents went in wages, 15½ cents in fuel for locomotives and 26¾ cents in other operating expenses. The Central Vermont figures were 63, 18½ and 18½ cents respectively.

Equipment, Grand Trunk—All Lines

A statement showing details of equipment of the Grand Trunk, including the Central Vermont, will be included with other tabulated information. It shows that at the end of the year these lines had 1,495 locomotives, 1,208 passenger service cars, 46,188 freight service cars, 2,537 company service cars and 3 car ferries. The corresponding figures at the end of 1921 were, 1,498, 1,210, 47,321, 2,555 and 3.

Coal

Locomotive coal purchased from all sources in 1922 amounted to 2,565,723 tons and cost on the average $6.50 a ton or a total of $16,685,813.03. Of this coal 2,157,134 tons was American at an average price of $6.56; 348,696 Canadian at $5.81 and 59,893 tons English and Scotch coal at $8.59.

Additions and Betterments

Additions and betterments, Grand Trunk, all lines, were made in 1922 at a total cost of $4,403,837.23. Of this amount, $1,598,651.30 was spent on equipment, and $1,277,822.43 on rails and various track material. The spread of this betterment expenditure will be brought down in detail.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—FINANCE

Consolidated Income Figures

The gross operating revenue of all roads now comprising the Canadian National lines was $234,111,090.01 compared with $236,100,024.22 in 1921. The operating expenses were $229,917,540.98, compared with $247,947,842.48, and the net revenue from railway operations $4,193,549.03 as against an operating deficit of $11,847,818.26 in 1921.

From the net revenue from operation, all lines, of $4,193,549.03, tax accruals amounting to $4,095,677.45 must be deducted, leaving the total operating income $97,871.58. The corresponding figure for 1921 was a deficit of $16,082,792.51.

To the total operating income of $97,871.58 must be added non-operating income such as rentals, express, mails, elevators, etc., which amounted to $15,752,496.48, but from which must be deducted our own hire of equipment and joint facilities charges, etc., which amounted to $13,647,585.24, making the total revenue, before fixed charges, $2,202,782.82, as against a deficit of $12,638,778.88 in 1921.

Next, the fixed charges must be considered. The fixed charges due the government increased from $19,569,989.79 to $24,649,513.45; those due the public decreased from $40,453,509.49 to $37,805,114.50, leaving the net increase in fixed charges $2,431,128.67.

Taking these fixed charges into account, the total deficit for 1922 amounted to $60,251,845.13 as compared with $72,662,278.16 last year, an improvement of $12,410,433.03.

Memorandum re Financing done during the Year 1922

During the year, an issue of $11,000,000. Canadian Northern Railway Company 5 per cent Three Year Notes, guaranteed by the Dominion government, was disposed of at 99·03 per cent. The proceeds, together with accrued interest and New York exchange amounting to $10,953,290.52, were used to retire maturing obligations, as follows: $5,651,000 Canadian Northern Railway 6 per cent 2½-Year Collateral Trust Notes which matured on February 1st, 1922; $4,601,789.76 to purchase sterling exchange to retire $5,109,026.67, Canadian Northern Railway 5 per cent Dominion Guranteed Series "C" Notes, which matured in London on April 5, 1922. The balance of $700,500.76 was applied in reduc-

tion of the loan made by the Dominion government under authority of War Measures Act and order in council dated July 5, 1918. The saving in exchange covering the retiring of the securities in London, amounted to $507,-236.91.

On June 1, 1911, $1,250,000 Canadian Northern Railway 5½ per cent Three Year Secured Notes, maturing at Toronto on that date, were retired from an advance from the Dominion government, provided for in the Appropriations.

$6,000,000 Canadian Northern Railway 5½ per cent Three Year Notes were paid off on December 1st, 1922, from an advance made by the Dominion government.

On December 1st, 1922, $7,099,493.34 Canadian Northern Railway 5 per cent Land Mortgage Debentures held by the public, were called for redemption in London, England. It was thought advisable to redeem these securities on that date rather than wait until the date of maturity, namely, June 1st, 1923, in view of the rising Sterling Exchange rates. This step has been justified, as the exchange rate on December 1st was $4.52, whereas to-day the rate is approximately $4.80. The funds necessary to retire these securities were advanced by the Dominion government. If the exchange rate reaches par by June 1st, 1923, which is quite probable, then the saving in exchange that will be effected by having retired the above securities on December 1st, 1922, would amount to $505,717.34.

Advances by the Government

Advances during 1922 to the Canadian Northern amounted to $49,826,881.29, making a grand total of $298,799,591.72 to December 31, 1922, on which, to the same date, interest amounting to $51,233,156.66 had accrued.

The advances during the year were utilized as follows: construction and betterments, $13,-251,014.30; equipment, $719,046.85; repayment of loans and equipment trust obligations $19,254,893.33, operating deficit, $4,344,418.27; fixed charges, $12,257,508.54.

Advances during 1922 to the Grand Trunk Pacific were $9,813,640.23, and the total advances to December 31, 1922, amounted to $90,538,034.75. Last year advances were distributed as follows: construction and betterments, $2,991,387.24; operating deficits, $4,552,-021.98; fixed charges, $2,270,231.01. Total accrued interest to December 31, 1922, amounted to $20,924,521.32.

On Grand Trunk account, there was advanced during 1922, $10,858,188,18, bringing the total up to $84,560,342.60 to December 31 last. The advances during the year were absorbed as follows: construction and betterments, $3,142,680.96; repayment of loans and equipment trust obligations, $2,487,778.44; operating deficit, $3,272,385.22; fixed charges, $1,955,343.56. The total of accrued interest to December 31, 1922, was $7,967,405.29.

In addition to the above, the government advanced to the Canadian Government Railways during 1922, $7,056,887.55, divided as follows: capital expenditure, $4,151,961.77; operating deficits, $2,904,925.78.

Fixed Charges

The total fixed charges, including Grand Trunk and Central Vermont, were $62,454,-627.95, compared with $60,023,499.28 in 1921.

The fixed charges of the Canadian Northern system show a net increase of $1,891,630.44, made up of a decrease of $680,533.25, in interest due the public and an increase of $2,572,-163.69 in interest due the government.

The decrease in interest due the public was occasioned by the fact that retirements during the year exceeded the increases, which latter were mostly due to interest charges running the full year in 1922, as compared with part only of the previous year. The increase in interest due the government reflects the advances made during 1922, and the full year interest on the advances made at various times during the previous year.

Grand Trunk Pacific interest charges are shown as $1,428,293.73 less than in 1921, largely because of the fact that interest on the Grand Trunk Pacific 4 per cent debentures, $1,395,-170.12, concerning which there has been more or less discussion, is no longer shown as a fixed charge, it not being considered a liability unless earned. G.T.P. interest due the government increased $869,018.02. There are also some inter-company adjustments, details of which will be shown in the comparative statement.

The Grand Trunk fixed charges increased $1,967,791.96, of which $6,506.52 was Central Vermont. A full year's interest on sinking fund 6 per cent Gold Debenture Bonds issued September 26, 1921, accounts for $1,108,333.33, and on government loans $1,638,341.95, the latter due chiefly to the 1921-22 advances running for the full year instead of only part of the year, as in 1921. On the other hand, there were decreases, the chief of which was an item of $657,000.00, due to the retirement in 1921 of 3-year 6 per cent secured notes. Details of all these interest charges are being brought down.

This is a fairly complete statement, I submit, of what has taken place during the year 1922, and I think that under the conditions existing in the Dominion of Canada, and

which exist elsewhere, perhaps all over the world, in a more aggravated degree, the better showing of our Canadian National lines at the end of 1922 is very encouraging to the people of Canada who believe that eventually a public-owned railway can be made a success in this country. The problem is not easy to work out, but if we give it a fair show I think it will work itself out. Notwithstanding the reduction in rates from the West owing to the restoration of the Crowsnest pass agreement, which represents a reduction of over six million dollars, the improvement shown is very encouraging, and when amalgamation is fully completed and traffic is carried by the lines that can carry it most advantageously, when the operation of the two great systems becomes dovetailed and friction ceases, it is reasonable to suppose that there will be a betterment in conditions.

May I interject another word? Notwithstanding the fact that psychologically some of us seem to be hard up, the improved condition of this great highway that carries the people's products reflects, I think, the improved condition of the people generally throughout the Dominion of Canada, because it is a generally conceded fact that the condition in which the transportation companies of a country find themselves is a reflection of the condition in which the people of that country find themselves.

THE ESTIMATES

Now, as to next year you have all heard, no doubt, the story that our late lamented friend, Mahlon Cowan, once a brilliant member of this House, told us. In one of his election campaigns he went to see a coloured gentleman to whom he had been very kind and asked him for his support—as is usual, they tell me, when candidates are canvassing. His friend was a little reluctant to make him any pledge and he said to him "You remember, don't you Sam, that a week ago I got out of bed and went down and got you out of gaol?" "Oh, yes, I remember that." "Well, can't you give me your support after all that?" "Well, I will tell you. 'Liza and I have been talkin it over, and it's not what you have done but it is what you is goin' to do that is goin' to influence us." In making an estimate for next year, of course, we are going to base that estimate on the view that conditions in Canada are likely to continue to improve, and while that is not unduly optimistic I think it is on the safe side.

The amount to be voted on account of the railways for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1924, is $73,189,015, as compared with $97,220,000 last year.

[Mr. Graham.]

Four relatively small items, amounting to $189,015, relate to transactions under the direct control of the department, so that the amount required on railway account is represented by the loan of $73,000,000 asked for on Canadian National Railway Company account.

The following is a comparison of the several items which went to make up the estimate last year and this:

Description	Provided 1922-23	Provided 1923-24
Operating Deficits..	$21,123,827 62	$10,050,000 00
Interest due to Public..	33,571,438 19	21,687,723 94
Interest due the Gov't and the Grand Trunk.	1,133,536 40	1,133,536 40
Refunding and Sinking Funds..	11,129,910 92	8,184,699 33
Additions and Betterments	30,261,286 87	32,133,055 33
Total..	$97,220,000 00	$73,189,015 00

Mr. MACLEAN (York): What are the capital expenditures for which you are providing interest?

Mr. GRAHAM: For next year?

Mr. MACLEAN (York): No, the capital expenditures for which the interest which the minister has mentioned in the statement just given is required?

Mr. GRAHAM: I would have to figure that out; I have not got those figures at the moment. What I have just given is the interest due to the public. I have given the interest and it will be easy to figure out the principal.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Do the figures my hon. friend has given apply to the Canadian National Railways?

Mr. GRAHAM: They apply to the entire system.

As already alluded to in the reference to the year's financing, it was regarded as good business to retire certain securities on December 1 last, which was optional, instead of waiting until redemption was obligatory during the present year. The government advanced the money and a saving in exchange amounting to more than half a million dollars resulted. The supplementary estimates of the current fiscal year contain an item of $13,099,493.34 to cover these retirements.

SIR HENRY THORNTON ON REORGANIZATION

I asked the president of the Canadian National Railways to give me a synopsis of what had been accomplished in the matter of reorganization, and he has furnished me with the following statement:

The present management took charge of the property about December first, 1922, at a session of the year

when inspections, examinations and progress were difficult on account of winter conditions.

Obviously, the first effort of the management was to make as complete an inspection of the property as weather conditions would permit, in as short a time as possible, and to become acquainted with the officers and employees on the various constituent parts of the National Railway system. In addition to this, traffic conditions and problems had to be examined, as all of these were essential factors in the determination of the organization which would be necessary to operate the consolidated system.

There were three primary problems which demanded immediate attention:

1. The determination of the kind of an organization which was to be employed in the administration of the property.

2. The determination of the regions into which the property was to be divided for operating purposes, and the location of regional and general headquarters.

3. The selection of officers for the various posts involved in the organization.

The study and successful solution of these three questions naturally involved examination of the property itself; the country, its productivity; the movement of traffic and the rates charged thereon; the principal lines of future commercial and agricultural development; coupled with a general study of the economic condition of the Dominion. Perhaps the most important and difficult problem was to assess the value of officers for prospective posts, with a view to getting the right man in the right place.

The organization which has been decided upon is what may be called a strengthened divisional organization as distinguished from a departmental organization. The executive officers consist of a chairman and president, assisted by five vice-presidents as under:

1. Vice-president in charge of operation, maintenance and construction.

2. Vice-president in charge of financial affairs.

3. Vice-president in charge of insurance, immigration, development, lands, express and telegraphs.

4. Vice-president in charge of legal affairs.

5. Vice-president in charge of traffic.

The above executive officers represent the minimum with which, in my judgment, it would be possible to operate such a property as the Canadian National Railways; indeed, as time goes on and traffic increases, it will probably be necessary to add another vice-president. The list above given, however, represents a considerable economy as compared with the executive officers of the old national system and the Grand Trunk Railway. Those properties had in the aggregate one chairman, two presidents, and eleven vice-presidents, with a complete staff of officers for each. There is now one chairman and president, and five vice-presidents. The actual saving in salaries of vice-presidents and their immediate office forces should be at least $150,000 a year.

It is not possible at the moment to say exactly what the total savings in the salary list will be, as the organization has been barely completed and the officers have hardly settled into their places, and consequently the exact number of clerks and subordinates in each department has not been finally fixed; but one would be quite safe in saying that a material saving will be accomplished, and a much more efficient administrative machine provided. Most of the announcements made with respect to officers represent either a rearrangement of duties and responsibilities or the confirmation of positions which already existed. In only one or two cases have entirely new positions been created; and the net result will undoubtedly be the employment of a smaller administrative class.

The railway has been divided into three regions for operating purposes, and this feature has been so exhaustively discussed before that comment is now unnecessary. Suffice it to say that the principle followed was to give to each operating region as much autonomy and local control in the actual operation of the property as was consistent with efficient principles of administration. Every effort will be made to confine the functions of the vice-presidents and the executive officers to policies, leaving to general managers, general superintendents and superintendents the responsibility of carrying out details. In the administration of such a large property as is represented by the Canadian National Railways no other theory of organization can be successful.

Various aspects of the operation of the national system are being studied with a view to reducing expenses as rapidly as possible. For example, it has been found that the railway could advantageously do its own insuring, and this has been decided upon. It is anticipated that from this item alone there will be a saving which will approximate half a million dollars a year.

It is the intention of the present administration to apply itself as diligently as possible to the creation of new traffics and the movement of those traffics and existing traffics with a constantly increasing economy. A system of statistics is under development which will, it is hoped, enable the maximum of use to be made of engine power. An examination of timekeeping methods is under way, in order to ensure that every employee is paid all that is coming to him, but no more. New methods of storekeeping, and the custody of materials, are being developed, in order that purchases may be reduced to a minimum; and in various ways the organization is preparing to bring each department and function of the railway to as high a degree of efficiency as modern scientific knowledge will permit.

In the organization of such a property, where we employ about one hundred thousand people, scattered over nearly 23,000 miles of line, the process of consolidating and harmonizing the various forces is one which will necessarily take some time. It is, therefore, earnestly hoped that those who administer the affairs of the nation will be sufficiently patient to give those who are sincerely, honestly and conscientiously working at this problem an opportunity to show what can be accomplished before criticisms are made.

That is a statement by the president, Sir, Henry Thornton.

INSURANCE

Then I take up the matter of insurance. The Canadian National Railways, with the full approval, I think, of the government, has decided to carry its own insurance. I might add that their Canadian Government Merchant Marine will be in the same class. The insurance on these two great properties will amount roughly speaking, to $400,000,000. That is a good insurance business in itself. I would be delighted to be president of an insurance company that would net me approximately $400,000,000 worth of business, with the gilt-edged premium handed me every year. I would not need to do anything else or to get any more business. My renewals would keep me the rest of my time quite comfortably, and I would be able to leave something for my family. If an insurance company can do that, we believe the Canadian National Railway, with the government behind it—because we, the people, are the shareholders—can

carry its own insurance and make quite a saving. The insurance will not be let run wild or the risks go unprovided for. Each year when the premiums would naturally fall due, the amount of these premiums would be placed in a reserve fund for insurance purposes. Already I think the Grand Trunk has an insurance fund accumulation and I believe I am safe in saying that we have, in the several railway fire insurance funds, a rest fund of $2,000,000 with which we start. A good many policies come due on the 31st March, and in two or three weeks from now we will have substantially increased that reserve fund. Some figures have been given me which I will give to the House, to be sure that I am accurate in my reference to them. But let me say that at first blush it might seem to be quite a radical policy. Well, radical policies are all right, unless they are too radical, but if during the last ten years these roads—I am speaking only of the railroads—had insured themselves, they would have saved $7,000,000 and replaced all the destroyed property. When I had the honour of being Minister of Railways in Sir Wilfrid's government, the government of course carried its own insurance. At my suggestion we established an insurance fund, not large, of course, but each year we put aside a certain amount for insurance purposes, and that fund paid all the fire losses, and had quite a substantial surplus at the end of three or four years' time.

9 p.m.

I would like to amplify the president's reference to the change in insurance methods. The only railway property on which insurance has not been carried either by the underwriters or by means of railway insurance funds is that comprising the original group of Canadian Government Railways where the risk, about 50 millions, has been carried by the government. On the other railways, the Canadian Northern and Grand Trunk groups, the insurance carried has totalled $279,425,999 and on the marine—railway as well as Canadian Government Merchant Marine—$47,620,562, a grand total of $327,046,561, on which the total annual premium or fund contribution has been $2,637,800. Had the government lines been insured—that is the Intercolonial, the Transcontinental and the Prince Edward Island railway—the premiums or fund contributions would have totalled $2,837,800. The total losses during 1922 amounted to $1,144,279, or forty per cent of that amount. Thus, on the basis of complete insurance, the premiums would have exceeded last year's losses by $1,693,521.

[Mr. Graham.]

The insurance records have been examined for 10 years back, and they show that our average losses over that period have been a little under seventy per cent, so that over a ten year period the saving, under the method proposed, would have been thirty per cent. Should that record be maintained, the management have every reason to expect a saving of between $750,000 and $1,000,000 a year.

In this connection I might be permitted to say that hon. members will notice on the order paper a resolution indicative of legislation to be asked in order to cover certain points in reference to the insurance. As to mortgages, we all understand that if we have a mortgage on our house we have to keep the house insured, in order to protect the individual or the company which advances the money. This is particularly the case with the rolling stock, the buildings, etc., on the railway lines. Where these have been mortgaged, they have been mortgaged under the pledge that certain insurance would be carried on the property, in order to protect the lender. In this legislation which I referred to a moment ago, all we are asked to do is that, in lieu of this insurance in a company which is supposed to have a full guarantee of stability behind it, the government will step in and guarantee that the insurance will be paid in case of the destruction of the property. In other words, the government, in regard to these loans or these mortgages held on the property, takes the place of the company and that will be perfectly satisfactory to the lenders or to the holders of security.

Hon. members will want to know now, what about constructing branch railways. Well, the completion of branch lines already started, as well as the construction of others, has been held up by the war and by financial stringency since the war. Nothing will be found in the estimates for new construction during the coming year, but I might say, in palliation of that offence, that it is the intention of the government to submit to the House a little later on, in the way of legislation, a programme for construction extending over a term of years. That will be decided by parliament after discussion, and the public will know just what the government proposes to try to do, aided by parliament, during the next three years, in the way of construction. It will not mean that parliament will be tied down to that programme of construction, but it will be a guarantee to the public of what parliament intends to do along that line. That legislation will be brought down in due course after consideration. I know that it

will have the sympathy and the full consideration of the House. I might say, in that connection, that there is on the statute books at the present time what is called the Branch Lines Act—I do not know whether that is the proper title—under which not a few branch lines have been taken over by the federal government. While I believe we must be economical and keep as close in our expenditure as possible; nevertheless, we cannot blind our eyes to the other side of the picture. If the members of this parliament on both sides of the House, including the government, do not take somewhat of an optimistic view of the future of Canada, then we cannot expect the people of Canada, or the people of any other country, to believe in Canada.

While, I say, we must be as economical as possible, still there is a point beyond which economy becomes extravagance; and I believe that the programme which we hope to bring down will appeal to the members of the House. I believe it will be seen that it is not for the purpose of making extravagant expenditures but of carrying out the ideas expressed so often in this House in regard to making the people of this country more contented; for I admit that a contented settler is the best advertisement that any country can have.

As I say, we have the Branch Lines Act. Now, it may be necessary, as it has been in years past, to build short lines that will not pay. I am not prophesying, but I say that we may have to build lines that will not be profitable. And that is where a government differs somewhat from the private company. The government finds its own people have moved into a new district; or perhaps in an older part of the country they may find a railway aided by both governments and by the municipality but not properly operated. The railway itself is properly constructed, but the company has perhaps been taking everything out and putting nothing in, so that the road might just as well not be operated at all in some instances. I leave it to the consideration of the House whether, under these circumstances, it is not the duty of the government to go to the aid of people in some cases even if we know that the undertaking will not pay in dollars and cents just at the present time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I realize that it has been a long and dreary task for hon. members to listen to the statement I have submitted. The figures I have given this afternoon and evening are merely a synopsis of tabulated information which should be immediately made available in complete form for the members of the House. I would therefore request the permission of the House to hand to Hansard a copy of certain statements which it is impossible to read in full and which cannot appear unless taken as read. So that the whole situation concerning the Canadian National Railways will be before hon. members in Hansard for their consideration, and they can compare the explanations I have given with the detailed statements which they will find therein.

The tabulated statements referred to by Mr. Graham are as follows:

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

TABULATED INFORMATION SUMMARIZED BY THE ACTING MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS, IN THE ANNUAL STATEMENT TO PARLIAMENT CONCERNING THE OPERATIONS OF CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS (ALL LINES DURING 1922.)

SCHEDULE "A"—

(1) Income account, Canadian National Railways, exclusive of Grand Trunk;
(2) Income account, Grand Trunk Railway System, including Central Vermont;
(3) Combined income account, Canadian National Railway, all lines.

SCHEDULE "B"—Operating results, by months, for the year 1922—

(1) Canadian National Railways;
(2) Grand Trunk Railway System;
(3) Central Vermont Railway.

SCHEDULE "C"—

(1) Comparative statement of operating deficits for Canadian National Railways;
(2) Comparative statement of net deficits, Grand Trunk Railway System, including Central Vermont.

SCHEDULE "D"—Results of operation by Grand Trunk and Central Vermont Railways of separately operated companies.

SCHEDULE "E"—Summary of fixed charges—

(1) Canadian Northern Railway;
(2) Grand Trunk Pacific Railway;
(3) Grand Trunk Railway System, including C.V.

SCHEDULE "F"—Total advances by Dominion Government to December 31, 1922, and distribution of same by Canadian Northern Railway, Grand Trunk Pacific Railway and Grand Trunk Railway System.

SCHEDULE "G"—Summary of operating results—

(1) Comparative statement of traffic, Canadian National Railway, steam lines;
(2) Comparative statement of operating results and detailed statistical information, Grand Trunk Railway System;
(3) Comparative statement of operating results and detailed statistical information, Central Vermont Railway;
(4) Distribution of operating revenues and operating expenses, Grand Trunk Railway System, including C.V.

SCHEDULE "H"—Canadian National Railways—

(1) Statement of operating revenue paid in labour;
(2) Ratio of expenses to gross earnings;
(3) Distribution of operating expenses;
(4) Grand Trunk and C.V. Railways: disbursal of expenditure dollar and disbursal of revenue dollar.

SCHEDULE "I"—Train mileage—

(1) Canadian National Railways;
(2) Grand Trunk, including C.V. Railways.

SCHEDULE "J"—Equipment statements—

(1) Canadian National Railways;
(2) Grand Trunk Railway, including C.V.;
(3) New equipment ordered to date, 1923.

APPENDIX "K"—Revenue tonnage by commodities, Grand Trunk System and C.V.—

APPENDIX "L"—Grand Trunk Railway System, including C.V.—

(1) Operated road mileage;
(2) Summary of additions and betterments during 1922.

APPENDIX "M"—Canadian National Railways—

(1) Details of betterments effected during 1922;
(2) Statement of work done on construction of new lines during 1922.

NOTE: Italicized figures mean deficit, credit, or decrease in all cases.

SCHEDULE "A" (1)

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

INCOME ACCOUNT

Years ending December 31, 1922 and 1921

	1922	1921
GROSS OPERATING REVENUE	$ cts.	$ cts.
Canadian Northern Railway System	60,679,033 37	69,088,474 16
Canadian Government Railways	40,939,945 76	41,275,314 84
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway	18,516,977 58	16,638,677 64
Canadian National Railways	120,135,956 71	127,002,466 64
OPERATING EXPENSES		
Canadian Northern Railway System	63,625,763 09	75,564,385 30
Canadian Government Railways	43,436,667 67	46,990,047 74
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway	22,809,843 99	20,668,369 51
Canadian National Railways	129,872,274 75	143,222,802 55
NET DEFICIT FROM RAILWAY OPERATIONS		
Canadian Northern Railway System	2,946,729 72	6,475,911 14
Canadian Government Railways	2,496,721 91	5,714,732 90
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway	4,292,866 41	4,029,691 87
Canadian National Railways	9,736,318 04	16,220,335 91
TAX ACCRUALS		
Canadian Northern Railway System	1,077,433 16	1,191,890 84
Canadian Government Railways	23,426 91	35,743 87
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway	247,903 22	357,394 54
Canadian National Railways	1,348,763 29	1,585,029 25
TOTAL OPERATING DEFICIT		
Canadian Northern Railway System	4,024,162 88	7,667,801 98
Canadian Government Railways	2,520,148 82	5,750,476 77
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway	4,540,769 63	4,387,086 41
Canadian National Railways	11,085,081 33	17,805,365 16
NON-OPERATING INCOME		
Canadian Northern Railway System	3,777,512 86	3,119,349 72
Canadian Government Railways	1,074,548 74	679,577 30
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway	792,155 62	863,185 83
	5,644,217 22	4,662,112 85
DEDUCTIONS FROM GROSS INCOME		
Canadian Northern Railway System	1,352,376 43	1,011,242 14
Canadian Government Railways	1,465,057 85	1,255,901 00
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway	1,603,746 21	801,667 77
Canadian National Railways	4,421,180 49	3,068,810 91
TOTAL DEFICIT BEFORE FIXED CHARGES		
Canadian Northern Railway System	1,599,026 45	5,559,694 40
Canadian Government Railways	2,910,657 93	6,326,800 47
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway	5,352,360 22	4,325,568 35
Canadian National Railways	9,862,044 60	16,212,063,22

SCHEDULE "A" (1)—*Concluded.*

	1922	1921
	$ cts.	$ cts.
FIXED CHARGES		
Canadian Northern Railway System—		
Interest due public	16,915,174 26	17,595,707 51
Interest due Government	15,796,371 96	13,224,208 27
	32,711,546 22	30,819,915 78
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway—		
Interest due public	2,341,266 96	3,977,447 36
Interest due Government	2,200,131 75	1,535,474 22
Interest on Receiver's Certificates	1,907,247 13	1,702,886 64
Interest due Grand Trunk Railway	2,081,060 25	2,742,191 60
	8,529,706 09	9,957,999 82
Canadian National Railways	41,241,252 31	40,777,915 60
TOTAL DEFICIT		
Canadian Northern Railway System	34,310,572 67	36,379,610 18
Canadian Government Railways	2,910,657 93	6,326,800 47
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway	13,882,066 31	14,283,568 17
Canadian National Railways	51,103,296 91	56,989,978 82

SCHEDULE "A" (2)

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY SYSTEM (INCLUDING CENTRAL VERMONT RAILWAY)

INCOME ACCOUNT

Results of Operations—Years 1922 and 1921

	1922		1921	
		$ cts.		$ cts.
Railway Operating Revenues—				
Canadian Lines		77,700,019 23		76,858,032 27
Western Lines		25,525,304 98		22,193,256 82
New England Lines		3,123,182 90		2,910,515 43
Central Vermont		7,626,626 19		7,135,753 06
		113,975,133 30		109,097,557 58
Railway Operating Expenses—				
Canadian Lines		70,317,813 45		71,179,292 80
Western Lines		20,027,078 78		22,641,181 93
New England Lines		3,180,273 38		3,592,005 72
Central Vermont		6,520,100 62		7,312,559 48
		100,045,266 23		104,725,039 93
Net Revenue from Railway Operations—				
Canadian Lines		7,382,205 78		5,678,739 47
Western Lines		5,498,226 20	Def.	447,925 11
New England Lines	Def.	57,090 48	Def.	681,490 29
Central Vermont		1,106,525 57	Def.	176,806 42
		13,929,867 07		4,372,517 65
Taxes, uncollectible Railway Revenues, Hire of Equipment and Joint Facility Rents—Net—				
Canadian Lines	Cr.	1,883,645 51	Cr.	1,149,574 46
Western Lines	Dr.	4,472,129 58	Dr.	3,640,721 22
New England Lines	Dr.	895,340 50	Dr.	673,594 82
Central Vermont	Dr.	705,749 57	Dr.	469,122 45
	Dr.	4,189,574 14	Dr.	3,633,864 03
Net Operating Income or Loss—				
Canadian Lines		9,265,851 29		6,828,313 93
Western Lines		1,026,096 62	Def.	4,088,646 33
New England Lines	Def.	952,430 98	Def.	1,355,085 11
Central Vermont		400,776 00	Def.	645,928 87
		9,740,292 93		738,653 62
Difference—Increase				9,001,639 31
Other Income Net—				
Canadian Lines	Cr.	3,516,652 19	Cr.	2,278,129 80
Western Lines	Dr.	290,734 94	Cr.	1,368,567 48
New England Lines	Dr.	446,169 37	Dr.	526,008 73
Central Vermont	Dr.	455,213 39	Dr.	286,057 83
	Cr.	2,324,534 49	Cr.	2,834,630 72
Difference—Decrease				510,096 23
Net Income before fixed Charges—				
Canadian Lines		12,782,503 48		9,106,443 73
Western Lines		735,361 68	Def.	2,720,078 85
New England Lines	Def.	1,398,600 35	Def.	1,881,093 84
Central Vermont	Def.	54,437 39	Def.	931,986 70
		12,064,827 42		3,573,284 34

SCHEDULE "A" (2)—*Concluded*

	1922		1921	
	$	cts.	$	cts.
Fixed Charges—Interest on Funded Debt—				
Payable to Dominion Government Canadian Lines	4,745,762	61	3,107,420	66
Payable to others—				
Canadian Lines	13,772,127	35	13,385,194	04
Western Lines	2,013,108	88	2,077,098	70
New England Lines	.....		.....	
Central Vermont	682,376	80	675,870	28
	16,467,613	03	16,138,163	02
Net Income or Loss—				
Canadian Lines	Def. 5,735,386	48	Def. 7,386,170	97
Western Lines	Def. 1,277,747	20	Def. 4,797,177	55
New England Lines	Def. 1,398,600	35	Def. 1,881,093	84
Central Vermont	Def. 736,814	19	Def. 1,607,856	98
	Def. 9,148,548	22	15,672,299	34
Difference—Decrease	.....		6,523,751	12

NOTE:—Does not include credits on account of interest on advances to Grand Trunk Pacific Railway and its Subsidiaries.

SCHEDULE "A" (3)

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—(All Lines)

INCOME ACCOUNT

Years ending December 31st, 1922 and 1921

	1922		1921	
	$	cts.	$	cts.
GROSS OPERATING REVENUE				
Canadian National Railways	120,135,956	71	127,002,466	64
Grand Trunk Railway System	106,348,507	11	101,961,804	52
Central Vermont Railway	7,626,626	19	7,135,753	06
	234,111,090	01	236,100,024	22
OPERATING EXPENSES				
Canadian National Railways	129,872,274	75	143,222,802	55
Grand Trunk Railway System	93,525,165	61	97,412,480	45
Central Vermont Railway	6,520,100	62	7,312,559	48
	229,917,540	98	247,947,842	48
NET REVENUE FROM RAILWAY OPERATIONS				
Canadian National Railways	Def. 9,736,318	04	Def. 16,220,335	91
Grand Trunk Railway System	12,823,341	50	4,549,324	07
Central Vermont Railway	1,106,525	57	Def. 176,806	42
	4,193,549	03	11,847,818	26
TAX ACCRUALS				
Canadian National Railways	1,348,763	29	1,585,029	25
Grand Trunk Railway System	2,523,538	57	2,412,912	92
Central Vermont Railway	223,375	59	237,032	08
	4,095,677	45	4,234,974	25
TOTAL OPERATING INCOME				
Canadian National Railways	Def. 11,085,081	33	Def. 17,805,365	16
Grand Trunk Railway System	10,299,802	93	2,136,411	15
Central Vermont Railway	883,149	98	Def. 413,838	50
	97,871	08	Def. 16,082,792	51
NON-OPERATING INCOME				
Canadian National Railways	5,644,217	22	4,662,112	85
Grand Trunk Railway System	9,970,724	38	11,293,066	61
Central Vermont Railway	137,554	88	154,544	19
	15,752,496	48	16,109,723	65
DEDUCTION FROM GROSS INCOME				
Canadian National Railways	4,421,180	49	3,068,810	91
Grand Trunk Railway System	8,151,262	50	8,924,206	72
Central Vermont Railway	1,075,142	25	672,692	39
	13,647,585	24	12,665,710	02
TOTAL REVENUE BEFORE FIXED CHARGES				
Canadian National Railways	Def. 9,862,044	60	Def. 16,212,063	22
Grand Trunk Railway System	Cr. 12,119,264	81	Cr. 4,505,271	04
Central Vermont Railway	Def. 54,437	39	Def. 931,986	70
	Cr. 2,202,782	82	Def. 12,638,778	88

SCHEDULE "A" (3)—*Concluded*

	1922	1921
	$ cts.	$ cts.
FIXED CHARGES		
Interest Due Dominion Government—		
Canadian National Railways	19,903,750 84	16,462,569 13
Grand Trunk Railway System	4,745,762 61	3,107,420 66
	24,649,513 45	19,669,989 79
Interest Due Public—		
*Canadian National Railways	21,337,501 47	24,315,346 47
†Grand Trunk Railway System	15,785,236 23	15,462,292 74
‡Central Vermont Railway	682,376 80	675,870 28
	37,805,114 50	40,453,509 49
Total Fixed Charges	62,454,627 95	60,023,499 28
GRAND TOTAL DEFICIT		
Canadian National Railways	51,103,296 91	56,989,978 82
Grand Trunk Railway System	8,411,734 03	14,064,442 36
Central Vermont Railway	736,814 19	1,607,856 98
	60,251,845 13	72,662,278 16
NOTE.—		
*Includes interest due G.T. Ry. Co.	2,081,060 25	2,742,191 60
†Includes interest due G.T. Ry. Co.	1,365,997 99	1,413,371 06
‡Includes interest due G.T. Ry. Co.	206,173 33	205,615 00
	3,653,231 57	4,361,177 66

SCHEDULE "B" (1)

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

(*Operating Results by Months for Year 1922*)

Month	Earning	Operating Expenses	Result
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
January	8,300,098 21	10,532,111 27	*2,232,013 06*
February	7,733,660 52	10,118,250 57	*2,384,590 05*
March	9,510,561 07	10,493,936 50	*983,375 43*
April	7,911,108 81	9,256,924 00	*1,345,815 19*
May	9,797,431 35	9,836,070 31	*38,638 96*
June	8,371,138 50	10,310,456 22	*1,939,317 72*
July	9,056,708 60	10,623,531 68	*1,566,823 08*
August	9,749,597 75	10,514,386 64	*764,788 89*
September	11,886,309 88	11,242,188 79	644,121 09
October	14,211,314 85	12,022,632 76	2,188,682 09
November	12,872,740 23	12,096,073 39	776,666 84
December	10,735,286 94	12,825,712 62	*2,090,425 68*
	120,135,956 71	129,872,274 75	*9,736,318 04*

SCHEDULE "B" (2)

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY SYSTEM

(Operating Results by Months for the Year 1922)

Month	Earnings	Operating Expenses	Result
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
January	7,339,605 00	6,745,800 21	595,804 79
February	7,658,359 00	6,461,903 10	1,196,455 90
March	8,420,021 00	7,061,327 73	1,358,693 27
April	6,803,191 00	6,317,318 85	485,872 15
May	8,064,364 00	7,075,519 23	988,844 77
June	9,220,064 00	7,508,821 62	1,711,242 38
July	9,820,641 00	7,561,253 76	2,259,387 24
August	10,037,144 00	8,206,449 75	1,830,694 25
September	9,384,984 00	8,252,590 82	1,132,393 18
October	10,156,568 00	8,980,713 83	1,175,854 17
November	10,084,710 00	8,861,393 13	1,223,316 87
December	9,358,856 11	10,494,073 58	*1,135,217 47*
	106,348,507 11	93,525,165 61	12,823,341 50

SCHEDULE "B" (3)

CENTRAL VERMONT RAILWAY

January	493,623 52	508,373 04	*14,749 52*
February	524,510 33	483,532 08	40,978 25
March	608,459 14	555,473 30	52,985 84
April	554,668 28	486,257 05	68,411 23
May	613,360 18	510,096 10	103,264 08
June	596,727 38	551,525 99	45,201 39
July	560,874 29	480,774 14	80,100 15
August	604,638 20	554,254 11	50,384 09
September	658,461 10	542,853 78	115,607 32
October	791,589 74	581,610 21	209,979 53
November	860,933 26	663,645 21	197,287 99
December	758,780 83	601,705 61	157,075 22
	7,626,626 19	6,520,100 62	1,106,525 57

Italics—Denote loss.

SCHEDULE "C" (1)

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

Comparative Statement of Operating Deficits for Years 1922 and 1921

	Year ending December 31st 1922	Year ending December 31st 1921
CANADIAN GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS	$ 2,496,721 91	$ 5,714,732 90
Divided as follows.		
Intercolonial Railway Inc. Branch Lines	$ 2,302,703 36	$ 4,457,035 75
Prince Edward Island District	634,588 66	617,158 93
Transcontinental Railway Eastern Lines	875,233 02	1,964,730 89
Transcontinental Railway Western Lines (Surplus)	1,488,833 23 (Surplus)	1,523,547 90
St. John & Quebec Railway	148,078 67	127,434 15
Hudson Bay Railway	24,951 43	71,921 08
CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY SYSTEM	2,946,729 72	6,475,911 14
GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY	4,292,866 41	4,029,691 87
Total Deficit	9,736,318 04	16,220,335 91

SCHEDULE "C" (2)

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY SYSTEM
AND
CENTRAL VERMONT RAILWAY

Comparative Statement of Net Deficits for Years 1921 and 1922

	Year ending December 31st, 1922	Year ending December 31st, 1921
GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY SYSTEM:		
Divided as follows.—		
Canadian Lines—		
Grand Trunk Railway Company	$ 5,620,814 37	$ 7,207,349 39
Ottawa Terminals Railway	113,769 09	104,994 20
Canada Atlantic Transit Co	82,454 25	73,827 38
St. Clair Tunnel Company	231,852 26	
Toronto Terminals Railway	203,091 48	
Terminal Warehouse Reg	*250,000 00*	
Canadian Express Company	*266,594 97*	
	5,735,386 48	7,386,170 97
Grand Trunk Western Lines	1,277,747 20	4,797,177 55
Grand Trunk New England Lines	1,398,600 35	1,881,093 84
Central Vermont Railway	736,814 19	1,607,856 98
Total Deficit	9,148,548 22	15,672,299 34

SCHEDULE "D"

SEPARATELY OPERATED COMPANIES NET SURPLUS OF WHICH IS NOT TAKEN UP IN INCOME ACCOUNTS OF GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY COMPANY OF CANADA OR CENTRAL VERMONT RAILWAY COMPANY

Results of Operation, Years 1921 and 1922

	Net Income		Dividends paid to G.T. Rly. Co.		Accumulated Undistributed Surplus	
	1922	1921	1922	1921	1922	1921
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Grand Trunk Railway System						
Chicago, New York and Boston Refrigerator Company	34,178 03	219,526 48			67,284 56	340,522 42
International Bridge Co.	198,559 23	88,310 09	120,000 00	120,000 00	465,547 99	379,740 40
Montreal Warehousing Co Ltd	178,933 12	165,772 42			6,531 17	2,598 05
Terminal Warehousing Co. Ltd	46,068 69	57,838 03	250,000 00		28,686 60	232,617 91
Oshawa Railway	132,350 09	51,367 29	4,200 00	2,800 00	257,964 84	143,767 61
Rail and River Coal Company	89,566 87	211,573 84	200,000 00		716,674 85	854,158 83
Thousand Islands Railway	11,091 93	1,830 26	2,100 00	4,200 00	14,871 87	6,995 05
Montreal and Southern Counties Ry	*16,102 17*	*90,124 23*			*564,811 03*	*548,708 86*
*St. Clair Tunnel Company		*106,102 37*				*390,299 83*
*G.T. Milwaukee Car Ferry Co		*146,873 13*				*102,405 37*
Central Vermont Railway—						
Central Vermont Transpn. Co	37,477 45	*71,679 63*			*841,079 69*	*878,557 14*
	712,123 24	381,439 05	576,300 00	127,000 00	151,671 16	40,429 07

*Taken up by Grand Trunk Railway Company in 1922 accounts.

[Mr. Graham.]

SCHEDULE "E"

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

Summary of Fixed Charges

—	1922	1921	Increase or Decrease
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Canadian Northern Railway—			
Interest due Public	16,915,174 26	17,595,707 51	*680,533 25*
Interest due Government	15,796,371 96	13,224,208 27	2,572,163 69
	32,711,546 22	30,819,915 78	1,891,630 44
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway—			
Interest due Public	2,341,266 96	3,977,447,36	*1,636,180 40*
Interest due Government	4,107,378 88	3,238,360 86	869,018 02
Interest due Grand Trunk Railway	2,081,060 25	2,742,191 60	*661,131 35*
	8,529,706 09	9,957,999 82	*1,428,293 73*

SCHEDULE "E" (1)

CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY SYSTEM

STATEMENT OF FIXED CHARGES FOR YEAR 1921 AND 1922

Summary

—	Principal Outstanding Dec. 31,1921	Interest Accrued Dec. 31, 1921	Principal Outstanding Dec. 31,1922	Interest Accrued Dec. 31, 1922
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Funded Debt—Canadian Northern Railway	175,017,195 57	7,415,769 05	167,359,495 52	8,259,638 77
Funded Debt—Affiliated Companies	127,321,811 97	4,844,985 90	126,339,777 97	4,968,614 00
Short Term Notes	22,708,026 66	1,822,051 52	21,349,000 00	1,475,039 49
Equipment Trust Obligations	36,656,000 00	2,465,325 70	32,519,000 00	2,207,647 13
Interest on Unfunded Debt	.....	16,548,132 17	.....	16,910,939 39
	.....	1,047,575 34	.....	4,234 87
		17,595,707 51	.....	16,915,174 26
Dominion Government Loans	.....	13,224,208 27	.....	15,796,371 96
		30,819,915 78	.....	32,711,546 22

SCHEDULE "E" (2)

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY AND AFFILIATED COMPANIES

FUNDED DEBT AND FIXED CHARGES

Years ended December 31, 1922 and 1921

	Principal Outstanding, Dec. 31, 1922	Interest Rate	Interest Accrued, Dec. 31, 1922	Principal Outstanding, Dec. 31, 1921	Interest Rate	Interest Accrued, Dec. 31, 1921
GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY	$ cts.	%	$ cts.	$ cts.	%	$ cts.
Guaranteed as to Principal and Interest by the Dominion of Canada—						
1st Mortgage Bonds (Prairie)	11,908,000 00	3	357,240,00	11,908,000 00	3	357,240 00
1st Mortgage Bonds (Mountain)	56,132,000 00	3	.....	56,132,000 00	3	.....
Sterling Bonds due 1962	8,440,848 00	4	337,633 92	8,440,848 00	4	337,633 92
Guaranteed by Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada—						
1st Mortgage Prairie Section "A" Bonds	10,206,000 00	4	408,240 00	10,206,000 00	4	408,240 00
1st Mortgage Mountain Section "B" Bonds	9,963,000 00	4	398,520 00	9,963,000 00	4	398,520 00
1st Mortgage Lake Superior Branch Bonds	7,533,000 00	4	301,320 00	7,533,000 00	4	301,320 00
Secured Sterling Notes	20,926 68	5	.....	9,720,000 00	5	81,221 92
Perpetual Debenture Stock (Conditionally Guaranteed)	34,879,252 86	4	.....	34,879,252 86	4	1,395,170 12
	139,083,027 54	.....	1,802,953 92	148,782,100 86	.....	3,279,345 96
GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC AFFILIATED COMPANIES						
Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines						
Guaranteed by Province of Saskatchewan—						
1st Mortgage Saskatchewan Lines Sterling Bonds	9,874,062 00	4	394,962 48	11,309,706 00	4	394,962 48
Terminal Sterling Bonds	.....	4½	.....	1,881,792 00	4½	.....
Guaranteed by Province of Alberta—						
1st Mortgage Alberta Lines Sterling Bonds	1,153,764 00	4	46,150 56	1,153,764 00	4	46,150 56
1st Mortgage Alberta Lines Sterling Bonds	2,430,000 00	4	97,200 00	2,430,000 00	4	97,200 00
Grand Trunk Pacific Elevator Company						
5% 1st Mortgage Sterling Bonds	.....	.....	.....	1,862,352 00	.....	93,117 60
	13,457,826 00	.....	538,313 04	18,637,614 00	.....	631,430 64
Other Interest	.....	.....	Nil	.....	.....	66,670 76

SCHEDULE "E" (2)—*Continued*)

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY

INTEREST ON DEMAND AND SHORT TERM LOANS

	Principal Outstanding, Dec. 31, 1922	Interest Rate	Interest Accrued, Dec. 31, 1922	Principal Outstanding, Dec. 31, 1921	Interest Rate	Interest Accrued, Dec. 31, 1921
	$ cts.	%	$ cts.	$ cts.	%	$ cts.
Due Dominion of Canada—						
G.T.P. Loan Act, 1909	.....	4	* 64,657 53	.....	.....	.....
G.T.P. Loan Act, 1913	15,000,000 00	4	600,000 00	.....	.....	.....
Appropriation Act, 1916	7,081,783 45	4	424,907 00	7,081,783 45	4	424,907 00
Appropriation Act, 1917	5,038,053 72	6	302,283 22	5,038,053 72	6	302,283 22
Appropriation Act, 1918	7,471,399 93	6	448,284 00	7,471,399 93	6	448,284 00
Order-in-Council, September 5th-26th, October 24th and November 24th, 1914	6,000,000 00	6	360,000 00	6,000,000 00	6	360,000 00
	40,591,237 10	.....	2,200,131 75	25,591,237 10	.....	1,535,474 22
Receiver's Certificates	39,432,475 78	6	1,907,247 13	31,889,066 56	6	1,702,886 64
	.....	.....	4,107,378 88	.....	.....	3,238,360 86
Due Grand Trunk Railway—						
G.T.P. Loan Act, 1909	.....	.....	.....	10,000,000 00	4	400,000 00
G.T.P. Loan Act, 1913	.....	.....	.....	15,000,000 00	4	600,000 00
Advances G.T.P. Railway, G.T.P. Branch Lines and G.T.P. Saskatchewan Railway	11,491,320 65	5	574,566 01	11,491,320 65	5	574,566 02
Advanced to redeem G.T.P. Railway 5% Secured Note	9,712,406 65	5	584,000 00	9,720,000 00	5	485,733 70
Advanced to repay Loan Act, 1909	10,000,000 00	6	* 500,000 00	.....	6	.....
Interest on Coupons redeemed by Grand Trunk Railway	.....	.....	280,397 84	.....	.....	.....
Interest on Branch Lines Securities owned by Grand Trunk Railway	.....	4 & 4½	142,096 40	.....	4 & 4½	142,096 40
Advanced to G.T.P. Development Company	10,795,909 44	.....	.....	10,795,909 44	.....	539,795 48
	41,999,636 74	.....	2,081,060 25	57,007,230 09	.....	2,742,191 60

*NOTE.—$64,657.53 represents interest on loan of $10,000,000 from January 1 to February 28, 1922, being the date on which loan was transferred to Grand Trunk Railway System.

$500,000 represents interest on loan of $10,000,000 from February 28, to December 31, 1922, being the date on which loan was transferred from Dominion Government.

SCHEDULE "E" (3)

GRAND TRUNK SYSTEM (INCLUDING CENTRAL VERMONT RAILWAY)

Principal and Interest on Funded Debt—Years 1922 and 1921

	1922			1921		
	Principal Outstanding December 31st	Interest Rate	Interest Accrued	Principal Outstanding December 31st	Interest Rate	Interest Accrued
Grand Trunk Rly Co. of Canada—						
G.T.P. Perpetual Deb. Stock	20,782,491 67	5%	1,039,124,58	20,782,491 67	5%	1,039,124 58
G.W. Perpetual Deb. stoc.	13,252,322 67	5%	662,616 12	13,252,322 67	5%	662,616 12
G.T.R. Consolidated Stock	119,839,014 33	4%	4,793,560 56	119,839,014 33	4%	4,793,560 56
Nor. Rly. Perpetual Stock	1,499,979 67	4%	59,999 18	1,499,979 67	4%	59,999 18
Canada Atlantic 1st. Mort Bonds	16,000,092 00	4%	640.003 68	16,000,092 00	4%	640,003 68
Northern Railway 3rd Pref. Bonds	70,566 66	6%	4,234 00	70,566 66	6%	4,234 00
Second Equipt. Mortgage Bonds	.....	.....	*	.....	6%	21,593 40
Well, Grey & Bruce Bonds	259,393 32	Vs.	* 26,698 18	268,640 00	Vs.	28,223 37
Guaranteed Stock	60,833,333 33	4%	2,433,333 33	60,833,333 33	4%	2,433,333 33
Equipment Trust Notes "A"	.....	.....	* 2,955 00	197,000 00	4½%	19,207 50
Equipment Trust Notes "B"	.....	.....	* 8,820 00	336,000 00	4½%	23,940 00
Equipment Trust Notes "C"	224,000 00	4½%	*15,960 00	448,000 00	4½%	26,040 00
Equipment Trust Notes "D"	1,250,000 00	5%	* 66,666 66	1,500,000 00	5%	79,166 66
Equipment Trust Notes U.S.R.A.	778,700 00	6%	* 46,722 00	838,600 00	6%	50,316 00
Whipple Car Shop Bonds	.....	6%	* 2,475 00	45,000 00	6%	4,350 00
Notes Payable Whipple Car Shops	.....	.....	*	100,000 00	5%	5,000 00
3 year 6% Secured Notes	.....	.....	*	.....	.....	657,000 00
2 year S.F.G. Debenture Bonds	24,743,000 00	7%	* 1,732,010 00	24,743,000 00	7%	1,741,824 00
Equipment Trust Certificates "F"	11,230,000 00	6½%	† 736,949 06	11,586,000 00	6½%	703,994 99
15 year S.F.G. Debenture Bonds	25,000,000 00	6%	† 1,500,000 00	25,000 000 00	6%	391,666 67
Dominion Government Loan 1918	.....	.....	*	.....	.....	35,624 00
Dominion Government Loan 1919	.....	.....	*	.....	6%	33,288 00
Dominion Government Loan 1920–1921	25,000,000 00	6%	† 1,500,000 00	25,000,000 00	6%	1,481,038 81
Dominion Government Loan 1921–1922	56,442,019 88	6%	† 3,154,731 28	48,702,154 42	6%	1,557,469 85
Dominion Government Loan 1922–1923	3,118,322 72	6%	† 91,031 33	.....	.....	.....
Total G.T. Rly. Company of Canada	380,323,236 25	.....	†18,517,889 96	371,042,194 75	.....	16,492,614 70
Grand Trunk Western Rly. Company—						
1st Mortgage Bonds	14,999,720 00	4%	599,988 80	14,999,720 00	4%	599,988 80
Consolidated Mortgage Bonds	11,541,000 00	4%	461,640 00	11,541,000 00	4%	461,640 00
G.T. Jct. Rly. Consolidated Mortgage Bonds	3,872,000 00	5%	193,600 00	3,872,000 00	5%	193,600 00
Equipment Gold Notes	2,684,500 00	6%	* 161,586 25	2,891,000 00	6%	178,203 00
Indebtedness for Cars	.....	.....	*	1,098,700 00	6¾ & 8%	82,174 76
Indebtedness for Advances	2,650,196 86	5%	† 123,052 85	1,874,583 60	5%	93,729 18
Total G.T. Western Rly. Company	$35,747,416 86	.....	* 1,539,867 90	36,277,003 60	.....	1,609,335 74

*Decrease. †Increase.

[Mr. Graham.]

SCHEDULE "E" (3)—*Concluded*

	1922			1921		
	Principal Outstanding December 31st	Interest Rate	Interest Accrued	Principal Outstanding December 31st	Interest Rate	Interest Accrued
Detroit, Grand Haven & Milwaukee Rly. Co.—						
Equipment Mtge Bonds	2,000,000 00	7%	140,000 00	2,000,000 00	7%	140,000 00
Consolidated Equipment Mtge. Bonds	3,200,000 00	7%	224,000 00	3,200,000 00	7%	224,000 00
Mowatts Mtge. Bonds	146,000 00	5%	7,300 00	146,000 00	5%	7,300 00
South Lyons Land	80,000 00	6½%	5,200 00	80,000 00	6½%	5,200 00
Indebtedness for Steamers	285,000 00	Vs.	16,010 30	285,000 00	.....	16,010 30
Indebtedness for Advances	1,710,826 45	5%	†80,730,68	1,505,053 39	5%	75,252 66
Total Detroit, Grand Haven & Milwaukee Rly. Company	$ 7,421,826 45	.....	* 473,240 98	7,216,053 39	.....	467,762 96
Total G.T. Western Lines	$43,169,243 31	.....	* 2,013,108 88	43,484,056 99	.....	2,077,098 70
Central Vermont Railway—						
Refunding Mort. Gold Bonds	13,560,700 00	5%	* 642,868 35	13,161,500 00	5%	654,915 62
Montreal & Province Lines Bonds	200,000 00	4%	8,000 00	200,000 00	4%	8,000 00
Stanstead, Shefford & Chambly Bonds	155,865 00	4%	6,234 60	155,865 00	4%	6,234 60
Equipt. Trust Bonds "D"	.....	.....	* 204 17	49,000 00	5%	4,083 33
Equipt. Trust Bonds "E"	401,000 00	6%	† 7,050 00	.....	.....	.....
U.S. Govt. Note	52,000 00	6%	† 3,589 68	65,000 00	6%	1,551 51
U.S. Govt. Note	128,000 00	6%	† 7,680 00	128,000 00	6%	1,085 22
American Locomotive Note	50,000 00	6%	† 6,750 00	.....	.....	.....
Total Central Vermont Rly.	$14,547,565 00	.....	† 682,376 80	13,759,365 00	.....	675,870 28

*Decrease. †Increase.

SCHEDULE "F"

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

Total Advances by Dominion Government to December 31st, 1922

——	Total	Construction and Betterments	Equipment	Repayment of Loans, including Equipment Trust Obligations	Operating Deficit	Fixed Charges
CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Total Advances to Dec. 31, 1921	251,088,248 88	76,318,790 29	37,362,781 00	32,225,080 16	16,748,874 00	88,432,723 43
Total Advances during year ended December 31, 1922	49,826,881 29	13,251,014 30	719,046 85	19,254,893 33	4,344,418 27	12,257,508 54
Less Repayments	*2,115,538 45*			*2,115,538 45*		
Total Advances to December 31, 1922	298,799,591 72	89,569,804 59	38,081,827 85	49,364,435 04	21,093,292 27	100,690,231 97
Total Accrued Interest on above Advances to December 31, 1922—$51,233,156.66.						
GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY						
Total Advances to Dec. 31, 1921	90,724,394 52	38,520,687 42	6,417,729 83		21,433,043 02	24,352,934 25
Total Advances during year ended December 31, 1922	9,813,640 23	2,991,387 24			4,552,021 98	2,270,231 01
Less Transfer to Grand Trunk Railway	*10,000,000 00*	*10,000,000 00*				
Total Advances to Dec. 31, 1922	90,538,034 75	31,512,074 66	6,417,729 83		25,985,065 00	26,623,165 26
Total Accrued Interest on above Advances to December 31, 1922—$20,924,521.32.						
GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY SYSTEM						
Total Advances to Dec. 31, 1921	73,702,154 42	612,322 46	7,246,495 98	31,370,661 71	18,514,130 87	15,958,543 40
Total Advances during year ended December 31, 1922	10,858,188 18	3,142,680 96		2,487,778 44	3,272,385 22	1,955,343 56
Total Advances to Dec. 31, 1922	84,560,342 60	3,755,003 42	7,246,495 98	33,858,440 15	21,786,516 09	17,913,886 96
Total Accrued Interest on above Advances to December 31, 1922—$7,967,405.29.						

SCHEDULE "G" (1)

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

STEAM LINES

Comparative Summary of Operating Results for 12 Months ending December 31st, 1922-1921

——	1922	1921	Increase	Decrease	Change
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	%
Operating Revenues—					
Freight	89,726,925 51	93,628,537 37	.....	3,901,611 86	4·17
Passenger	17,919,602 17	20,208,820 19	.....	2,289,218 02	11·33
Mail	2,094,621 29	2,026,600 65	68,020 64	.....	3·36
Express	3,433,612 28	3,664,424 20	.....	230,811 92	6·30
Other Freight Train	6,505 35	7,692 55	.....	1,187 20	15·43
Other Passenger Train	1,973,395 50	2,166,797 30	.....	193,401 80	8·93
All other	3,455,778 78	3,614,559 57	.....	158,780 79	4·39
Total Ry. Opertg. Revenues	118,610,440 88	125,317,431 83	.....	6,706,990 95	5·35
Operating Expenses—					
Mtce. of Way and Structures	31,033,118 35	33,555,870 76	.....	2,522,752 41	7·52
Mtce. of Equipment	30,264,956 08	31,460,270 70	.....	1,195,314 62	3·80
Traffic	2,861,695 68	2,541,874 83	319,820 83	.....	12·58
Transportation	59,887,257 53	71,119,354 60	.....	11,232,097 07	15·79
Miscellaneous Operations	1,831,339 01	2,041,495 78	.....	210,156 77	10·29
General	3,589,650 11	3,002,365 55	587,284 56	.....	19·56
Trans. for Investment, Cr.	859,921 66	1,987,543 45	.....	1,127,621 79	56·73
Total Ry. Opertg. Expenses	128,608,095 10	141,733,688 77	.....	13,125,593 67	9·26
Net Operating Revenue—					
Operating Ratio	*9,997,654 22*	*16,416,256 94*	6,418,602 72	.....	39·10
	108·42%	113·09%	.....	4 67	4·12
Operating Statistics—					
Av. Miles of Road Operated	17,225,30	17,110,30	115 00	.....	0·67
Tons moved 1 Mile—All Frt	11,470,240,341	10,411,510,971	1,058,729,370	.....	10·17
Freight Train Miles*	20,918,121	21,571,041	.....	452,920	3·03
Passenger Train Miles*	12,737,487	13,198,116	.....	460,629	3·49
Special Train Miles	40,258	48,684	.....	8,426	17·31
Total Revenue Train Miles	33,695,866	34,817,841	.....	1,021,975	2·94
Non-Revenue Train Miles	2,224,061	1,785,735	438,326	.....	24·55
Freight Car Miles, Loaded—Tr.	424,635,893	389,521,482	35,114,411	.....	9·01
Freight Car Miles, Empty—Tr.	219,857,824	211,428,758	8,429,066	.....	3·99
Passenger Train Car Miles	92,511,668	93,042,229	.....	530,561	0·57
Average per Traffic Train Mile—					
Operating Revenue	3 52	3 60	.....	0·08	2·22
Operating Expenses	3 82	4 07	.....	0·25	6·14
Net Earnings	*0 30*	*0 47*	0 17	.....	36·17
Average per Mile of Road Operated—					
Operating Revenue	6,885 33	7,324 09	.....	438 16	5·98
Operating Expenses	7,466 23	8,283 53	.....	817 30	9·87
Mtce. of Way and Structures	1,801 60	1,961 15	.....	159 55	8·14
Tons moved 1 Mile—All freight	665,895	608,494	57,501	.....	9·43
Average per Freight Train—*					
Tons of Freight—All Freight	548 34	482·66	65·68	.....	13·61
Loaded Freight Cars—Trans	20·30	18·06	2·24	.....	12·40
Empty Freight Cars—Trans	10·51	9·80	0·71	.....	7·24
Passg. Train Cars per Passgr. Train	7·26	7·05	0·21	.....	2·98
Av. Tons per Loaded Freight Car	27·01	26·73	0·28	.....	1·05
Percent Loaded to Total F.C. Miles	65·89	64·82	1·07	.....	1·65
Ratio of Optg. Exp. to Optg. Rev	108·18	113·10	.....	4·92	4·35

*Contains proportion of mixed train miles.

SCHEDULE "G" (1)—*Concluded*

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

Comparative Statement of Traffic, 1922-21

(Exclusive of Elec. Lines)

—	1922	1921	Increase or Decrease		Inc.	Dec.
					%	%
1. PASSENGERS CARRIED—						
Canadian Government	6,249,545	6,317,130	Dec.	67,585	.....	1·07
Canadian Northern & G.T.P.	5,143,580	5,671,064	Dec.	527,476	.....	9·30
Canadian National*	11,331,226	11,938,149	Dec.	606,923	.....	5·08
2. No. PASSENGERS CARRIED 1 MILE—						
Canadian Government	293,019,125	301,525,666	Dec.	8,506,541	.....	2·82
Canadian Northern & G.T.P.	396,372,817	413,222,551	Dec.	16,849,734	.....	4·08
Canadian National	689,391,942	714,748,217	Dec.	25,356,275	.....	3·55
3. TONS OF REV. FREIGHT HANDLED—						
Canadian Government	9,667,420	8,377,464	Inc.	1,289,956	15·40	.....
Canadian Northern & G.T.P.	15,897,096	16,257,869	Dec.	360,773	.....	2·22
Canadian National*	22,426,403	21,261,600	Inc.	1,164,803	5·47	.....
4. TONS REV. FRT. MOVED 1 MILE—						
Canadian Government	3,360,800,955	2,712,519,996	Inc.	648,280,959	23·90	.....
Canadian Northern & G.T.P.	6,730,308,713	6,285,193,516	Inc.	445,115,197	7·06	.....
Canadian National	10,091,109,668	8,997,713,512	Inc.	1,093,396,156	12·15	.....

—	Per Ton Freight		Per Passenger	
	1922	1921	1922	1921
5. AVERAGE HAUL—				
Canadian Government	347·64	323·79	46·89	47·73
Canadian Northern & G.T.P.	423·37	386·59	77·06	72·87
Canadian National*	449·97	423·19	60·84	59·87

*Less System Interline.

SCHEDULE "G" (2)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF OPERATING RESULTS AND DETAILED STATISTICAL INFORMATION—YEARS 1922 AND 1921

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY SYSTEM

——	Year 1922	Year 1921	Increase or Decrease	% of Increase or Decrease
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	
Passenger Revenue	17,566,692 55	19,235,152 10	*1,668,459 55*	*8·67*
Freight Revenue	79,716,164 68	74,003,180 71	5,712,983 97	7·72
Other Revenue	9,065,649 88	8,723,471 71	342,178 17	3·92
Total Operating Revenue	106,348,507 11	101,961,804 52	4,386,702 59	4·30
Maintenance of Way and Structures	14,443,436 90	17,342,492 84	*2,899,055 94*	*16·72*
Maintenance of Equipment	25,534,095 46	23,843,169 19	1,690,926 27	7·09
Traffic	2,388,205 97	2,300,614 59	87,591 38	3·81
Transportation—Rail	46,871,731 69	48,928,295 25	*2,056,563 56*	*4·20*
Miscellaneous	666,470 19	728,139 68	*61,669 49*	*8·47*
General	3,653,288 74	4,295,753 59	*642,464 85*	*14·95*
Transportation for Investment—Cr	*32,063 34*	*25,984 69*	*6,078 65*	*23·39*
Total Operating Expenses	93,525,165 61	97,412,480 45	*3,887,314 84*	*3·99*
Operating Ratio	87·94%	95·53%	*7·59%*	*7·95%*
Net Revenue from Railway Operations	12,823,341 50	4,549,324 07	8,274,017 43	181·87
Railway Tax Accruals	2,523,538 57	2,412,912 92	110,625 65	4·58
Uncollectable Rly. Revenues	34,777 12	23,919 38	10,857 74	45·39
Hire of Equipment—"Dr"	1,270,560 66	1,026,924 90	243,635 76	23·72
Joint Facility Rent—"Cr."	345,051 78	299,015 62	46,036 16	15·40
Net Operating Income	9,399,516 93	1,384,582 49	7,954,934 44	574·53
Revenue Tons Carried	29,942,949	27,254,786	2,688,163	9·86
Revenue Tons Carried one Mile	6,341,677,948	5,604,187,795	737,490,153	13·16
Average Rate per Ton	$ 2 66	$ 2 72	$ *0 06*	*2·21*
Average Rate per Ton per Mile	c. 1·26	c. 1·32	c. *0·06*	*4·54*
Average Distance Hauled	211·79	205·62	6·17	3·00
Revenue Passengers Carried	12,401,927	13,526,108	*1,124,181*	*8·31*
Revenue Passengers Carried one Mile	597,916,068	622,495,530	*24,579,462*	*3·95*
Average Rate per Passenger	$ 1 42	$ 1 42	.....	.....
" " per Mile	c. 2·94	c. 3·09	c. *0·15*	*4·85*
Average Distance Hauled	48·21	46·02	2·19	4·76
Revenue Train Miles	23,603,634	23,457,661	145,973	0·62
Earnings per Revenue Train Mile	$ 4 50	$ 4 35	$ 0 15	3·45
Expenses per Revenue Train Mile	3 26	4 15	*0 19*	*4·58*
Net Earnings " "	0 54	0 20	0 34	170·00
Employees and Compensation, Etc.—				
Average number of Employees	38,359	39,234	*875*	*2·23*
Average Wage	$ 1,507 96	$ 1,595 52	$ *87 56*	*5·49*
Total Operating Expenses	93,525,165 61	97,412,480 45	*3,887,314 84*	*3·99*
Total Payroll Expenses	54,016,242 75	57,905,998 84	*3,889,756 09*	*6·72*
Payroll to Operating Expenses	57·76%	59·44%	*1·68%*	*2·83*
Total Fuel for Locomotives	14,412,077 01	13,050,864 04	1,361,212 97	10·43
Fuel to Operating Expenses	15·41%	13·40%	2·01%	15·00

SCHEDULE "G" (3)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF OPERATING RESULTS AND DETAILED STATISTICAL INFORMATION—YEARS 1922 AND 1921

CENTRAL VERMONT RAILWAY

	Year 1922	Year 1921	Increase or Decrease	% of Increase or Decrease
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	
Passenger Revenue	1,207,451 76	1,362,007 56	*154,555 80*	*11·34*
Freight Revenue	5,677,849 89	5,143,566 53	534,283 36	10·39
Other Revenue	741,324 54	630,178 97	111,145 57	17 64
Total Operating Revenue	7,626,626 19	7,135,753 06	490,873 13	6·88
Maintenance of Way and Structures	1,045,831 74	1,304,427 26	*258,595 52*	*19·82*
Maintenance of Equipment	1,092,053 62	1,604,438 61	*512,384 99*	*31·93*
Traffic	150,454 71	145,934 57	4,520 14	3·10
Transportation—Rail	3,949,302 15	3,959,970 20	*10,668 05*	*0·27*
Miscellaneous	18,933 67	19,173 95	*240 28*	*1·25*
General	266,181 59	280,394 91	*14,213 32*	*5·07*
Transportation for Investment—Cr	*2,656 86*	*1,780 02*	*876 84*	*49·26*
Total Operating Expenses	6,520,100 62	7,312,559 48	*792,458 86*	*10·84*
Operating Ratio	85·49%	102·48%	*16·99%*	*16·57%*
Net Revenue from Railway Operations	1,106,525 57	*176,806 42*	1,283,331 99	725·84
Railway Tax Accruals	223,375 59	237,032 08	*13,656 49*	*5·76*
Uncollectable Rly Revenue	1,774 90	631 29	1,143 61	181·15
Hire of Equipment—"Dr."	506,519 18	255,986 69	250,532 49	97·87
Joint Facility Rent—"Cr."	25,920 10	24,527 61	1,392 49	5·68
Net Operating Income	400,776 00	*645,928 87*	1,046,704 87	162·05
Revenue Tons Carried	3,865,689	3,428,344	437,345	12·75
Revenue Tons Carried per Mile	369,128,514	298,520,857	70,607,657	23·65
Average Rate per Ton	$ 1 46	$ 1 49	$ *0 03*	*2·01*
Average Rate per Ton per Mile	c. 1·53	c. 1·72	c. *0·19*	*11·04*
Average Distance Hauled	95·49	87·07	8·42	9·67
Revenue Passengers Carried	1,015,097	1,235,122	*220,025*	*17·81*
Revenue Passengers Carried one Mile	33,149,915	36,890,101	*3,740,186*	*10·14*
Average Rate per Passenger	$ 1 19	$ 1 19	$ 0 09	8·18
" " per Mile	c. 3·64	c. 3·69	c. *0·05*	*1·35*
Average Distance Hauled	32·66	29·87	2·79	9·34
Revenue Train Miles	1,884,060	1,870,166	13,894	0·74
Earnings per Revenue Train Mile	$ 4 05	$ 3 82	$ 0 23	6·02
Expenses per Revenue Train Mile	3 46	3 91	*0 45*	*11·51*
Net Earnings " "	0 59	*0 09*	0 68	755·55
Employees and Compensation, Etc.—				
Average Number of Employees	2,763	2,859	*96*	*3·36*
Average Wage	$ 1,566 91	$ 1,597 69	$ *30 78*	*1·93*
Total Operating Expenses	6,520,100 62	7,312,559 48	*792,458 86*	*10·83*
Total Payroll Expenses	4,109,420 19	4,314,835 58	*205,415 39*	*4·76*
Payroll to Operating Expenses	63·03%	59·01%	4·02%	6·81
Total Fuel for Locomotives	1,202,160 97	1,093,575 65	108,585 32	9·93
Fuel to Operating Expenses	18·44%	14·96%	3·48%	23·26

SCHEDULE "G" (4)

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY SYSTEM (INCLUDING CENTRAL VERMONT RAILWAY)

Years 1922 and 1921

DISTRIBUTION OF OPERATING REVENUES

—	Freight	Passenger	Mail	Express	Other Revenue from Transportation	Revenue from operations other than Transportation	Total
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
1922							
Canadian Lines	56,561,067 87	14,342,003 03	1,212,433 28	2,883,700 28	1,202,740 35	1,498,074 42	77,700,019 23
Western Lines	20,934,597 45	2,751,016 77	327,731 59	495,738 82	701,951 88	314,268 47	25,525,304 98
New England Lines	2,220,499 36	473,672 75	38,408 70	45,169 08	54,817 65	290,615 36	3,123,182 90
Central Vermont	5,677,849 89	1,207,451 76	115,540 93	189,805 25	293,268 75	142,709 61	7,626,626 19
Total	85,394,014 57	18,774,144 31	1,694,114 50	3,614,413 43	2,252,778 63	2,245,667 86	113,975,133 30
1921							
Canadian Lines	54,239,903 65	15,510,164 08	1,133,737 52	3,285,110 86	1,169,414 66	1,519,701 50	76,858,032 27
Western Lines	17,731,671 85	3,207,277 53	329,093 86	218,627 08	396,466 51	310,119 99	22,193,256 82
New England Lines	2,031,605 21	517,710 49	38,595 55	13,759 00	63,628 59	245,216 59	2,910,515 43
Central Vermont	5,143,566 53	1,362,007 56	123,431 64	119,428 99	262,734 87	124,583 47	7,135,753 06
Total	79,146,747 24	20,597,159 56	1,624,858 57	3,636,925 93	1,892,244 63	2,199,621 55	109,097,557 58
Increase or Decrease	6,247,267 33	*1,823,015 35*	69,255 93	*22,512 50*	360,534 00	46,046 31	4,877,575 72
Per cent of Increase or Decrease	7·89	*8·85*	4·26	*0·62*	19·05	2·10	4·47

SCHEDULE G (4)—*Continued*

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY SYSTEM (INCLUDING CENTRAL VERMONT RAILWAY)

Year 1922 and 1921

DISTRIBUTION OF OPERATING EXPENSES

——	Maintenance of Way and Structures	Maintenance of Equipment	Traffic	Transportation	Miscellaneous	General	Transporation for Investment Cr.	Total
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
1922								
Canadian Lines	10,740,705 72	20,792,314 43	1,815,853 22	34,020,648 66	414,133 95	2,560,590 96	*26,433 49*	70,317,813 45
Western Lines	2,952,528 94	4,293,834 08	509,507 62	11,247,629 78	84,791 57	944,403 88	*5,617 09*	20,027,078 78
New England Lines	750,202 24	447,946 95	62,845 13	1,603,453 25	167,544 67	148,293 90	*12 76*	3,180,273 38
Central Vermont	1,045,831 74	1,092,053 62	150,454 71	3,949,302 15	18,933 67	266,181 59	*2,656 86*	6,520,100 62
Total	15,489,268 64	26,626,149 08	2,538,660 68	50,821,033 84	685,403 86	3,919,470 33	*34,720 20*	100,045,266 23
1921								
Canadian Lines	12,862,797 47	17,809,497 41	1,583,830 08	35,574,797 57	462,320 04	2,904,024 32	*17,974 09*	71,179,292 80
Western Lines	3,645,973 97	5,422,977 19	658,956 14	11,672,504 08	91,864 32	1,156,028 48	*7,122 25*	22,641,181 93
New England Lines	833,721 40	610,694 59	57,828 37	1,680,993 60	173,955 32	235,700 79	*888 35*	3,592,005 72
Central Vermont	1,304,427 26	1,604,438 61	145,934 57	3,959,970 20	19,173 95	280,394 91	*1,780 02*	7,312,559 48
Total	18,646,920 10	25,447,607 80	2,446,549 16	52,888,265 45	747,313 63	4,576,148 50	*27,764 71*	104,725,039 93
Increase or Decrease	*3,157,651 46*	1,178,541 28	92,111 52	*2,067,231 61*	*61,909 77*	*656,678 17*	6,955 49	*4,679,773 70*
Per cent of Increase or Decrease	*16·93*	4·63	3·76	*3·91*	*8·28*	*4·35*	25·05	*4·47*

Increase—Roman. Decrease—Italic.

SCHEDULE "H" (1)

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

STATEMENT OF OPERATING REVENUE PAID IN LABOUR

Years 1922 and 1921

——	1922	1921	Increase or Decrease	% Inc. or Dec.
Gross Earnings—	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	
Canadian Northern	60,679,033 37	69,088,474 16	D. 8,409,440 79	D. 12·17
Canadian Government	40,939,945 76	41,275,314 84	D. 335,369 08	D. 0·81
Grand Trunk Pacific	18,516,977 58	16,638,677 64	I. 1,878,299 94	I. 11·29
System	120,135,956 71	127,002,466 64	D. 6,866,509 93	D. 5·41
Operating Labour—				
Canadian Northern	36,209,864 10	42,233,504 97	D. 6,023,640 87	D. 14·26
Canadian Government	23,715,240 30	28,842,633 11	D. 5,127,392 81	D. 17·78
Grand Trunk Pacific	13,044,274 08	11,498,120 09	I. 1,546,153 99	I. 13·45
System	72,969,378 48	82,574,258 17	D. 9,604,879 69	D. 11·63
Ratio of Labour to Gross Earnings—				
Canadian Northern	59·67	61·13	D. 1·46	D. 2·39
Canadian Government	57·92	69·88	D. 11·96	D. 17·12
Grand Trunk Pacific	70·44	69·10	I. 1·34	I. 1·94
System	60·74	65·02	D. 4·28	D. 6·58
Comparison of Payroll— (Including Betterments)				
Canadian National	82,390,245 42	88,948,031 14	D. 6,557,785 72	D. 7·37

AVERAGE NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES

——	1922	1921	Inc or Dec.	%
Can. Northern and Grand Trunk Pacific	37,888	39,480	D. 1,592	4·03
Canadian Government	20,510	20,835	D. 325	1·56
	58,398	60,315	D. 1,917	3·18

SCHEDULE "H" (2)

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

RATIO OF EXPENSES TO GROSS EARNINGS

——	1922	1921	Inc. or Dec.	% Inc. or Dec.
Labour—				
Canadian Northern	59·67	61·13	D. 1·46	D. 2·39
Canadian Government	57·92	69·88	D. 11·96	D. 17·12
Grand Trunk Pacific	70·44	69·10	I. 1·34	I. 1·94
CANADIAN NATIONAL	60·74	65·02	D. 4·28	D. 6·58
Fuel—				
Canadian Northern	13·29	15·63	D. 2·34	D. 14·97
Canadian Government	15·00	17·91	D. 2·91	D. 16·25
Grand Trunk Pacific	14·20	19·24	D. 5·04	D. 26·20
CANADIAN NATIONAL	14·01	16·84	D. 2·83	D. 16·80
Other—				
Canadian Northern	31·89	32·61	D. 0·72	D. 2·21
Canadian Government	33·18	26·06	I. 7·12	I. 27·32
Grand Trunk Pacific	38·54	35·87	I. 2·67	I. 7·44
CANADIAN NATIONAL	33·35	30·91	I. 2·44	I. 7·89
Total—				
Canadian Northern	104·85	109·37	D. 4·52	D. 4·13
Canadian Government	106·10	113·85	D. 7·75	D. 6·81
Grand Trunk Pacific	123·18	124·21	D. 1·03	D. 0·83
CANADIAN NATIONAL	108·10	112·77	D. 4·67	D. 4·14

SCHEDULE "H" (3)

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

DISTRIBUTION OF OPERATING EXPENSES

——	1922
	%
Labour—	
Canadian Northern	56·91
Canadian Government	54·60
Grand Trunk Pacific	57·19
Total, Canadian National	56·19
Fuel (Loco.)—	
Canadian Northern	12·68
Canadian Government	14·13
Grand Trunk Pacific	11·52
Total, Canadian National	12·96
Other—	
Canadian Northern	30·41
Canadian Government	31·27
Grand Trunk Pacific	31·29
Total, Canadian National	30·85
	100·00

SCHEDULE "H" (4)

DISBURSAL OF THE EXPENDITURE DOLLAR

Year 1922

	G. T. Ry. System	C. V. Ry. Co.
	Cts.	Cts.
Wages	57¾	63
Fuel for Locomotives	15½	18½
Other Operating Expenses	26¾	18½
Total	100	100

DISBURSAL OF THE REVENUE DOLLAR

Year 1922

	G. T. Ry. System	C. V. Ry. Co.
	Cts.	Cts.
Wages	50¾	54
Fuel for Locomotives	13¾	15¾
Other Operating Expenses	23½	15¾
Total	88	85½
Balance required to meet Taxes, Rentals, Fixed Charges, etc	19¾	24¼
	107¾	109¾
Over expenditure	7¾	9¾
Total	100	100

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

SCHEDULE "I" (1)

Train Mileage

——	1922	1921	Increase or Decrease	% Increase or Decrease
Passenger—				
Canadian Government Railways	4,581,949	4,753,004	*171,055*	*3·6*
Canadian Northern Railway	5,949,755	6,348,272	*398,517*	*6·3*
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway	1,711,546	1,606,093	105,453	6·6
Canadian National Railways	12,243,250	12,707 369	*464,119*	*3·7*
Mixed—				
Canadian Government Railways	803,390	1,141,457	*388,067*	*20·6*
Canadian Northern Railway	1,836,926	1,784,768	52,158	2·9
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway	304,918	368,075	*63,157*	*17·2*
Canadian National Railways	2,945,234	3,294,300	*349,066*	*10·6*
Freight—				
Canadian Government Railways	5,839,937	5,360,057	479,880	9·0
Canadian Northern Railway	9,426,244	10,305,947	*879,703*	*8·5*
Grand Trunk Pacific	3,206,447	3,111,247	95,200	3·1
Canadian National Railways	18,472,628	18,777,251	*304,623*	*1·6*
Special—				
Canadian Government Railways	10,225	14,629	*4,404*	*30·1*
Canadian Northern Railway	17,378	28,496	*11·118*	*39·0*
Grand Trunk Pacific	7,031	8,782	*1,751*	*19·9*
Canadian National Railways	34,634	51,907	*17,273*	*33·3*
Work—				
Canadian Government Railways	522,337	318,070	204,267	32·8
Canadian Northern Railway	1,185,027	1,124,793	60,234	5·4
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway	527,900	412,619	115,281	28·6
Canadian National Railways	2,235,264	1,855,482	379,782	20·5
Total—				
Canadian Government Railways	11,757,838	11,587,217	170,621	1·5
Canadian Northern Railway	18,415,330	19,592,276	*1,176,946*	*6·0*
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway	5,757,842	5,506,816	251,026	4·6
Canadian National Railways	35,931,010	36,686,309	*755,299*	*2·6*

SCHEDULE "I" (2)

GRAND TRUNK SYSTEM (INCLUDING CENTRAL VERMONT RAILWAY)

Train Mileage

	1922	1921	Increase or Decrease	Increase or Decrease
Passenger—				
Canadian Lines	7,524,503	7,733,973	*209,470*	*2·71*
Western Lines	1,967,427	2,307,987	*340,560*	*14·76*
New England Lines	296,698	345,220	*48,522*	*14·06*
Central Vermont	908,282	1,029,060	*120,778*	*11·74*
	10,696,910	11,416,240	*719,330*	*6·30*
Mixed—				
Canadian Lines	709,961	714,067	*4,106*	*·58*
Western Lines	31,050	40,078	*9,028*	*22·53*
New England Lines	.....	.....	.....	.....
Central Vermont	59,473	66,606	*7,133*	*10·71*
	800,484	820,751	*20,267*	*2·47*
Freight—				
Canadian Lines	9,604,682	9,130,212	474,470	5·20
Western Lines	3,010,504	2,749,979	260,525	9·41
New England Lines	444,043	421,998	22,045	5·22
Central Vermont	910,678	774,190	136,488	17·63
	13,969,907	13,076,379	893,528	6·83
Special—				
Canadian Lines	7,578	9,023	*1,445*	*16·01*
Western Lines	6,344	4,977	1,367	27·47
New England Lines	844	147	697	474·15
Central Vermont	1,355	308	1,047	339·94
	16,121	14,455	1,666	11·53
Work—				
Canadian Lines	595,304	547,379	47,925	8·76
Western Lines	53,783	99,672	*45,889*	*46·04*
New England Lines	8,374	10,172	*1,798*	*17·68*
Central Vermont	19,677	38,700	*19,023*	*49·15*
	677,138	695,923	*18,785*	*2·70*
Total—				
Canadian Lines	18,442,028	18,134,654	307,374	1·70
Western Lines	5,069,108	5,202,693	*133,585*	*2·57*
New England Lines	749,959	777,537	*27,578*	*3·55*
Central Vermont	1,899,465	1,908,864	*9,399*	*·49*
	26,160,560	26,023,748	136,812	·53

Increase—Roman.
Decrease—Italic.

SCHEDULE "J" (1)

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

STATEMENT showing Details of Equipment on Hand December 31, 1921; Deliveries, Retirements and Position at December 31, 1922

—	December 31, 1921	Retirements during the year	Delivered during the year	December 31, 1922
LOCOMOTIVES—				
Passenger—Freight	1,733	24	.....	1,709
Switching	227	.....	2	229
Electric Locomotives	13	.....	.....	13
Total Locomotives	1,973	24	2	1,951
Passenger Equipment—				
First Class Cars	477	9	.....	468
Second Class Cars	230	9	.....	221
Combination Cars	195	7	3	191
Emigrant Cars	342	5	1	338
Dining Cars	73	1	.....	72
Parlour Cars	67	1	10	76
Sleeping Cars	222	5	1	218
Postal Cars	55	.....	2	57
Baggage and Express Cars	565	4	.....	561
Business and Pay Cars	66	3	.....	63
Other Cars in Pass. Service	83	.....	9	92
Total Pass. Equipment	2,375	44	26	2,357
Freight Equipment—				
Box Cars	55,833	1,279	105	54,659
Flat Cars	9,586	649	51	8,988
Stock Cars	3,825	25	3	3,803
Coal Cars	8,259	128	333	8,464
Tank Cars	71	3	.....	68
Refrigerator Cars	1,800	15	1	1,786
Other Cars in Frt. Service	1,595	36	68	1,627
Total Freight Equipment	80,969	2,135	561	79,395
Work Equipment—				
Gravel Cars	479	3	2	478
Derrick Cars	187	15	7	179
Caboose Cars	1,049	34	4	1,019
Other Road Cars	3,419	226	861	4,054
Total Work Equipment	5,134	278	874	5,730
Total Cars	88,478	2,457	1,461	87,482

SCHEDULE "J" (2)

STATEMENT Showing Details of Equipment on Hand January 1st, 1922, Additions, Retirements and Position at December 31st, 1922

	Grand Trunk Railway, Including the Central Vermont Railway			
	Number on Hand Jan. 1, 1922	Additional during the Year	Retirements during the Year	Number on Hand Dec. 31, 1922
Locomotives—				
Passenger	339	.....	11	328
Freight	902	5	6	901
Switching	251	10	1	260
Electric	6	.....	.....	6
	1,498	15	18	1,495
Passenger Service Cars—				
Coaches	586	.....	4	582
Combination Cars	109	.....	7	102
Dining Cars	24	.....	.....	24
Parlour Cars	32	.....	.....	32
Sleeping Cars	.....	.....	.....	.....
Postal Cars	42	1	1	42
Baggage and Express Cars	374	6	3	377
Other Passenger Cars	43	7	1	49
	1,210	14	16	1,208
Freight Service Cars—				
Box Cars	32,380	325	1,068	31,637
Flat Cars	3,931	43	155	3,819
Stock Cars	1,517	.....	14	1,503
Coal Cars	7,031	.....	8	7,023
Tank Cars	100	.....	.....	100
Refrigerator Cars	1,651	.....	262	1,389
Caboose Cars	711	31	25	717
	47,321	399	1,532	46,188
In Company's Service—				
Officers' and Pay Cars	33	2	1	34
Gravel Cars	606	.....	7	599
Derrick Cars	43	4	.....	47
Other Road Cars	1,873	86	102	1,857
	2,555	92	110	2,537
Floating Equipment—				
Car Ferries	3	.....	.....	3

SCHEDULE "J" (3)

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAY COMPANY

Statement of New Equipment Ordered during 1923

No of Items	Description of Equipment	Name of Builder	Price	Total
8	Mikado Type Locomotives	American Locomotive Works	$ 56,625 00	$ 453,000 00
10	Mikado Type Locomotives	Can. Loco. Co., Ltd	66,500 00	665,000 00
35	Mikado Type Locomotives	Montreal Loco. Works, Ltd	66,500 00	2,327,500 00
3	Six Wheel Switching Locomotives	Lima Locomotive Works	40,000 00	120,000 00
5	Eight Wheel Switching (Transfer Type) Locomotives.	Lima Locomotive Works	51,700 00	258,500 00
16	Mountain Type Locomotives	Can. Loco. Co., Ltd	74,500 00	1,192,000 00
30	Steel Standard Sleepers	Can. Car & Foundry Co., Ltd	49,400 00	1,482,000 00
35	Steel First Class Coaches	Can. Car & Foundry Co., Ltd	35,443 81	1,240,533 35
10	Steel Mail Cars	Can. Car & Foundry Co., Ltd	29,650 00	296,500 00
20	Steel Baggage Cars	Can. Car & Foundry Co., Ltd	24,750 00	495,000 00
10	Steel Baggage Cars	National Steel Car Co., Ltd	24,750 00	247,500 00
50	Steel Underframe Express Refrigerator Cars.	National Steel Car Co., Ltd	10,550 00	527,500 00
250	Freight Refrigerator Cars	American Car & Foundry Co	3,132 11	783,027 50
1000	40-ton Steel Frame Box Cars	Can. Car & Foundry Co., Ltd	2,550 00	2,550,000 00
1000	40-ton Steel Frame Box Cars	National Steel Car Co., Ltd	2,555 84	2,555,840 00
500	40-ton Steel Frame Box Cars	Eastern Car Co., Ltd	2,555 20	1,277,600 00
600	40-ton Steel Frame Automobile Cars.	Can. Car & Foundry Co., Ltd	2,625 00	1,575,000 00
400	40-ton Steel Frame Automobile Cars.	National Steel Car Co., Ltd	2,625 00	1,050,000 00
100	Hart Ballast Cars	Can. Car & Foundry Co., Ltd	3,264 50	326,450 00
100	General Service Cars	Eastern Car Co., Ltd	2,950 00	295,000 00
100	General Service Cars	Pressed Steel Car Co	2,300 00	230,000 00
100	Hopper Cars	Eastern Car Co., Ltd	2,730 00	273,000 00
5	Depressed Centre Type Flat Cars	Can .Car & Foundry Co., Ltd	5,930 00	29,650 00
				$20,250,600 85

SCHEDULE "K"

(GRAND TRUNK SYSTEM AND CENTRAL VERMONT)

Statement of Revenue Tonnage by Commodities—Year 1922

	Tons	
	Grand Trunk Railway System	Central Vermont Railway
COMMODITY		
Products of Agriculture—		
Wheat	1,406,452	33,416
Corn	969,313	192,122
Oats	547,848	114,156
Other Grain	391,973	9,206
Flour & Meal	877,723	98,403
Other Mill Products	402,860	199,519
Hay, Straw & Alfalfa	283,132	37,833
Tobacco	13,810	9,586
Cotton	111,208	48,141
Cotton, Seed & Products (except oil)	9,338	3,136
Citrus Fruits	48,354	4,021
Other Fresh Fruits	198,266	9,923
Potatoes	82,207	5,804
Other Fresh Vegetables	94,880	7,716
Dried Fruit & Vegetables	61,698	4,580
Other Products of Agriculture	170,007	67,943

SCHEDULE "K"—*Concluded*

(GRAND TRUNK SYSTEM AND CENTRAL VERMONT)

Statement of Revenue Tonnage by Commodities—Year 1922

—	Tons	
	Grand Trunk Railway System	Central Vermont Railway
COMMODITY—*Con.*		
Products of Animals—		
Horses and Mules	21,045	627
Cattle and Calves	234,249	15,600
Sheep and Goats	38,869	335
Hogs	123,667	1,140
Fresh Meats	328,460	125,873
Other Packing House Products	133,522	2,786
Poultry	23,840	7,822
Eggs	66,165	13,111
Butter and Cheese	113,963	14,954
Wool	15,300	11,246
Hides and Leather	90,840	27,968
Other Products of Animals	41,511	7,367
Products of Mines—		
Anthracite Coal	2,128,016	196,201
Bituminous Coal	3,859,921	312,276
Coke	252,311	4,556
Iron Ore	326,730	730
Other Ores and Concentrates	64,638	1,934
Base, Bullion and Matte	27,152	.....
Clay, Gravel, Sand and Stone	2,763,440	205,809
Crude Petroleum	84,899	241
Asphaltum	49,628	1,219
Salt	341,142	18,465
Other Products of Mines	134,570	4,243
Forest Products—		
Logs, Posts, Poles and Cordwood	388,843	39,007
Ties	84,213	3,859
Pulpwood	1,089,864	67,455
Lumber, Timber, Box Shooks, Staves and Heading	2,089,523	405,382
Other Products of Forest	140,860	34,543
Manufactures and Miscellaneous—		
Refined Petroleum and its Products	621,390	113,077
Vegetable Oils	8,140	506
Sugar, Syrup, Glucose and Molasses	289,477	126,184
Boats and Vessel Supplies	2,252	28
Iron, Pig and Bloom	243,774	19,179
Rails and Fastenings	63,039	4,181
Bar and Sheet Iron, Structural Iron & Iron Pipe	405,990	15,417
Other Metals, Pig, Bar and Sheet	108,869	10,456
Castings, Machinery & Boilers	258,450	19,142
Cement	794,016	37,388
Brick and Artificial Stone	441,717	20,746
Lime and Plaster	178,723	32,896
Sewer Pipe and Drain Tile	71,960	1,606
Agriculture Implements and Vehicles other than Autos	65,708	5,941
Automobiles and Auto Trucks	630,907	27,739
Household Goods and Second Hand Furniture	18,205	2,049
Furniture (new)	51,400	3,964
Beverages	36,749	2,661
Ice	130,681	6,853
Fertilizers (All Kinds)	97,295	12,609
Paper, Printed Matter and Books	812,119	64,270
Chemicals and Explosives	157,452	28,387
Textiles	21,411	12,200
Canned Goods (All canned food products)	114,835	12,688
Other Manufactures and Miscellaneous	2,016,894	649,120
Merchandise, all L.C.L. Freight	1,575,246	266,148
Total Tons	29,942,949	3,865,689

SCHEDULE "L" (1)

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY SYSTEM (INCLUDING CENTRAL VERMONT RAILWAY)

Operated Road Mileage at December 31st, 1922

Name	Miles	
Grand Trunk—Canadian Lines		3,611·87
Grand Trunk—Western Lines—		
Grand Trunk Western Railway	335·94	
Chicago & Kalamazoo Terminal Rly	1·92	
Chicago, Kalamazoo & Saginaw Rly	9·51	
Detroit, Grand Haven & Milwaukee Rly	188·32	
Grand Rapids Terminal Rly	1·51	
Toledo, Saginaw & Muskegon Rly	116·28	
Pontiac, Oxford & Northern Rly	99·89	
Detroit & Huron Rly	18·58	
Chicago, Detroit & Canada G. T. Jct. R.R.	59·55	
Michigan Air Line	105·92	
Cincinnati, Saginaw & Mackinaw Rly	53·10	
Bay City Terminal Railway	1·17	
Grand Trunk Milwaukee Car Ferry (85·9 miles)		991·69
Grand Trunk—New England Lines—		
Atlantic & St. Lawrence Railroad including line from Island Pond to International Boundary	165·35	
Lewiston & Auburn Railroad	5·43	
Norway Branch Railroad	1·43	
		172·21
Total Grand Trunk Railway System		4,775·77
Central Vermont Railway		538·31
Total (including Central Vermont Rly.)		5,314 08

SCHEDULE "L" (2)

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY SYSTEM & CENTRAL VERMONT RAILWAY

Addition and Betterments—Year ending December 31st, 1922

—	G.T. Ry. System	Central Vermont Railway	Total
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Land	*30,354 52*	1,405 00	*28,949 52*
Traders Sidings	168,827 85	.....	168,827 85
Rails, ties, track material, grading, etc	1,155,826 20	121,996 23	1,277,822 43
Tunnels, subways, bridges, etc	207,868 95	35,461 44	243,330 39
Crossings, signals and inter-lockers	146,845 23	12,705 07	159,550 30
Station and Roadway Buildings, etc	269,083 24	74,891 63	343,974 87
Shops, enginehouses and machinery	202,324 19	54,387 18	256,711 37
Grain Elevators and Docks	224,327 22	.....	224,327 22
Telegraph and Telephone Lines	77,738 29	.....	77,738 29
Miscellaneous	76,837 93	5,014 80	81,852 73
Expenditures on Equipment	1,275,739 70	322,911 60	1,598,651 30
	3,775,064 28	628,772 95	4,403,837 23

SCHEDULE "M" (1)

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

Betterments effected during Fiscal Year ending December 31st, 1922

The total main track mileage operated by Canadian National Railways was reported for the year ending December 31st, 1921 as—17,338·30 miles.

On December 31st, 1922, the main line mileage was as follows:—

Canadian Government Railways—		
Intercolonial Rly. (including Branch Lines)	2,283·44	
National Transcontinental Rly. Eastern Lines	1,415·74	
National Transcontinental Rly. Western Lines (including Lake Superior Branch)	582·14	
St. John & Quebec Railway	171·80	
Hudson Bay Railway	214·00	
		4,667·12
Canadian Northern Railway, Eastern Lines (including Halifax & South Western Rly..)	2,892·28	
Canadian Northern Railway, Western Lines (including D. W. & P. Railway)	6,976·38	
Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway and Toronto Suburban Rly. (Electric Lines)	126·13	
		9,994·79
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway		2,710·50
Total Main Line Mileage		17,372·41

Of the above main line mileage, the following lines are inactive—

Canadian Government Railways—		
Riviere Ouelle Wharf Branch	4·68	
Lyster to Villeroy	13·00	
Canadian Northern Railway, Eastern Lines—		
Lynton Jct. to La Tuque	39·60	
Maynooth to Wallace	15·90	
Lyn Jct. to Brockville	4·25	
Udney to Orillia	10·21	
Canadian Northern Railway, Western Lines—		
Edmonton to Stony Plains	19·94	
Milnes Landing to Koksilah River	25·90	
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway—		
Snaring Jct. to Pochohontas	14·89	
Total Inactive Mileage		148·37
Total Main Line Operated Mileage		17,224·04

The additions and reductions of main line mileages, during the year, were as follows:—

	Additions	Reductions
Canadian Government Railways—		
New "cut off" constructed at Moncton	3·25	
Line abandoned by "cut off" at Moncton		3·92
Spurs previously reported, which should not have been reported as main lines—		
Fairview to D.W.T. Halifax		3·68
Nicolet to Nicolet Wharf		2·06
Marine Spur, Quebec		6·48
Changes due to realignments and rechainages		2·08
Canadian Northern Railway, Eastern Lines—		
Connections constructed—		
Hawkesbury	0·19	
Rockland	0·18	
Colbright	0·13	
Pembroke	1·47	
Washago	0·27	
Spurs previously reported which should not have been reported as main lines—		
Valcartier to Clarks		5·40
Loretteville to Stoneham		10·00
Montmorency Jct. to Montmorency Mills		7·20
Arundel to China Clay Mines		9·20
Bessemer Jct. to Bessemer		4·80
Belmar to Cordova		9·60
Oshawa to Oshawa Town		2·40
Garson Jct. to Garson		3·70
Key Jct. to Key Harbour		6·20
Changes due to realignments and rechainages		1·37

SCHEDULE "M" (1)—*Continued.*

Canadian Northern Railway, Western Lines—		
Lines on which construction was completed and taken over for operation during the year—		
Amaranth to Alonza	17·84	
Gravelbourg to Hodgeville	28·99	
Lintlaw to Kelvington	13·24	
Meifort to Ridgedale	22·69	
Demain to Beechy	6·11	
Turtleford to St. Walburg	22·10	
Red Deer Jct. to Red Deer	6·10	
Victoria to Koksilah River	52·50	
Spurs previously reported which should not have been reported as main lines—		
Hope Farm Spur		2·86
Dundee Branch		4·02
Ocre River to end of track		3·76
Craven Jct. to Craven		4·38
Changes due to short connections, realignments and rechainages		1·96
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway—		
Line taken over for operation, Leyland to Luscar	5·53	
Spurs previously reported which should not have been reported as main lines—		
Spurs on Prairie District		17 15
Spurs on Mountain District		19·11
Alberta Coal & Mountain Park Branch		7·78
Alberta Coal & Pacific Pass Branch		2·54
Calgary Branch		3·71
Changes due to short connections and rechainages		1·12
Totals	180·59	146·48

Net increase in main line mileage—34·11 miles.

The following betterments were made to Roadbed and Track during the year 1922:—

New 85-lb. Rail laid 1922—		
Canadian Government Railways—Eastern Lines	107·16	Miles
" " " —Western Lines	40·32	"
Canadian Northern Railway—Eastern Lines	26·78	"
" " " —Western Lines	240·75	"
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway	29·24	"
Total	444·25	"
Second Hand Relay Rail Laid 1922—		
Canadian Government Railways—Eastern Lines	32·59	Miles
" " " —Western Lines	7·82	"
Canadian Northern Railway—Eastern Lines	35·03	"
" " " —Western Lines	72·57	"
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway	4·62	"
Halifax & South Western Railway	20·00	"
Total	172·63	"
Ties Put in Track for Renewals 1922—		
Canadian Government Railways—Eastern Lines	1,253,958	
" " " —Western Lines	231,333	
Canadian Northern Railway—Eastern Lines	929,931	
" " " —Western Lines	2,367,178	
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway	977,614	
Halifax & South Western Railway	150,000	
Total	5,910,014	

SCHEDULE "M" (1)—*Continued*

Ballasting Chargeable to Capital Account 1922—

Canadian Government Railways—Eastern Lines	101·8 Miles
Canadian Northern Railway—Eastern Lines	92·8 "
" " " —Western Lines	667·7 "
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway	159·4 "
Halifax & South Western Railway	8·9 "
Total	1,030·6 "

Water Supplies 1922—

	Number
Canadian Government Railways—Eastern Lines	10
Canadian Northern Railway—Western Lines	27
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway	7
Halifax & South Western Railway	6
Total	50

Tie Plates 1922—

	Number
Canadian Government Railways—Eastern Lines	193,624
" " " —Western Lines	110,000
Canadian Northern Railway—Eastern Lines	51,715
" " " —Western Lines	185,242
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway	74,290
Halifax & South Western Railway	28,000
Total	642,871

Rail Anchors 1922—

	Number
Canadian Government Railways—Eastern Lines	20,500
" " " —Western Lines	71,600
Canadian Northern Railway—Eastern Lines	1,102
" " " —Western Lines	82,400
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway	10,000
Total	185,602

Fencing, Wire and Snow 1922—

Canadian Government Railways—Eastern Lines	276·27 Miles
" " " —Western Lines	0·50 "
Canadian Northern Railway—Eastern Lines	5·67 "
" " " —Western Lines	94·70 "
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway	39·26 "
Halifax & South Western Railway	16·00 "
Total	432·40 "

SCHEDULE "M" (1)—*Continued*

The following new structures were constructed and improvements to existing structures and facilities carried out:—

Item	Can. Govt. Rly.		Can. Nor. Rly.		G.T.P. Rly.	H. & S. W. Rly.	Total
	East Lines	West Lines	East Lines	West Lines			
Stations, New	9	.....	3	20	8	1	41
Stations, Extensions	5	.....	2	8	1	.....	16
Freight Sheds, New	3	.....	.....	1	1	1	6
" " Extensions	6	.....	1	2	.....	.....	9
Bunk Houses, Section Dwelling, New	11	1	.....	24	26	2	64
Other Buildings, New	14	4	19	34	6	.....	77
" " Extensions	4	1	4	13	3	.....	25
Coaling Plants, New	1	1	4	4	4	1	15
New Water Tanks (Completed)	3	.....	.....	5	3	.....	11
New Culverts	177	10	8	177	32	2	406
New Bridges	13	.....	3	11	5	.....	32
Bridges and Trestles Filled	16	3	49	79	16	.....	163
	262	20	93	378	105	7	865

In addition to the above considerable work was undertaken such as the construction of farm and highway crossings, roadways, ashpits, drop-pits, loading platforms, ditching and wells for station water supply, and the installation of track scales, turntables, interlocking plants, machinery in shops and round-houses, and the heating and lighting of stations, freight sheds, etc.

The number of sidings and siding extensions constructed during the year were as follows:—

	Number	Aggregate Length
Canadian Government Railways—Eastern Lines	42	54,837 Ft.
" " " —Western Lines	38	52,189 "
Canadian Northern Railway—Eastern Lines	66	66,844 "
" " " —Western Lines	102	133,841 "
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway	61	98,324 "
Halifax & South Western Railway	6	2,893 "
Total	315	408,928 "

The following are some of the larger items carried out during the year:—

CANADIAN GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS. (Eastern Lines)

At Elmsdale a new 40,000 gal. steel tank was erected to replace the old wooden tank.

At Truro Engine House six stalls were lengthened to accommodate "Santa Fe" locomotives.

New 40,000 gal. steel tank was erected at River Denys to replace the old wooden tank.

At Folleigh a new 40,000 gal. steel tank was erected and the old wooden tank removed.

At Maccan a diversion was made in the highway by which two dangerous grade crossings were eliminated. This work was carried out by the Province of Nova Scotia in conjunction with the Railway.

At Sackville the old piers of the Tantramar river bridge were removed and bank protection provided.

At Cape Tormentine extensive repairs were made to the docks where scour had been caused by the propeller of the S.S. *Prince Edward Island*. The entrance and turning basin were further dredged to facilitate the operation of the ferry and provide sufficient depth of water for same.

At Borden 5,000 tons of heavy stone rip rap was placed along outer face of pier and approach to afford additional protection and a large amount of concrete was placed under concrete cribs of pier to protect against further scouring and undermining. Work preparatory to standardization between Summerside and Tignish was carried on, about 15 miles of machine ditching and 15 miles of hand ditching being completed and the replacement of bridges and culverts in this territory being about 50% completed.

At Moncton the remodelling of the terminal facilities begun in 1920 and continued in 1921, was carried on. This year's work consisted of lengthening the main yard tracks at the west end; completing the new double track main line from station to mile 1·8 St. John Subdivision; constructing a new coach yard; extending platforms at Station and removing abandoned coaling plant, etc.

At Mechanical Shops, Moncton, a new floor was laid in one-half of the engine erecting shop and a portion of the roof of the freight car repair shop was insulated.

At St. John the remodelling of Island Yard was completed. This consisted of a new double track main line from Cold Brook to Gilberts Lane, a distance of 1·36 miles, together with the necessary alterations to yard tracks, etc., and two new pile trestle bridges, each one hundred feet long. A new yard office was built to replace the one destroyed by fire.

SCHEDULE "M" (1)—*Continued*

From Mont Joli to Levis a telephone despatching system was installed.

Absolute permissive automatic block signals were installed between Levis and Chaudiere from Charny to Cadorna and from West Junction to Chaudiere.

At St. Leonard Jct. a 100-ton capacity coaling plant, water supply and drainage system was installed.

At Ste. Rosalie Jct., new water supply and drainage system were completed during the year.

At Hughes, Mile 93·5 Makamik Subdivision, two main line connections were made with the A. R. & M. Co. Ry.

On the Murray Bay Subdivision telegraph wires were stretched between LaMalbaie and St. Joachim.

HALIFAX AND SOUTH-WESTERN RAILWAY

On the H. & S. W. Railway a new station and new freight shed were built at Lunenburg to replace those destroyed by fire and in this connection additions and alterations to trackage in yard were also made.

Between Halifax and Yarmouth, six hydraulic ram installations were made providing a more reliable supply of water and a more even distribution of water stations.

CANADIAN GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS. (Western Lines)

Work commenced on extension to roundhouse at Sioux Lookout in order to provide accommodation for proper handling of larger engines. A mechanical coaling plant, depressed cinder pit and sand house are in course of erection at this point, replacing the present facilities which are uneconomical to operate and expensive to maintain. In connection with the above facilities the engine house tracks are being re-arranged. The above works are about 35% completed.

At Sioux Lookout the erection of an employee's boarding and recreation building was commenced and is about 40% completed. A new sewer connecting with these buildings, and the hospital and station has been completed.

At Redditt, the terminal yard was extended to the East end to provide for average length trains which previously had to be cut when entering the yard.

Two No. 9 gauge copper wires were strung between Sioux Lookout and Winnipeg and telephone equipment installed for train despatching.

CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY (Eastern Lines)

At Quebec the outward freight shed was extended 200 feet.

At Limoilou a five-stall extension to engine house was constructed and heating system renewed. A new turntable centre, car truck pit and jack were installed. A new coaling dock was constructed.

At Morin Heights, St. Genevieve and Glen Miller, new stations were built and station extensions made at Consecon and Forfar.

At Brent, Jellicoe and Gogama, coaling docks which had been destroyed by fire were re-built.

At Leaside an oil storage building was constructed and extensive additions made to the stores building. Fourteen new hydrant houses were constructed.

At Capreol, two dwelling houses for employees were constructed. The heating system at this terminal was remodelled, and the construction of a 500-ton ice house was commenced.

At Hornepayne, two dwelling houses for employees were constructed.

The contract for connecting line between Long Lac on the C.N.R. and Nakina on the N.T.R., a distance of 29·46 miles, was awarded and construction is now being proceeded with.

CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY (Western Lines)

At Fort William, a concrete station platform 450′ x 20′ was constructed, also a concrete island platform 450′ x 6′.

Air cooling plants were installed at Port Arthur, Rainy River, Dauphin and Kamsack.

Grading was commenced on alignment revision between mile 32 and 38 Kashabowie Subdivision, near Rowan and is 20% completed.

At Bears Pass and Kawene, work on replacing of 40,000 gal. tanks by 60,000 gal. tanks was commenced.

On the Fort Frances Subdivision three pile trestles are being replaced by steel spans on concrete piers.

At Mile 72·3 on the Pleasant Point Subdivision a steel bridge consisting of one 225′ and two 80′ steel spans on concrete piers over the Assiniboine river, has been completed.

At Mile 7·7 on the North Lake Subdivision, a new steel bridge consisting of two 108′ and two 65′ steel spans on concrete piers has been completed.

At Maryfield, the construction of a dam and reservoir having 15,000,000 gal. capacity was completed providing a new water supply at this location. In connection with this new water supply the pipe line has been laid and pump house erected, and tank is now under construction.

At Tilney a new water supply has been provided by construction of dam and reservoir having 18,000,000 gal. capacity and the erection of tank and pump house.

At Gravelbourg, a new water supply was provided, involving the construction of dam, tank and pump house.

At Rama, new water supply has been provided by construction of dam and reservoir, having 34,000,000 gal. capacity. In connection with this water supply the pipe line has been laid, pump house erected and tank is under construction.

At Conquest, a reservoir having 10,000,000 gal. capacity was excavated, pipe line laid and pump house and tank erected.

At Wiseton, a dam was built and reservoir excavated, providing storage capacity of 12,000,000 gals. In connection with this water supply new pipe line was laid and pump house and tank erected.

The installation of new water supply at Ethelbert, which was commenced in 1921, was completed during the year.

SCHEDULE "M" (1)—*Continued*

CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY (Western Lines—*Continued.*

At Paskwegin, a new reservoir was excavated, providing water storage capacity of 17,000,000 gals., new pipe laid, and pump house erected.

At Radville, the capacity of water storage reservoir was increased by 6,000,000 gals., by construction of a new dam. Pump house was enlarged.

At Nutana, a dope reclaiming plant was constructed and wheel platform extended.

At Saskatoon, an additional story was erected on office building.

At Dauphin, a new subway was completed.

At Kindersley, 3 miles of pipe line were laid and installation of pumping plant completed, this work having been started during 1921.

At Mecheche, the construction of a new dam and reservoir having 100,000,000 gallons water storage capacity was completed and pipe line laid to tank.

At Lloydminster, a new water supply was provided, obtained from Neale Lake, 1·9 miles North from the track.

At Mount Robson, a 90¹ snow shed was constructed.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY.

At Rivers, construction of a new dam across the Little Saskatchewan river, to provide for increased water supply was started.

New sewers were constructed at Melville and Watrous.

At Raymore, a dam was built and reservoir excavated providing water storage capacity of 70,000,000 gallons. Pipe line was laid and pump house and tank erected.

At Pope, a dam was built and reservoir excavated, providing water storage capacity of 35,000,000 gallons. Pipe line was laid, pump house erected and tank is under construction.

At Hubbard, a dam was built and reservoir excavated, providing water storage capacity of 23,000,000 gallons. Pipe line was laid and pump house and tank erected.

At Birdtail Creek, Mile 190 Miniota Subdivision, an 80′ steel span was erected, replacing timber trestle of the same length.

At West Yard, Regina, additional tracks were provided, aggregating 14,490 feet in length. A 6 stall addition to the round-house at this location is under construction.

At Calder Yard, Edmonton, the erection of a car repair shop 303′ x 83′ was commenced.

At Mirror, a four stall addition to the engine house was built and new machine shop constructed.

At Coalspur, a 3 stall engine house, 200 ton coaling plant, and 50,000 gal., water tank were erected.

At Edson, the existing water reservoir was excavated to increase the storage capacity. Depressed cinder-pit was provided at this Station.

At Prince Rupert, a roadway was constructed to Oriental Dock, 3 electric elevators were installed in warehouse, and new fender booms provided at wharves.

Between Ansell and Bickerdike a line revision was constructed eliminating a long timber trestle.

Thirteen miles west of Prince George, a line revision was constructed, eliminating a timber trestle which had been a continual source of trouble, and also eliminating a portion of the line which had been built on a side hill subject to slides.

CO-ORDINATION

EASTERN LINES

At Hawkesbury, construction of two main track connection, additional yard tracks and 3 stall engine house commenced during 1921, was completed during the year. This work provides for the co-ordination of the G.T.R., and C.N.R., facilities at this point, allowing the elimination of one of the stations and an interlocking plant.

At Rockland, construction of connecting track between the G.T.R. and C.N.R., siding tracks, and one stall engine house, commenced during 1921, was completed and these facilities put into operation. The above facilities permit of the consolidation of the station at this point and the elimination of a diamond crossing and interlocking protection.

At Napanee, the construction of a connecting track between the G.T.R. and C.N.R., was commenced. The construction of this connection will eliminate a diamond crossing and 3 flagmen, also a back-up movement for C.N.R. trains at this point.

WESTERN LINES

At Neebing, 3·2 miles west of West Fort William, work was commenced on a new terminal yard and facilities consisting of 24 stall engine house, 350 ton coaling plant, 150,000 gal., water tank, with 8″ pipe line, 2¼ miles long, connecting to the city of Fort William water mains, also all other necessary yard accomodations and facilities. The yard which will have a capacity of 3,100 cars, is designed to accommodate the special requirements of traffic at this point.

Construction of a connection from mile 30·52 Graham Subdivision to the Kashabowie Subdivision, near Rowan, co-ordinating the C.G.R. and C.N.R., was commenced. Grading is about 35% completed. This connection will be carried over the Mattawin River and C.P.R. track on steel structures.

Double track will be laid from the above mentioned connection into Fort William and at present has been laid between mile 2·87 and 6·19 Kashabowie Subdivision, also through Neebing Yard from mile 6·19 to 11·1. Grading for the double track is completed from mile 11·1 to 13·4.

At Lampman, a connection between the C.N.R. and G.T.P. has been constructed, affording joint use of station, water supply and providing better facilities for handling freight and passenger traffic. The track has been laid but ballasting not completed. The completion of this connection will eliminate an interlocked diamond crossing.

SCHEDULE "M" (1)—*Continued*

At Regina, a connection between the Craik Subdivision of the C.N.R. and the Riverhurst Subdivision of the G.T.P. has been constructed. The track on this connection has been laid but ballasting not yet completed. This connection will give trains from the C.N.R. direct access to the G.T.P. yard, freight and engine terminal, and permits of the consolidation of staff at one point, saving in switching movements and operation.

At North Edmonton, the various connection between the C.N.R. and G.T.P. which were commenced during 1921, have been completed, with the exception of the interlocking plant, work on which is under construction. Train movements are controlled temporarily by semaphores pending the completion of the interlocking plant.

At Stony Plains, a short connection was constructed between the C.N.R. and G.T.P., permitting joint use of the G.T.P. station at this point, and allowing the abandonment of 19·4 miles of track.

At Magnolia, a connection was constructed between the C.N.R. and G.T.P. The construction of this connection permitted the elimination of 11 miles of parallel and duplicate track between Magnolia and Lobstick Junction.

The construction of a connection between the G.T.P. at Duhamel, and the C.N.R. at Battle was commenced and will be ready for operation during 1923. The construction of this connection will permit of the elimination of 10·3 miles of parallel track, on which there were two long timber bridges over the Battle River.

During the present year it is proposed to continue works which were uncompleted at the end of last year, and undertake new works of which then larger items are briefly referred to below.

CANADIAN GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS (Eastern Lines)

Paving team tracks with granite blocks at Deep Water Terminals, Halifax.

Dredge turning basin at Borden, P.E.I., to provide sufficient depth of water for operation of car ferry at all stages of tide.

Completion of work on standardization of gauge between Summerside and Tignish, P.E.I.

Erect one copper wire and provide telephone train despatching equipment between Campbellton and Mont Joli to facilitate the handling of train movements.

Extensions of store building at St. Malo.

CANADIAN GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS (Western Lines)

Completion of the construction of a boarding house for employees at Sioux Lookout.

Extension and rearrangement of trackage at Redditt, and the provision of 300 ton mechanical coaling plant, standard sand house, depressed cinder-pit and the replacement of turntable with turntable of greater length.

Replacement of machinery at Transcona shops and also provide additional machinery.

Replacement of frame trestle 854 feet long with concrete culvert and fill at mile 46·7 Quibell Subdivision.

HALIFAX AND SOUTH WESTERN RAILWAY

Replacement of timber trestle 257 feet long with concrete culvert to fill at Puddle River, mile 27·4 Chester Subdivision.

Ballasting on the Liverpool and Chester Subdivision.

CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY (Eastern Lines)

Provisions of interlocking plant at Harrowsmith.

Provision of 5 stall extension to engine house at Caperol.

Installation of additional equipment at Leaside locomotive and car shops and provision of heating, lighting and shelving in stores building extension.

Provision of scrap reclaim building and plant at Toronto.

Reconstruction of telegraph pole lines on various Subdivisions.

Replacing pile trestle 222 feet long with concrete and steel bridge at Indian River, mile 98·3 Pembroke Subdivision.

Replacing timber trestle 555 feet long with concrete culvert and fill at mile 110·0 Ruel Subdivison.

Replacing timber trestle 180 feet long with concrete abutments and steel span at Midway Creek, mile 147·3 Ruel Subdivision.

Replacing timber trestle 240 feet long with steel span, concrete abutments and fill, at Muskego River, mile 0·34 Oba Subdivision.

Replacing timber trestle 283 feet long with steel span concrete abutments and fill at Opishkanogama River, mile 0·72 Oba Subdivision.

Continuation of replacement of 1,300 foot trestle across Kiosk-Koqui Lake, mile 20·4 North Bay Subdivision.

CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY (Western Lines)

Revision of line between mile 48 and 50 Kashabowie Subdivision.

Provision of additional machinery and replacements of machine by those of improved type at Fort Rouge shops.

Extension and rearrangement of yard at Brandon.

Provision of a reservoir for water supply at Kipling.

Construction of a subway at Fairford Street, Moose Jaw.

Provision of water supply at Avonlea.

SCHEDULE "M" (1)—*Concluded*

Construction of freight shed at Dauphin.

Completion of rearrangement of yard and erection of coal dock, sand house, ashpits, and sewer lines at Humboldt commenced during 1922.

Revision of alignment between Horburg, mile 132 and Saunders mile 156 Brazeau Subdivision.

Filling trestles on various Subdivisions.

Ballasting on various Subdivisions.

Provision of telephone train despatching service between Yorath and Kindersley; North Battleford and Saskatoon; Saskatoon and Yorath Junction; Humboldt and Saskatoon.

Reconstruction of telegraph pole lines on various Subdivisions.

Extension of stores buildings at various locations.

Provision of additional buildings and facilities at Jasper Park Summer Resort.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY

Completion of freight car repair shops at North Edmonton Terminals.

Provision of snow shed 600 feet long at mile 1075·5 Tete Jaune Subdivision.

Filling trestles on various Subdivisions.

Ballasting on various Subdivisions.

Provision of stores building and locomotive foreman's office at Rivers.

Provision of Oil handling equipment at Smithers and Prince George.

Acquisition of and improvements to Minaki Inn.

Improvements and additions at Fort Garry Hotel, Winnipeg.

Provisions of water supply and installation of ventilating system at MacDonald Hotel, Edmonton.

HUDSON BAY RAILWAY

Provisions of two stall engine house at The Pas, and general improvements to roadbed and track.

CO-ORDINATION

Eastern Lines.

Installation of two additional signals and low voltage junction switch operating machine in connection with existing automatic signals at Chaudiere.

Provision of track connection of Joffre.

Completion of terminal facilities, rearrangement of yard, additional trackage and paving of roadways at Quebec.

Provisions of additional yard trackage at Limoilou.

Double tracking on St. Charles River Bridge and approaches thereto between Limoilou and Parent Square, Quebec.

Construction of six mile connection between C.G.R., near Dombourg and C.N.R., at Donnacona with a view to the abandonment of 25·7 miles of Canadian Northern Railway between Donnacona and Allenby Junction.

Completion of connection between the C.N.R. and G.T.P. and improvements of water supply at Hawkesbury.

Continuation of work paving team roadways at Cherry Street yard Toronto.

Completion of installation of 75 foot turntable at Howland.

Construction of Spur track at Brockville between G.T.R. Manitoba yard and C.N.R., track.

Construction of a 60 car capacity storage siding, at Washago.

Completion of connection between G.T.R. and C.N.R. and track alterations at Napanee, also the construction of a new joint station at Napanee.

Provision of a new baggage room at North Bay.

Western Lines—

Completion of initial development of yard and engine facilities at Neebing.

Completion of double tracking from Port Arthur to Kakabeka Falls.

Provision of additional sidings between Kakabeka Falls and Mokomon and installation of automatic signals.

Double tracking on 0·5% grade from Mokomon mile 32 and mile 35·6 Kashabowie Subdivision.

Completion of grade and alignment revision at Rowan mile 35 to 38 Kashabowie Subdivision.

Rearrangement of tracking at Portage la Prairie to provide double track through town and eliminate interlocking plant at East end of town.

Construction of two wye connections at Yorkton, elimination of interlocking plant at present crossing of C.N.R., and G.T.P. abandonment of C.N.R., wye at mile 24 Tonkin Subdivision and removal of C.N.R., engine house and water tank to the G.T.P.

Completion of connection between G.T.P. and C.N.R. at Lampman and moving C.N.R., water tank to Junction Point.

Provisions of water supply at Lampman to serve C.N.R. and G.T.P.

Completion of connection between C.N.R. and G.T.P. at Regina and Co-ordination of engine facilities at the G.T.P. terminal, also improvement of local freight facilities at this point.

Construction of connection between G.T.P. and C.P.R. at Saskatoon and Provision of automatic signals.

Construction of connection between the G.T.P. and C.N.R. at Ryley and provision of automatic signals.

Completion of installation of automatic signals for co-ordination connections constructed at Alix during 1921 and 1922.

Completion of the South connection between the C.N.R. and G.T.P., at Camrose, also provisions of automatic signals, additional siding extension to station and connection to city water supply.

Completion of interlocking plant at North Edmonton.

Provisions of automatic signals for connection between the C.N.R. and G.T.P., at Magnolia.

Consolidation of G.T.P. terminal facilities at Jasper, with C.N.R., terminal facilities at Lucerne involving construction of seven stall extension to engine house, coaling plant and sand house, ashpit, additional yard tracks, cottages and dwellings for employees, coach, water and steam lines.

SCHEDULE "M" (2)

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

Statement of work done on construction of new lines during 1922

EASTERN LINES

A contract for the grading, bridging and culverts on the Long Lake Cut-off was awarded December 30, 1922, but only preparatory work was done up to December 31, 1922.

Beyond this no other work was done on Eastern Lines in way of construction of new branches.

WESTERN LINES

Grading

No grading was done during the year.

Bridges, Trestles and Culverts

On new lines in 1922 in the erection of bridges, trestles and culverts, 455,846 F.B.M. timber and 7,949 lin. ft. of piling was used. Details of where this work was done is given on attached statement, N° 1.

Tracklaying

No tracklaying was done in 1922 on new lines.

Ballasting and Surfacing

In 1922 there were 170·3 miles of new track ballasted, including sidings and wyes. With the exception of 3 miles on the Vancouver Island Line, the whole of this was on Prairie Lines. Detailed statement No. 2, attached, shows the branches on which this ballasting was done, and divided into Provinces shows there was ballasted on Manitoba lines 19 miles; on Saskatchewan lines 78·9 miles; Alberta lines 69·4 miles and British Columbia lines 3 miles.

Fencing and Telegraph Lines

59·6 track miles of fence and 27·4 miles of telegraph line were erected during the year. Detailed statement No. 2 shows the lines on which this work was done, and gives mileages covering each branch.

BUILDINGS AND STRUCTURES

Water Tanks

2 water tanks were completed during the season, for new lines, and also 3 pump houses, and 2,970 lin ft. of pipe line built to serve them.

Stations, Loading Platforms, etc.

During the year 4 third-class and 3 fourth-class stations, 15 freight and passenger shelters, 10 loading platforms and 16 stock yards, were erected on new lines.

Section Houses

10 section houses were completed on new lines during 1922.

Turntables

1 turntable was erected during the year.

The branches on which the above buildings and structures were placed are shown in attached statement No. 1.

Miles put in Operation

During 1922 on Canadian Northern Western Lines there were 172·3 miles of new lines turned over to the Operating Department for permanent operation. Attached detail statement No. 3 shows these lines and mileages.

Office of Vice-President of Construction,
Toronto, February 14, 1923.

SCHEDULE "M" (2)—*Continued*

No. 1

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

WESTERN LINES

Buildings and Structures erected on New Lines during year 1922, to December 31

Branch	Water Tanks	Pump Houses	Pipe Line	3rd Class Station	4th Class Station	F. and P. Shelters	Section Houses	Loading Platforms	Stock Yards	Turntable	Bridges, Trestles and Culverts	Piles Driven
			L. ft.								F.B.M.	Lin. ft.
Manitoba—												
Amaranth	1	1			1	1	1	3	2			
Total for Manitoba	1	1			1	1	1	3	2			
Saskatchewan—												
Jackfish					1	2	2	3	3			
Luck Lake					1	1	1	1	2			
Melfort, N.E.		1		1		2	2		2			
Swift Current				1			1		3			
Thunderhill	1	1		1		2	1	2	2			
Melfort—Humboldt						1						
Total for Sask.	1	2		3	2	8	7	6	12			
Alberta—												
Onoway				1		6	2		2		84,850	
Red Deer Spur								1		1		
Total for Alta.				1		6	2	1	2	1	84,850	
British Columbia—												
Okanagan Branch											370,996	7,949
Totals	2	3		4	3	15	10	10	16	1	455,846	7,949

SCHEDULE "M" (2)—*Concluded*

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

No. 2

WESTERN LINES

Statement of Ballasting, Fencing and Telegraph Line on Construction Lines during 1922

Branch	Fencing track Miles	Telegraph line Miles	Ballasting Miles		
			Main Line	Sidings and Wyes	Total
Manitoba—					
Amaranth	17·8	17·8	18·0	1·0	19·0
Total for Manitoba	17·8	17·8	18·0	1·0	19·0
Saskatchewan—					
Luck Lake	.....	5·5	4·8	1·2	6·0
Melfort N.E	22·0	.....	23·7	1·5	25·2
Swift Current	.....	4·1	30·0	2·5	32·5
Thunderhill	13·7	.....	13·7	1·5	15·2
Total for Saskatchewan	35·7	9·6	72·2	6·7	78·9
Alberta—					
Red Deer Spur	6·1	.....	6·1	0·6	6·7
Camrose S.E	.....	.....	59·7	3·0	62·7
Total for Alberta	6·1	.....	65·8	3·6	69·4
British Columbia—					
Vancouver Island	.....	.....	3·0	.....	3·0
Total for British Columbia	.....	.....	3·0	.....	3·0
Totals	59·6	27·4	159·0	11·3	170·3

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

No. 3

WESTERN LINES, 1922

Statement of Miles of New lines put into Permanet Operation, to December 31st

Branch	From	Mile	To	Mile	Miles	Total
Manitoba—						
Amaranth	Amaranth	44·18	Alonsa	62·02		17·8
Saskatchewan—						
A Thunderhill	Lintlaw	100·3	Kelvington	114·2	13·9	
B Jackfish Lake	Turtleford	55·7	St. Walburg	77·8	22·1	
C Melfort N.E	Melfort	0·0	Ridgedale	23·7	23·7	
D Luck Lake	Demaine	28·8	Beechy	34·4	5·6	
E Swift Current	Gravelbourg	79·0	5 miles west of Hodgeville.	109·6	30·6	95·9
Alberta—						
Red Deer Spur	Red Deer Jct.	0·0	Red Deer	6·1		6·1
British Columbia—						
F Cowichan Sub	Victoria	0·0	Koksilah River	52·5		52·5
Total						172

A—Previously operated on behalf of Construction Dept. Board Order No. 31900 issued Dec. 12th, 1921 opened line with speed restrictions. Permanent operation started October 2nd, 1922.

B—Previously operated on behalf of Construction Dept. Board Order No. 31833 Nov. 28, 1921 opened line M. 57 to 77·8 with speed restrictions. Permanent operation started January 2nd, 1922.

C—Previously operated on behalf of Construction Dept. Board Order No. 31813 Nov. 24, 1921 opened line with speed restrictions. Permanent operation started Oct. 2, 1922.

D—Previously operated on behalf of Construction Dept. Board Order No. 31961 Jan. 3, 1922 opened line with speed restrictions. Permanent operation started Oct. 2, 1922.

E—Previously operated on behalf of Construction Dept. M. 79·0 to M. 104·6. Board Order No. 32966 13th Oct., 1922 opened line M. 79 to 109 with speed restrictions. Permanent operation started Oct. 31st, 1922.

F—Previously operated on behalf of Construction Dept. Board Order No. 29308, Jan. 27, 1920 opened line Mile 1·80 to Mile 52·5 with speed restrictions between Mile 26·5 and Mile 52·5. Board Order 29543 April 15th, 1920 opened line between Mile 0 (Point Ellice) and Mile 1·80 (Alpha St.) with speed restrictions. Turned over for permanent operation as from Jan. 1st, 1922.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): The minister has placed on Hansard an imposing array of figures covering, I think, most of the features dealt with in previous years, and covering some that were not in such detail presented before. Obviously this statement is of such a nature that it cannot be digested for purposes of criticism merely by being heard. A railway statement must be read and studied and compared with previous statements of the same character in order that comment may be helpful or useful. I am not sure that I or anyone else could have succeeded better than the minister in bringing out the outstanding results of the operations of 1922. It may be permissible for me though to repeat for purposes of emphasis some things that I gleaned from the minister's statement, expressing the hope that if I did not catch the exact purport of his words he will correct me as I pass along.

The year 1922, of course, witnessed the operation of our National Railways still in two divisions, just the same precisely as the year 1921 and the year 1920. The parent Grand Trunk was operated under a separate board. It was divided for purposes of operation into separate departments, and, in all things pertaining to the accounting which the minister presents, was wholly distinct from the Canadian National Railways. It was under a board headed throughout that time, or until virtually the end of the year, by Sir Joseph Flavelle, but under, as managing director, Mr. Howard Kelley. The board that surrounded Mr. Kelley was selected by the late government. It was a board against which no word was ever uttered. In the management, through the late government keeping faith with the company in the contract it made, in the taking over of the stock, we preserved practically intact the constitution of the personnel up to the completion of the arbitration. This was agreed upon because the Grand Trunk directors felt that if we placed our men in direct charge before the time had come when all the evidence which they considered would be required for presentation to the board had been gleaned from their records, we would be taking an advantage in the arbitration that would be unjust to them. Once this evidence was gleaned, of course, the reason for the retention of the same personnel no longer obtained. That happened in the midst of the political contest of 1921. Such was the management of the road to the end or nearly the end of the year 1922.

I say, without the least hesitation, and indeed I am glad of the opportunity to say it, that for myself I never felt satisfied with all the personnel of the management of the Grand Trunk. I do not think that the Grand Trunk had been well managed for many years prior to the taking over of that system by the government. It may be that good management was possible by the method of absent treatment applied by their directorate; but whether good management was possible or not good management was not actually present I am quite sure that much better results can be obtained now with the old management out of the way. Rapid improvement should take place aside entirely from the additional fact that from the 30th of January last onward the Grand Trunk will be operated in harmony and in unison with the Canadian National Railways, the whole system operated as one. These two great factors, the removal of the management which the Grand Trunk kept, and secondly, the advantages of unification should contribute from this time on to a very rapid improvement in the showing of the Grand Trunk.

I refer, first, to the minister's statement as to the Canadian National Railways. This road was operated under a directorate named wholly by the late government, a directorate headed by Mr. D. B. Hanna, as president. He had been president of the Canadian Northern ever since it was taken over by the administration and had been managing director of the Canadian Northern for long years prior to the interest of the government in that system. This directorate had control of the road under Mr. Hanna throughout virtually the whole of last year. Mr. Hanna was displaced about the 4th of October, and on the 4th of October a new president was appointed. The directors under Mr. Hanna were displaced at the same time as himself, and on the 4th October their successors took charge. I make no comment on the new directors at this time—such discussion can wait the committee stage. Sir Henry Thornton, however, did not actually take over his duties until about two months later, i.e. on December 4th, 1922. So the results of 1922 are not 80 per cent, but 90 per cent—yes, 100 per cent the work of the old directorate and of the management of Mr. D. B. Hanna.

Now, what are these results? In 1920, by reason of conditions that the whole world knows, there was an operating deficit of some $36,000,000. By reason of the condition of the property; by reason of wage awards and wage agreements and conditions of work and operation put into effect in the United States, which had to be followed in this country, and by reason as well of a tremendous advance in the costs of materials; because of those three

factors—there were others, but they were negligible in comparison—which could not be compensated for by an increase in rates—for whatever increase was granted was accompanied by at least a sufficient curtailment of traffic to prevent the effects of the increased rates counterbalancing an enormous penalty that had to be paid in augmented wages and costs of materials; because of this condition of affairs an operating deficit of some $36,000,000 resulted. It was an operating deficit though which, relative to parallel results in the United States, was very small indeed. In fact there is no study more illuminating of the history of the operation of our roads than the study of parallel operations of the roads and their results in the United States. Such was the outcome of 1920's operation.

In 1921, reported to us on the 11th of April of that year by the late Minister of Railways, Mr. Kennedy, the result was an operating deficit of slightly over $16,000,000—an improvement of nearly $21,000,000. At the same time, of course there was an increase of fixed charges, because with the deficit of any year the fixed charges for the succeeding year are increased by the interest on such deficit. The deficit takes the form of an advance to the system secured against the system, and the interest thereon is added to the fixed charges, though of course that interest possibly wholly comes to the government of Canada.

Last year's deficit on the Canadian National lines—leaving out of account the Grand Trunk—is reduced again this year, that is to say 1922, to some $9,000,000—an improvement from $16,000,000 to $9,000,000—and this notwithstanding a very considerable reduction of earnings, due in part to the imposition on the Railway Commission of restraints emanating from this parliament. But the whole $6,500,000 mentioned by the minister is not due to that cause at all, because if this parliament had left the commission free, unquestionably reductions would have been effected on the very same class of articles that would have totalled the greater part of the $6,500,000, if not 66⅔ per cent of it. This the minister understands just as well as I do. Anyway, the main factor in keeping earnings down this past year was the general reduction which was inevitable and which really was not great. Owing to certain reductions of wages and costs of materials which had taken place chiefly in 1921, the effect had to come in reduction of rates in 1922, the actual reduction being delayed by the timidity of the government—by the procrastination of this parliament in deciding what our course should be as respects an extension of the Crowsnest pass agreement suspension.

Those considerations have contributed to contracting the earnings for the year to the extent that the improvement for 1922 is not equal in operating results to the improvement of 1921 over the year before. However, it is gratifying under the circumstances—gratifying indeed I think to all hon. members, and I am certain to none more than to the group behind me, to whose perseverance, to whose fidelity to the policy which is now being vindicated we owe the comparatively happy situation we are in with respect to this long, trying, baffling problem at the present time. True, $9,000,000 is a considerable operating deficit on the Canadian National Railways. I will come though to some observations on that subject when I have finished a parallel account taken from the minister's address of the returns from the Grand Trunk for the same year.

For the year 1921 there was a profit on operation of the Grand Trunk of some $4,000,000. It was disappointing in comparison with the returns even of the year before. The reason of the disappointment was mainly that the American govenment had radically changed its methods of returns to American roads and as a consequence the operating results upon our American mileage of the Grand Trunk were vastly less than they were for 1920. Those returns should have been higher. This year I am glad to learn that they are very considerably improved, and if I caught correctly the statement by the minister applicable to this point, the operating profits of the Grand Trunk for 1922 were something over $12,000,000. This is particularly gratifying under the conditions of operation, because it must be remembered that the same managing director was in charge who had been in charge under the Grand Trunk directorate and to whose management I attribute in part the failure of that road to present the returns and give the service that might reasonably have been expected.

Taking into account the operating profits of over $12,000,000 on the Grand Trunk, and the operating deficit of about $9,000,000 on the Canadian National, a net operating surplus results of approximately $4,000,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: If you take in the Central Vermont, a little over $4,000,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, if the Central Vermont is taken in the net operating surplus is a little over $4,000,000 This is the first operating surplus that parliament has had reported to it since we came out of the valley of doubt and difficulty through which we had been

struggling for many years in the solution of our railway problem.

Now, while we have an operating surplus on the two roads together of some $4,000,000, we must not forget that the fixed charges which we have to pay on the systems aggregate a vastly larger sum than this. The fixed charges on the Canadian National aggregate, if I have put the figures together correctly, approximately $42,000,000. What the fixed charges are on the Grand Trunk I was not able to glean, but from my recollection of the subject I think they were some $8,000,000—that is to say, the interest on the debenture stock and the interest on the guaranteed stock which we have assumed. As a consequence, on the Canadian National Railway, where there is a deficit in operation of $9,000,000 and where we have some $42,000,000 of fixed charges to pay, we find ourselves confronted with an aggregate deficit of some $51,000,000. That $51,000,000 compares with the parallel figure for 1921 of $56,000,000 odd and with the parallel figure for 1920 of $67,000,000 odd. So it will be seen that notwithstanding the annual mounting of the fixed charges due to the fact that each year the interest on the previous deficit must be added, the improvement in operation is such that the annual deficit is year by year reduced—reduced, in millions, from 67 to 56 and then from 56 to 51 for the year through which we have just passed. These figures apply, of course, to the Canadian National Railway alone. Coming to the Grand Trunk, the profit on operation is some $12,000,000. If my figures are right as to the fixed charges—the interest on the bonded indebtedness, if you so describe it, of the system—there would be a surplus there of some $4,000,000. I am not quite sure that my figures are precisely right—though I think they are—as regards the Grand Trunk; as regards the Canadian National they are undoubtedly right.

I wish to call the attention of the House to the significance of these figures and as well to impress upon the House really what is meant by these recurring deficits in order that all will understand—though I do not wish to intimate that all do not now—just what these deficits imply, and will not think that they imply more than they do. I am not unaware—indeed, if there is anyone in this country wholly and vitally and keenly aware, it is myself—that there are influences at work—and I do not refer to railway systems—to make the people or some sections of the people believe that these deficits mean something that they do not mean at all; that they have been brought upon us because of the folly of weak-kneed, blind and stupid politicians in bringing this country into the ownership of the national lines we have to-day. Of this $51,000,000—let us think of that for the time being; for by means of it the point I make can be well made clear—of this amount of deficit this year on the Canadian National, about $33,000,000 is money owed the government of Canada. That is to say, it is not money that must be found in order to let the railways stand up and proceed and give service. About $33,000,000, then, is money owed the government of Canada, and the proportion that is owed us of the total deficit is growing year by year. Because it is owed us, of course, it is a debt all the same, and I am not by any means suggesting that it should be left out of account But we must understand that it is money owed this country because of guarantees we gave and loans we made in years gone by, because of indebtedness we have assumed as respects the system, in regard to all of which we have our charge against the system.

What I impress at the moment is this: That assuming we go ahead, as certainly we should—and we should go ahead with accelerated speed from this on, now that we are loosened from the London management and have only one system instead of two—assuming we go ahead as we have been going for these three years, and reach the point where deficits cease, then we must remember that all these deficits of years gone by have been no loss to the people. Quite the contrary; when we get to the point where deficits cease and we commence an era of returns over fixed charges, at that point all the deficits of these previous years become interest bearing assets. Because they are in the form of loans they now add to the fixed charges year by year; when we overtake the fixed charges so increased from year to year and get to earning money over and above them, at that point we have gathered up all the deficits of the years that have gone and they have become assets, loans, securities, in the treasury of the Dominion, bearing interest to the people of this country. It is a common feeling—I have met many who hold this view, and I can scarcely find fault with anyone reading some of the newspapers of Canada for doing so—that after we get past the era of these terrible deficits and reach the point where operation produces a revenue over fixed charges, then we shall have to look back and think of the money we have thrown away because of the folly of politicians; we shall have to sit in sackcloth and ashes and repent for the $50,000,000 in 1922, the $56,000,000 in 1921, the $67,000,000 in 1920, all of which is gone forever. The very contrary, let me repeat, will be the fact. When that time

comes—and it should not be long; the pace at which we reach it should henceforth be accelerated; we have been progressing towards it satisfactorily in these late years during which members of this House have listened to the returns—when that time comes all these deficits will take the form of mortgages in the treasury, bearing interest to the Canadian people.

There is another point I want to impress on the House as respects the deficits. Keeping in mind still the $51,000,000 which in 1922 is our deficit in connection with the Canadian National Railways, $33,000,000 of which is owed to the people of Canada, does anybody imagine that if any other policy had been followed, this country would have escaped those deficits? I was glad to hear from the minister an expression of confidence that, given a chance, as they have been given, and as the results show they have been given ever since they came under the operation of the Hanna directorate, ever since they became the National Railways—continuing to give them that chance, there is abundant hope; there is, indeed, serene and well founded confidence, that good results, all that has been hoped for, will come.

I was glad to hear him say that, although I could not help but note that it was not received with any sign of applause by hon. gentlemen around him—hon. gentlemen who felt that applause over a statement of that sort would scarcely be in accord with their assertions and predictions of just a few years ago. Nevertheless the statement will be received with approval by the people of this country and will be received, as well, as the expression of the honest belief of the minister, who, having reviewed the history of this question and having investigated the financial situation as regards these roads, comes to the House and says this is his profound conviction.

No, we would not have escaped these deficits if any other course had been taken. As a matter of fact, it is my belief we would have had to face one of two alternatives. We would have to have faced either an utterly demoralized service given to the people of Canada by the roads, or vastly greater sums to be provided by the parliament of Canada to hold the roads in private hands. Why is such the case? The Transcontinental Railway would have had to have been run by the Grand Trunk Pacific. It would have got from the west the traffic of the Grand Trunk Pacific, and no other traffic. The Grand Trunk Pacific would have had to have been held on its feet by the bounty of this parliament in loans of millions year after year, operated as an isolated and almost trafficless road. The Grand Trunk would have continued to have been operated from London, under Sir Alfred Smithers and his board of directors sitting in an attic in the middle of that city, operated by Mr. Kelley here in Canada, with Mr. Kelley's methods and Mr. Kelley's directorate, and the Grand Trunk, which was at the end of its tether by the admission of its directorate in 1918, would have been out of smelling distance of its tether long years before this, and the shoulders of the Canadian people would have been under the staggering Grand Trunk, holding it there by a bounty of millions voted by this parliament year after year.

As for the Canadian Northern, this is a road that with greater assistance would have pulled through and been able to stand on its own feet. It is the only constituent of the whole Canadian National system that could have done so. It would have required advances beyond the advances that were given. It would have required to have been carried past the period when properly equipped, all its maintenance provided, its branch lines constructed, it would have had the traffic that would have supported a system of its mileage. But it is the only one. Now they are all in the one system and the tremendous advantage of the policy that has been pursued is this, that instead of four or five, yes there would be five, unit roads each struggling and fighting with the other, each coming to this parliament year after year to be enabled to stand by itself and continue the hopeless battle, instead of such a condition as that we have all of them brought into one. We have the vast tremendous advantage of unification. We have the Grand Trunk system feeding traffic westward. We have the Canadian Northern system feeding traffic eastward. We have the Canadian Northern system turning such traffic as goes to eastern Canada through non-navigation times over to the Transcontinental railway, and we have the Transcontinental as a consequence showing this year only a trifling deficit whereas under other circumstances it would be showing a deficit to-day of millions of dollars which this parliament would have had to supply.

One word of repetition. The tremendous advantage of what has been done is not the improvement due to and flowing out of the fact that we have government operation; it is the improvement that arises from the fact that all these staggering unit systems are now one system, a system that is balanced in the east and west of Canada, a system that would be attractive to any band of capitalists

in the world, a system that has every hope and prospect of growing into a great success.

I want to call attention to one other fact. This system that we have was not wholly built for commercial purposes. There are long mileages of the system as respects which it was never hoped that for years at least they would be able to stand alone. If for the purposes of this discussion I may abandon all party beliefs, if one may so describe them I will refer to certain features of the system as colonization features, and not political features. Many parts of the Transcontinental, for example, a whole lot of the Grand Trunk Pacific, all of the Grand Trunk Pacific that ever should have been built, for the great part of it never should have been built, those roads are not roads that are founded on any commercial basis at all. Those roads are roads that if put on a commercial footing to be run by a private company, by any company, by any government in the world, would have waited decades after decades before they could ever stand on their feet and give a service to the country at all. Consequently, it is no more than blindness and folly to compare the results of a system so collected, of factors of so various a character—colonization, political blundering, non-commercial, all the others—it is folly to compare the results of a system so constructed, so brought together with the results of a system that was projected by business men in order that they might get business returns. So when we say that the Canadian Pacific, on the one hand, has a surplus and pays ten per cent on its capital stock, and that the Canadian National road, on the other hand, has a deficit of $51,000,000 and pays nothing on its capital stock, when we say that and believe that by saying so we are making a comparison of private ownership as against public ownership we are only talking the language of children.

Now a new board is in charge, and in charge of the Grand Trunk and the Canadian National combined. This unification took effect, so we are informed, and so the order in council discloses, on the 31st of January of this year. For the year 1923 the results will be the results of a unified system under single control, each serving the other instead of each fighting the other. We have every reason to hope for a very considerable improvement in the year 1923, a great improvement arising from the feature I have just recited, and arising as well from the fact that the Grand Trunk management in all its aspects is gone. Already the road has taken over its own insurance business. I quite agree, and it seems to me it is so obvious as scarcely to need comment, that to take over its insurance business now that the two are unified is manifestly the proper course. There would be just as much reason for the government of this country insuring its own post offices all through the Dominion as for the Canadian National Railways with a business of $400,000,000 pretending to lean upon the financial strength of some insurance company. The insurance company in all probability would be weaker financially than the road itself, so the very first ingredient and primary principle of insurance would be absent.

There should, it seems to me, be very many more economies resulting from the amalgamation. I am not a railway man, nor have I had the advantage of consultation with men who are, but I venture to say this, with a lot of deference because of the considerations I have mentioned: I venture to say that if error is being made at this time in the reorganization because of the bringing together of the systems, it is the error of over organization rather than of simplicity. The results tabulated in the press so far would seem to indicate that an effort is being made to retain everybody possible, instead of an effort to get rid of all the overhead we can, and seek to make the system no longer top heavy. I hope I am incorrect in my diagnosis. The tremendous, almost endless, table of departments, and departmental heads, and sub-heads, and assistants to presidents, and assistants to vice-presidents, and all sorts of door keepers and paraphernalia that has been presented to the public so far, fill me with some fear. It seems to me that we have not yet had assurance that the hand of the railway master is at work rather than the hand of the politician.

Let us have real amalgamation, and let the product of such amalgamation so appear that he who runs may read, that the wayfaring man although a fool may not err, that all the public will know the exact results year by year of the operation of the system. Before I sit down I want to impress again this thought on the minister. I do not find fault with his presentation this year, but I ask him that now, commencing with 1923, when we shall have one report rather than two, the minister present his details in tabulated form, and bring the data down to this House subsequently in blue book form, and in such array that the next year we can follow precisely in the line of the year before, that we can have parallel columns year by year, so that the eye can follow the results of an operation in each department one year with the other, so

that the eye can trace a financial product year by year comparable to the year before. We have these tabulations in our own fiscal returns. We have them so presented in the Auditor General's report. We ought to have the same presentation in the financial statement of our railways so that everyone who examines it can tell at a glance just how the success of any feature of any operation, and the success of any feature of financing, compares with similar success the year before, so that we can trace through the years the ascending or descending curve illustrating the results as time goes along.

I would like the minister to take that seriously into account. The tremendous moneys involved in the operation of these railways makes it incumbent that we have each year as full and complete discussion, and as full and complete disclosure, as we have of the financial affairs of the Dominion. There should be as illuminating a debate, there should be as comprehensive a debate, and as thorough and ruthless investigation, on the presentation of the minister's statement year by year as respects the railways as we have in the annual budget debate of this House. One is of as much consequence to the country as the other; and I earnestly hope that some method may be found whereby—by parallel reports—not only giving the same results the year before but giving them in the same form, giving them in columns so that the eye can see the effect without much effort of the mind —that such can be done. Then the people of Canada—interested as they are in their system as their first and greatest asset—will drive politics out and drive business in by insisting on results year by year; results that they know are improvements, and results that they can understand.

Mr. ROBERT FORKE (Brandon): Mr. Speaker, I hesitated to get on my feet to make any remarks after the very eloquent and lucid statement we have had from the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen). However, I felt that we should scarcely let this opportunity pass without complimenting the minister and the country upon the improved condition of our great National Railways. I notice that the leader of the Opposition, in commencing his remarks, could not let the opportunity pass without taking just a little hit at the Crowsnest pass agreement debate we had last year. We still feel that we were right in our attitude and that no mistake was made at that time; and any little deficit that has come to the railways through that arrangement has been fully and amply repaid by the benefit to the people who supplied the freight on those roads.

Although I have always believed that the only solution of our railway problem was in the national ownership of those roads, yet to-night, for the first time, I have felt almost a thrill of pride in the fact that the Canadian people really own these roads; and in the not very far distant future we are going, as the politicians say, "to point with pride" to the fact that we own that large system of railroads that we thought at one time were a millstone around the neck of the people of Canada. I am glad that we have a new board of management in whom, I think, the people of the country have faith; and I can only echo the words that have been repeated by the leader of the Opposition and hope that no political influences will enter into the management of this system, that these railways will have a fair chance to succeed, and that Sir Henry Thornton, and his board shall have a free field and no interference whatever in their management.

One of the things I have noticed in connection with the Canadian National Railways has been the improvement in the demeanour of the people engaged in the railway service. I think there has been a considerable improvement in the management and in the courtesy and treatment extended to passengers while travelling upon the system compared with what was experienced in these respects a few years ago. One of the things most conducive to the success of any system is when the interest and pride the people employed on it take in the service and its success. I am not going to attempt to make a speech to-night in connection with the railroads because I really do not know very much about the situation, other than that I do hope that we are on the road to prosperous times as far as our railroads are concerned. Of course, I happen to be of a rather optimistic temperament and I believe that we are going to see more prosperous times in this Dominion. With more people and more traffic, east and west, I have no fear for the future. I believe the time is not far distant when there will be no more deficits on the Canadian National Railways.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: (South York): I would like to draw attention to the annual report of the Canadian Pacific Railway, copies of which have been received by hon. members, and to point out that on page 3 there is a very succinct account of the earnings and the profits of that road for the year. In statements regarding our own railways, such

as the minister has presented to-day, we ought to have similar information. Then on page 14 of the same report there is a business statement of the assets and liabilities of the road. I do not say that the minister could prepare an exact statement of that kind for the use of the House at the present time, but progress in that direction could be made. Furthermore, in this Canadian Pacific Railway report there is a very succinct statement in regard to the mileage. In our annual railway statement the number of miles of railways we own in Canada and the number of miles of railway we own in the United States, and similar information should be set forth. That has been more or less mentioned by the minister to-night, but there is no reason why we should not have the figures tabulated in our railway statement just as they are in the Canadian Pacific Railway report. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company has supplied to the members of this House, and to the people of Canada, their annual statement on the lines that were referred to a few minutes ago by the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen). We should have information in that form; not only the figures which the minister has given to-night but an analysis of those figures somewhat in the form in which it has been prepared by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

I am one who has always believed in public ownership in this country. I see that policy coming now, and I hear almost everybody in this House saying there is no reason why it should not succeed. The greatest railway asset we have in the country to-day is the Grand Trunk. It possesses all the strategic positions in regard to traffic, or the great majority of them, in this country. It has the best grade and the best positions in the cities. It has the best position at Niagara, on the St. Lawrence, on the Detroit river, on the upper lakes, and it has good positions in cities in the West and in the West generally. There is no reason why that road, as has been said already this evening, should not be a great asset, and should not have a surplus, instead of a deficit, in a few years. The same may be said in regard to the Canadian National. While we are speaking of our own roads, and the misadventures which they suffered, let me read to the House an item that appeared in the press this morning, in regard to the railways of the United States and the railways of Great Britain. Do hon. members know that the railways of Great Britain to-day are practically on the scrap heap? The railways of the United States are in a similar position, and some kind of government relief must come to those roads. I am not speaking about the failures in connection with the railroad systems of Europe. They have all gone to pieces by reason of the war. Railways owned by the state in France, in Germany, Russia and Italy, as well as those owned by citizens, have been absolutely ruined by the war and some other things. Referring to the two cases of Great Britain and the United States, the following despatch appeared in the Ottawa press this morning:

> Washington, March 26.—Enforced consolidation of United States railroads into a small number of systems putting strong and weak together, is looming up more and more as the probable big feature of the transportation recommendations which President Harding will make in his forthcoming series of speeches. This step will be urged as the only salvation for weaker roads, short of government ownership. Not improbably the British experience with consolidations which is said to have been satisfactory, will be set forth.

They have a plan in Washington, and it will be submitted to the country, to unify the roads there, and that unification will be brought about by the use of the credit of the United States and the issue of bonds. They are going to issue bonds to recover possession of the railways there. They cannot go ahead.

10 p.m.

We have overbuilt and they have underbuilt; the roads are in trouble and the government has to come to their relief. They are in the same position in Great Britain. A consolidation is going on there for the improvement of the railways, and the government will have to take the responsibility. So that what is coming to Canada is coming to Great Britain and the United States, and the prospect is that national ownership of railways will be more or less adopted in those countries. If that is the case, we should not be discouraged in Canada, and we should have confidence in the road and in the government, inasmuch as they have said that they intend to give government ownership a fair trial. I have not heard to-night—and I am not going to make the statement myself—that they have not given it a fair trial, and I will go so far as to congratulate the minister on the statement he made and which indicated that the railways would get a fair trial. The results of unification will come and come rapidly. We will let the public see that we really have a first-class railway system and a real solution of the railway problem in Canada.

In connection with the suggestions that have been made and the grievances which have been voiced as to our railways, the new management cannot too soon take up the question of a reclassification of freight with special reference to the basic industries that provide the great bulk of the traffic. That does not quite involve a reduction in rate, so much as

an improved classification. We will give advantages to the public. The public are interested in grain and the products of grain, coal and ore, and there is no reason why the new management of the National Railways should not take up reclassification and bring relief to the people of this country who are now complaining of freight rates.

I do not suggest that the new administration, or the new board of directors, should take up the question of waterways in connection with the railways, but that the parliament of Canada should immediately take up the question of the improvement of waterways and in that way help to reduce freight rates, because the nation has just as much interest in waterways as in railways. The one is complementary of the other, and there is no reason why a great reduction in freight rates cannot be effected by parliament taking up the improvement of the waterways and co-operating with the board of directors of the railways. Therefore Mr. Speaker it is a satisfaction to those who, under a great deal of discouragement, favour the nationalization of the railways, not only because of conditions that go with it, but because of the mess into which our railways have got, that we have public ownership to-day, and that it promises to be a success. The people of Canada will be more than satisfied if they find the government on its part giving public ownership a fair trial, and doing everything possible to carry out the trust confided to them.

I wish to point out that a great change has come to the railways of America by reason of the improvement of the highways and the development of the motor truck and motor car. Do hon. members know that the local passenger business of the United States, or the great bulk of it, has gone largely to the motor car? Certainly the great bulk of the local freight in the United States and in Canada now is going to the motor truck, and in that way a lot of local business has been taken from the railways, and has gone to the highways and the motor car. I know districts 200 miles in extent where there are good highways, where almost all the local business in passengers and freight has gone to the motor trucks and cars operated on the highways. The great advantage of this—and we must all recognize it—is that the motor truck comes to the shipper for the freight and delivers it to the receiver. There is no cartage to pay. It goes the same day it is taken from the shipper and there is a return trip the next day.

The railways have suffered discouragement by the disappearance of a lot of the local business which has been profitable to them in the past. But notwithstanding all that, there is a future for the railways. There is no future for the railways that have not the government behind them—and that is a fact that has come out to-day—both in Britain and the United States. That being the case, we ought to have a feeling of confidence in regard to the future and of appreciation for those who put forward the idea that the only way out of the transportation problem was by government ownership, and who had not misled the country or induced it to embark upon a doubtful venture. Therefore, if the minister can improve his statements somewhat on the line of the statements given us by the Canadian Pacific Railway, we will be able to get the number of cars, the mileage, and the net receipts for the year, and we will also get, a little later on, an actual statement of the assets and liabilities in connection with these roads we have now taken over and which constitute, I hope, the greatest asset Canada has.

Motion agreed to and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

SUPPLY

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

Railways and Canals—amount not exceeding $73,000,000 to meet expenditures made or indebtedness incurred (where amounts available from net operating earnings may be insufficient) by or on behalf of the Canadian National Railway Company, hereinafter called "the Company", or any company specified in the first schedule to the act incorporating the Canadian National Railway Company, being chapter 13 of the Statutes of Canada, 1919, or by the company in respect of any railways, properties or works entrusted to the company from time to time under the provisions of section 11 of the said chapter 13 of the Statutes of Canada, 1919, or by or on behalf of any company specified or referred to in chapter 13 of the Statutes of Canada, 1920; or any one or more of them, on any of the following accounts: (a) Operating deficits whenever incurred or ascertained. (b) Acquisition of property, materials and supplies. (c) Interest and sinking funds on notes, securities or obligations. (d) Principal and interest of maturing or matured loans secured or unsecured. (e) Construction and betterments. (f) Co-ordination or consolidation of railway lines and facilities. (g) Guarantees of securities. The amount herein authorized may be applied from time to time, in the discretion of the Governor in Council: (a) To meet expenditures made or indebtedness incurred by the company in respect of railway, properties and works entrusted to the company as aforesaid. (b) By way of loans in cash, or by way of guarantee, or partly one way and partly the other, subject, however, as follows: If by way of loans, the amount or amounts advanced shall be repayable on demand, with interest at the rate fixed by the Governor in Council, from time to time, payable half-yearly, secured if and when directed by the Governor in Council by mortgage or mortgages upon such properties in such form and containing such terms and

conditions, not inconsistent herewith, as the Governor in Council may approve. If by way of guarantee, any such guarantee may be of the principal and interest of the notes and obligations or securities of one or more of the said companies specified by the Governor in Council, and may be signed by the Minister of Finance, on behalf of His Majesty, in such form and on such terms and conditions as the Governor in Council may determine to be appropriate and applicable thereto, $73,000,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We might possibly have some useful discussion on this item to-night, but I doubt it. The Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) last night intimated that to-night we would consider the estimates of the Department of Labour. There was no positive statement to that effect but that was his belief. I think it would be better if we took up the estimates of that department. The railway statement has just been given and hon. members would wish to read it before discussing it, or at least before coming to any decision with reference to it. This is the chief item of the railway estimates, and while I have no objection to its being discussed to some extent to-night, I do not think that the minister should ask us to consider an item of this kind to-night immediately after he has presented his statement to the House.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am fully in accord with what the leader of the Opposition says. Probably the discussion to-night would not lessen the volume of debate on any subsequent occasion; we should no doubt have to start all over again. The Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock) is here and I suppose there could be no objection to the committee proceeding to consider his estimates.

Mr. BOYS: The minister might be good enough to give me some information regarding the Crowsnest agreement. In his statement he said that the loss in revenue due to the restoration of the Crowsnest rates was in round figures $6,000,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: $6,500,000.

Mr. BOYS: That would, of course, be from the first of July to the end of the year. I did not gather just how that figure was arrived at. The statement which was submitted to the committee on transportation rates was based on the rates prevailing in 1921. Comparing those rates with the rates established by the Crowsnest agreement, and assuming the volume of business in 1922 to be the same as that of 1921, I find the estimate given by Mr. Hanna before the committee was $8,600,000 for the whole year, while in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway it was some $7,000,000. Now we are told that for the six months mentioned it was $6,500,000. I did not gather from the minister, however, what figures he used in arriving at that sum.

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend will probably find the data in the tables I have placed on Hansard but which I did not read. If not, I shall be glad to get them.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It would necessarily be arrived at by a comparison of the rates obtaining last year with the rates obtaining in 1921, because the information furnished the minister evidently was a comparison of 1922 with 1921. To be a comparison it would have to take the rates of 1922 as opposed to the rates of 1921.

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: As I pointed out, there is no doubt there would be that difference if we could assume that the 1921 rates under any conditions would have prevailed. Of course, the 1921 rates would never have prevailed, no matter what this parliament did as respects the Crowsnest agreement. But so far as the comparison goes, it would be the 1922 rates as against the 1921.

Mr. BOYS: I am of the same opinion, but I was paying fairly close attention to the matter and did not recall that the minister had mentioned that, That is why I wanted to be sure. It is an important matter, because we should like to compare the figures the minister gives with the statements given on behalf of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canadian National Railways before the committee on transportation rates.

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not think we can take any other basis than the rates of 1921 as compared with the rates of 1922; and I think I explained that it was also assumed that the same amount of traffic was carried in 1922. In other words, the comparison did not allow for the fact that greater tonnage might have been carried on account of the reduction in rates.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Could the minister give the figures comparing the actual rate in effect in 1922 with the rate that the railways agreed to accept before the special committee? I do not suppose the difference would be more than a million and a half or a million and a quarter.

Mr. GRAHAM: That estimate could be given. The railways did make a proposition as to rates, but I have not any comparison.

Mr. BOYS: If I remember rightly the figure is something over $3,000,000, I forget whether

in regard to the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Canadian National Railways.

Item stands.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOUR

Conciliation and Labour Act, including publication, printing, binding and distribution of Labour Gazette, and allowance to correspondents, $50,000.

Mr. BOYS: Was all of this appropriation expended last year?

Hon. JAMES MURDOCK (Minister of Labour): The expenditure up to January 31st was $38,928.29, leaving $11,000 for the three months.

Mr. BOYS: What are the details of this expenditure?

Mr. MURDOCK: Correspondents' salaries, $7,984.78; travelling expenses, $186.53; sundries, $1.60; printing and stationery, $28,615; retail prices reports, $139.55; rental survey, $736.17; publication newspapers, etc., $1,264.66.

Mr. BOYS: Is there any substantial difference in the various figures now given as between this year and last year?

Mr. MURDOCK: The expenditure is practically the same as last year.

Mr. BOYS: I know the total is of course; but are the figures the same in the separation of the various items?

Mr. MURDOCK: The actual amount expended is about the same from year to year.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is the printing and stationery item?

Mr. MURDOCK: The entire appropriation of $50,000 is intended mainly to meet the cost of printing, binding and distribution of the Labour Gazette, which runs to about $36,000 a year.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does not the Printing bureau print the Labour Gazette?

Mr. MURDOCK: No.

Mr. MEIGHEN: How is that?

Mr. MURDOCK: I do not think the Labour Gazette has been printed in the bureau for twenty years.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is evidently one reform that was left open for the minister. How is it he does not grasp the opportunity?

Mr. MURDOCK: I have been giving the matter very serious consideration and hope to meet the right hon. gentleman's wishes in respect to it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Where is the Labour Gazette printed?

Mr. MURDOCK: The placing of the union label on the Labour Gazette was regarded in years gone by as of sufficient importance to warrant having the Gazette printed outside the bureau. That has been the determining factor.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I suppose the government in doing all the rest of its printing, which would be about 97 or 98 per cent, is non-union; but when it comes to the Labour Gazette it is union?

Mr. BOYS: Where is the Labour Gazette printed?

Mr. MURDOCK: The Federal Printing Company prints the Labour Gazette at the present time.

Mr. BOYS: Where does that company operate?

Mr. MURDOCK: It is an Ottawa concern.

Mr. BOYS: Has it been printing the Labour Gazette for some years?

Mr. MURDOCK: No, the contract was given to the Federal Printing Company early in 1922.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They are a very strong Liberal aggregation, I am informed.

Mr. MURDOCK: I understand that there are some reputable Liberals connected with the firm.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Any disreputable?

Mr. MURDOCK: I do not know.

Mr. CHARTERS: What is the circulation?

Mr. MURDOCK: About 13,000 a month.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Was this contract made by tender, were other firms invited to tender, and how long is the contract likely to defer the minister's hopes of getting the work done in the bureau?

Mr. MURDOCK: The contract was not let by tender. It runs from month to month at the will of the minister.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Why is it not let by tender?

Mr. MURDOCK: The minister being new at the business just followed the practice that had been in vogue in the past, but which may not have been right.

Mr. BOYS: What was the cost of printing the Labour Gazette last year and the year before as compared with the present year? Was the change made because the price was too high, or the work done unsatisfactorily, or was it desired to increase the price a little?

Mr. MURDOCK: The Auditor General's report for 1921-22 shows that 213,800 copies of the Labour Gazette were printed at a cost of $32,614.15. The annual cost has been between $32,000 and $36,000 for a number of years, with a tendency to slightly increase each year.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is the fiscal year and would be at the old rate. Will the minister give the exact figures to show how the rates compare? Who was the old contract with? I do not know myself.

Mr. MURDOCK: The rates are standard, subject to the King's Printer's audit and check—in other words the current rates.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is no contract at all?

Mr. MURDOCK: A contract to do the work, subject to audit and payment for the amount of printing done.

Mr. BOYS: Is it a written or verbal contract?

Mr. MURDOCK: Verbal. There is a brief statement of the understanding with regard to the matter exactly the same as when I took charge.

Mr. BOYS: If the company who had the contract before that were doing the work satisfactorily and at the same price, why the change?

Mr. MURDOCK: I would not say that the work was being done altogether satisfactorily before.

Mr. BOYS: Would the minister say it was not?

Mr. MURDOCK: No, I would not like to be that positive about it.

Mr. BOYS: The minister must have had some good reason for making the change. It may have been a political reason, but to him it would have been good, at all events. Now, can he not let us have the reason?

Mr. MURDOCK: It was regarded as advisable and consistent under the circumstances, to make the change and to have another concern for the time being print the Labour Gazette with the union label thereon.

[Mr. Murdock.]

Mr. BOYS: I am delighted with the pleasant way in which the minister replies, but I would like to get the information. He says it was advisable—advisable for what reason?

Mr. MURDOCK: I cannot add anything to what I have said. There were various suggestions that indicated the advisability of making the change, for the time being at least.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What were those suggestions?

Mr. BOYS: Was it because there were some reputable Liberals in this new concern?

Mr. MURDOCK: That possibly was a factor.

Mr. BOYS: Has the minister not a better reason?

Mr. MURDOCK: There were various reasons, the chief of which was that the minister, being new on the job, was following what he understood to have been the invariable practice.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Who were the contractors before, and who were the contractors prior to 1911?

Mr. MURDOCK: The Ottawa Printing Company, of which the late Mr. Boudreault, I believe, was the head.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What was the matter with the firm that was doing the work?

Mr. MURDOCK: I am not charging anything.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It looks as if this is a patronage government, does it not?

Mr. MURDOCK: No, I would not think so—not so far as I am concerned.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The only reason the minister has yet given is that there may have been some Liberals in the new firm. Can he think of any other reason?

Mr. LANCTOT: I would like to know something about the old firm. Were there any Tories in it, or any Liberals?

Mr. MURDOCK: Up to 1911 the Ottawa Free Press Company had the contract. In 1911 it was promptly transferred to the Ottawa Printing Company and the work was done by them until about a year ago.

Mr. SHAW: Is it not about time that the contract was let by tender?

Mr. MURDOCK: That would not involve a saving, because the payment in any case for the printing done would be on the basis of the cost assessed by the auditors of the

Printing bureau and on standard rates fixed for all such work. Therefore it is merely a question of getting a concern which can satisfactorily and expeditiously turn out the work. It is known in advance what they are going to get for the work performed.

Mr. SHAW: Will the minister be frank and say that the reason for the change was entirely a political one?

Mr. MURDOCK: I could not truthfully say that. There were several reasons. The one that has been suggested by gentlemen opposite can be regarded by them as one of the side issues, but the real reason was that it was regarded under all the circumstances as being more satisfactory to make a change.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am sorry the minister's memory is so bad. He can only think of the political reason; there are other reasons that for the life of him he cannot think of to-night. The minister says all these prices are fixed and that there is no use in calling for tenders. When the Combines Act comes into operation is the minister going to turn his fury upon this combine?

Mr. JACOBS: Wait until it gets on the statute book, and then we will see.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Of course, I am prepared to wait for that. But the minister says that everything is fixed; that there would be no use in getting tenders because they would all be of the same amount. That would look to me like something that would come under the definition of "combine" under the new act. Does the minister intend to turn his wrath upon this combine when the new act comes into effect?

Mr. MURDOCK: My right hon. friend misunderstands. The government railways, for example, have a good deal of printing done at different places throughout Canada. No matter what the firm doing the work undertakes to charge, the payments are based on a recognized schedule of printers' rates. That is what happens in this case. All these printing accounts are audited by the King's Printer.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is the use of auditing them if they are all the same?

Mr. MURDOCK: Measurements have to be made, then we find printing concerns attempting to overcharge. In such cases their rate is cut down to the current or standard rate.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Does the minister think it is of any great value to have the union label on this one publication when it is not on the others?

Mr. MURDOCK: No.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Under these circumstances is any effort being made to see that some kind of council is established or other arrangements made under which the employees of the Printing bureau may have some sort of self-government?

Mr. MURDOCK: I have not heard of any complaint on the part of Printing bureau employees that they have not had all necessary opportunities to make their wants and complaints known to those in charge. I should be the first to resent it if I thought any condition of that kind existed.

Mr. BOYS: When was the Federal Printing Company incorporated?

Mr. MURDOCK: I am unable to answer that.

Mr. BOYS: Where they in business a year before they got this printing contract?

Mr. MURDOCK: I am not sure as to that.

Mr. BOYS: I will put a more direct question. Was the company incorporated for the express purpose of receiving and filling this contract?

Mr. MURDOCK: I have no knowledge as to that. I do not even know if it is incorporated yet.

Mr. BOYS: Then formed as a co-partnership?

Mr. MURDOCK: It has been doing the work.

Mr. BOYS: Would the minister have any difficulty in getting that information for the committee?

Mr. MURDOCK: I will try.

Mr. BOYS: I may say frankly that so far as I am concerned, if instead of mentioning one reason, namely, political, and then saying generally that there were other reasons, without giving them, the minister had given those various other reasons I would be quite satisfied. If he will not do so, I think we ought to have some information about this company, and if he cannot give it now perhaps the minister will get the information as to when they started doing business, and whether they formed a partnership or were incorporated as a company for the express purpose of filling this contract.

Mr. MURDOCK: We have no knowledge as to that. I am told they were in business for some time. They were certainly in business when they got the contract for printing the Labour Gazette.

Mr. RYCKMAN: I would like to ask the minister how he came to pick upon this amount of $50,000—and I will give him my reason for asking the question. This sum of $50,000 appears in the Estimates of 1920-1921, 1922-1923, and 1923-1924. The minister just seems to have carried the item on. The figure seems to have been tatooed into the Estimates. The minister in the section of the country whence I came made very loud protestation of the reforms and economies that were going to be effected when his government was in office. Surely this item of $50,000 need not be carried on from year to year. If the minister really means economy, I think that ten or fifteen or twenty thousand dollars could be deducted from this amount. I would ask the minister, since this hereditary item of $50,000 appears in the Estimates again this year, whether it is going to be $50,000 next year.

Mr. MURDOCK: If my hon. friend will look at the Auditor General's report he will find that for the last fiscal year there was spent $49,949.90. Up to the 31st of January last, as I have already stated to the committee, there was spent $38,928.29, leaving $11,071.71 to meet the expenses of printing the Labour Gazette, pay correspondents' salaries and other incidentals for the months of February and March of the closing fiscal year.

Mr. RYCKMAN: Can the minister effect any economies in this expenditure, or is economy just a conversational word with him?

Mr. MURDOCK: On this particular item I think not, because the circulation of the Labour Gazette is increasing, and an increase in circulation means an increased expenditure under this vote. This one item has therefore remained pretty stationary. As I have already intimated, there was only $50.10 too much voted for the last fiscal year, as is shown by the Auditor General's report. That, I think, is working pretty close to the estimate.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): To whom is the Labour Gazette distributed, organizations or individuals?

Mr. MURDOCK: There are from seven to eight thousand subscriptions to the Labour Gazette. It is also distributed free to the local secretaries of trades unions and very many others who are interested in its contents.

[Mr. Boys.]

Mr. MacLAREN: If the Gazette were printed in the Printing bureau, would that effect a saving over the present cost?

Mr. MURDOCK: I understand that in the actual printing there would be no particular saving. It might be possible for the Printing bureau to print the Labour Gazette without additional help, but it is pretty hard to determine what the actual cost would be having regard to the overhead in connection with the operation of the Printing bureau.

Mr. MacLAREN: Has the minister under consideration transferring the printing of the Labour Gazette to the Printing bureau?

Mr. MURDOCK: One of the principal considerations that was in mind about a year ago when this contract was changed was the possibility of its being printed, either then or at some time in the near future, at the Printing bureau if that appeared to be the proper thing to do. That is the reason the agreement was made to run from month to month.

Mr. BOYS: Would that not be a very good reason for not making the change? If you were contemplating getting it done at the Printing bureau, why make a change from the previous company at all? I should think the very opposite is the reason. This contract involves $32,600, which is a pretty snug amount. Another company had this work, and I understand that their work was satisfactory. The price was identical with the price the minister is paying now, and the minister was confronted with one of two alternatives: Either the Gazette would continue to be printed by that company, or a change would take place. The minister no doubt talked the matter over, and perhaps took advice upon it for all I know, made inquiries, and because of information of some kind that he received he decided to make the change. I do think the House is entitled to more information than the minister has given. He said that one reason for making the change was political, and that is the only reason we can get, but he admits frankly that the change was made for various other reasons. Now the fact that the minister says "for various reasons" shows that he knows there were various other reasons, and if he knows there were, he must know what they were. Surely in a matter involving such a sum we have a right to know why that change was made.

Mr. JACOBS: Does not the hon. member as the Whip of a once important party in this country consider the first reason sufficient?

Mr. BOYS: If the hon. member will have patience and give the minister a chance to answer my question—

Mr. JACOBS: I have asked a question and I would like an answer.

Mr. BOYS: I will await my answer. After that, I will be quite prepared to submit myself to examination by my hon. friend.

Mr. JACOBS: I have my doubts about it.

Mr. MURDOCK: If my hon. friend will indicate the question he wants answered—

Mr. BOYS: I do not wonder the minister has forgotten the various reasons. If I have to repeat this all again I am quite willing to do it but I do not want to unduly delay the committee. If the minister tells me that he does not know what I am asking I will be quite willing to repeat the question.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the resolution carry?

Mr. BOYS: Certainly not while I am on my feet and asking a question.

The CHAIRMAN: I thought the hon. member had put his question.

Mr. BOYS: I have asked the question and I am waiting for an answer.

Mr. MURDOCK: My hon. friend started out by making the assertion that a good reason for not transferring the contract would be if we were considering the possibility of having the printing done in the Printing bureau. He is entirely mistaken as to that. An important reason why we should not seriously consider it is the fact that for many years it has been regarded as the proper thing—such had been the opinion entertained under two previous governments—to have the Labour Gazette printed outside the Printing bureau for the purpose of getting the union label on it. The question to be determined was whether that should be continued. It was indicated that certain of the conditions under which the Labour Gazette was being printed were not altogether satisfactory, and that the concern handling it were, possibly, not performing the work with entire satisfaction. In other words it was indicated that it was advisable to make some change, and the point to determine was should we change from the concern that were printing the Gazette and had been doing so for a number of years, transfer it to the Printing bureau and take the chance of cutting the union label out; or should we let some other concern handle it for a time, under an agreement subject to thirty days' notice. That was the position that was taken and I think my hon. friend will, on reflection, agree—no matter how frank I may be expected to be—that he could scarcely require me to disclose all the particular reasons indicated to me as to why it is advisable to change this particular contract, or to change from one firm to the other. I was given to understand in the most emphatic manner that it was advisable to do so. One important reason why it was deemed advisable was, that the concern that had been printing it had so much work that they could not give as prompt consideration to the handling of the Labour Gazette as we believed the cause of Labour was entitled to have. In other words they could not get the Gazette out as promptly and satisfactorily as was considered necessary.

Mr. BOYS: I want to thank the minister for his explanation; that is one feature we have been waiting for. I would have thought that the main consideration in the matter would be the price and the way in which the work was done. If the work was properly done and at a right price one would not think a change would be desirable. However, if the publication of the Gazette was delayed and the minister gives that as a reason for making the change, I admit that is a fair reason. Now may I ask the minister, are there any other reasons as favourable that he can give? We have got two of them—value of the work and politics.

Mr. MURDOCK: May I correct my hon. friend on one point: There is no difference in the price. The price is fixed; it is a schedule rate.

Mr. BOYS: What I mean is that if you were getting the work done more cheaply that would be a good reason; but not if the price was the same, and the work was satisfactorily performed. The minister has given one reason for the change and if he has any more to assign we are entitled to have them.

Mr. MURDOCK: I have already informed the hon. gentleman that there were various reasons advanced. Among those reasons is a very important one that we wanted to get the Labour Gazette out promptly.

Mr. BOYS: The minister is still very strong in his use of the word "various", I see. Who is the editor of the Labour Gazette?

Mr. MURDOCK: Mr. Hooper has been the editor, or was so classified, although the committee will understand that the Deputy Min-

ister of Labour really occupies the position. In an effort to economize or, shall I say, co-ordinate the duties of the department, it has been decided that the deputy minister and the assistant deputy minister ought to be able to do all the necessary work in editing the Labour Gazette. In consequence the services of Mr. Hooper, who has been editing the Gazette, have been, with great regret, dispensed with, dating from the end of the present fiscal year.

Mr. CHARTERS: Does he belong to the union?

Mr. MURDOCK: I am not informed as to that. Furthermore, I do not know that there is a union which embraces editors.

Mr. SPENCER: May I ask the minister if Mr. Hooper did his work satisfactorily?

Mr. MURDOCK: Oh, yes. There has not been the slightest complaint in regard to Mr. Hooper's work; in fact I understand that his work has been commendably well done always. He is a very capable man so far as I know.

Mr. CHARTERS: Is Mr. Hooper still in the employ of the department?

Mr. MURDOCK: He will until the end of the fiscal year be on salary. Then, under the retirement regulations, he will receive, I think, an amount totalling some five months' salary for the number of years he has put in.

Mr. CHARTERS: So there is no saving at all by the arrangement which has been made?

Mr. MURDOCK: Yes, there will be a saving to the extent of $2,880 a year, which I think is the salary of the editor. For five months, of course, there will be no saving. The government will pay just as much for the next five months as though Mr. Hooper were on continuous duty, but after that there will be a saving.

Mr. SPENCER: How long has Mr. Hooper been in the regular service?

Mr. MURDOCK: He has been in the government's service for about seventeen years, and in the Department of Labour for five or six years.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Can the minister tell us the number of correspondents employed by the Labour Gazette and what allowance they receive at the present time?

Mr. MURDOCK: There are about sixty or sixty-five of these correspondents and the salary paid runs from $125 to $300 a year. I think one correspondent receives $300, but the majority are paid about $150, $175 or $200.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Does the minister think that those correspondents who receive $125 are being sufficiently remunerated for the work they do? I remember that when the Gazette was established, in the year 1900, the salary of a correspondent was $100, and he was expected to send in at least twelve reports per annum. I know at that time the amount paid was looked upon as very small. I am rather surprised to find that after twenty-three years there are men still working for the Labour Gazette at $125 per annum. Does not the minister think there ought to be an increase in the amount paid to those in the lower grade at the present time?

Mr. MURDOCK: The lower salaries are $125 or $150 paid to correspondents in the very small towns. For example, at Bathurst, New Brunswick, the salary is $125, and at Thetford Mines, Quebec, the salary is $150. My hon. friend, I am sure, will appreciate that some capable clerk, a young gentleman or older gentleman, who was thoroughly familiar with conditions at Bathurst, New Brunswick, or at Thetford, Quebec, could in his evenings or spare moments put together the detailed information that is required covering that particular locality, and send it in at the proper time to the Department of Labour.

Mr. GUTHRIE: What do they receive at points in Ontario such as Stratford, Kitchener and Guelph?

Mr. MURDOCK: At Kitchener $150, Stratford $150, and Guelph $150.

Mr. BOYS: What is the figure at Barrie? It might be under "Allandale." I think we would like an increase there.

Mr. MURDOCK: Not large enough to qualify.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The amounts paid in the smaller places are rather too small. I do not know that I am authorized to make any complaint on behalf of these correspondents. If they are satisfied with the amount, I do not know that I should offer any complaint at all. I know that I have heard comment among labour men that the position of correspondent of the Labour Gazette was hardly worth while, and I think the minister would make no mistake if he were to look into the matter a little in the ordinary places of from ten to twenty-five thousand people in the province of Ontario, because I do think $150 is too little for the work these men do.

Mr. MURDOCK: I understand that some few years ago there were some increases made in regard to these correspondents, and I will be glad to take under advisement any complaints in that respect that I receive.

Mr. GOULD: I wish to ask the minister in regard to the correspondent in the lignite area in southern Saskatchewan, and the correspondent in Alberta. What is the name of the gentleman in southern Saskatchewan?

Mr. MURDOCK: Mr. W. Hawkins at Lethbridge, Alberta, and Mr. McCreath, in Edmonton, Alberta.

Mr. GOULD: Who is the correspondent in southern Saskatchewan?

Mr. MURDOCK: Mr. W. B. McNeill at Regina and Rev. E. B. Smith at Saskatoon, Saskatchewan. I said $125 was the minimum, but I notice there is a salary of $100 a year.

Mr. EULER: Is there any effort to make the Gazette self-sustaining?

Mr. MURDOCK: No, we can only charge 20 cents a copy for the Labour Gazette, and of course that does not begin to pay the cost of its publication. That is only a nominal fee, I am told, to prevent people
11 p.m. from writing in just for fun to get the Gazette, but with a desire to circulate it as much as possible.

Item agreed to.

Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, $25,000.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Was this vote expended last year?

Mr. MURDOCK: Yes, and we are $3,376 in debt.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Could we have some particulars of the expenditure?

Mr. MURDOCK: For this year?

Mr. GUTHRIE: For last year—how the money was spent?

Mr. MURDOCK: The hon. member means for the present fiscal year?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK: During the present fiscal year we have had a considerable number of boards under the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act. The first one that is recorded here is the Association of Canadian Building and Construction Industries and employees, hod-carriers, $590; the Dominion Power and Transmission Company and employees, $125; various Nova Scotia coal companies and employees, $2,583.27; the Ottawa Electric Railway and employees, $1,560; The Algoma Eastern Railway and employees, $1,194.30; New York Central Railway and Federated Shopcrafts, $352.80, and so on. Does my hon. friend want me to complete the list? There were two large expenditures. The Southern Alberta Coal Company and employees, district 18, during last spring, cost $4,991.99. Another large matter was the Grand Trunk and employees, clerks' investigation, which cost $4,868.66. These are the two largest expenditures for the board.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Is there any expenditure under this item in regard to the strike that took place at Sydney, Nova Scotia, in which the militia of Canada was called out?

Mr. MURDOCK: Yes, considerably prior to the time that strike occurred there was a board; in fact it was the previous year. There were two boards, if my hon. friend will recall, down in Sydney, Nova Scotia, during the latter part of 1921 and the early part of 1922.

Mr. GUTHRIE: An item was given by the minister, Nova Scotia Coal Company, $2,583.27. Were the costs of these boards included in that item?

Mr. MURDOCK: Yes, that is the cost of the board of investigation that inquired into that situation.

Mr. BOYS: These costs all have to do with the board?

Mr. MURDOCK: Yes.

Mr. BOYS: Nothing whatever to do with the troops that were sent down there?

Mr. MURDOCK: Oh, no.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I think the expenditure under this head appears to be quite moderate, particularly if the convening of these boards has resulted in stopping the strike or the apprehended strike, but we know that in one instance that was not the result, that notwithstanding the efforts and the good offices of the board, very serious difficulties did arise. The question is likely to come before the House, and I suppose the question could be discussed under this item as to who is going to pay the rather substantial amount that someone is liable for in connection with one of these strikes in Nova Scotia which failed of settlement under the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act. Would the minister give us some of the particulars of the amount which that strike has cost the country?

Mr. MURDOCK: I am very sorry, but I have absolutely no knowledge of any other cost to the country except this particular item, unless it be the approximate amount lost in wages.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Has the minister the approximate amounts in lost wages? I should be glad to know what the cost of such a strike is to the country.

Mr. MURDOCK: I have not that information, and it would be to a very large extent guess work, as I think my hon. friend will appreciate. The alleged damage to property, if any, and the loss of wages and all of these things would be mere matters of conjecture. However, I have here a memorandum that indicates the time lost and the number of men who were out of work during the year on two big coal mining strikes in Nova Scotia. In the strike from August 14 to September 5th, eighteen days, 14,353 men were out and the time lost represented 258,354 days. In district No. 18 from April 1st to August 28th, 124 days, 7,538 men were out and the time lost represented 931,960 days. The total time lost therefore was considerably over a million days.

Mr. GUTHRIE: That is the loss in wages?

Mr. MURDOCK: No, that is the loss of days, and I presume that if you averaged that at $5 a day you could find the approximate total amount of money involved.

Mr. GUTHRIE: So that if I understand the matter, these strikes of which the minister has now given the particulars have cost in wages alone something between $5,000,000 and $6,000,000. If the discussion of these strikes comes properly under this item, I would ask that the item be allowed to stand until some future time, as I am aware that some hon. members desire to discuss it. Of course, if the strikes are not pertinent I have no objection to the item carrying. But when one considers the tremendous importance of these strikes to this country in view of the loss in wages to the men, the loss to the owners and operators of the mines, and the loss to the transportation companies, one is appalled by the figures; and if the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act fails in cases of this kind, could not the minister offer some suggestion for the improvement of the act? Is there no means which this parliament could adopt which in the future would have a better effect as between the employer and the employee in the way of avoiding or settling these strikes? They run into untold millions, and I should think that the minister has probably given a very great deal of attention to this question. The committee would no doubt be very much pleased to know, therefore, if he can offer any practical suggestion for the improvement of the act which in future will, if possible, obviate these strikes, or some of the larger ones at all events.

Mr. MURDOCK: The hon. member will no doubt have noted that in the proposed Bill No. 84 now before the House some suggestions are contained looking to the improvement of the act, and which it is hoped may assist in maintaining a better condition of industrial harmony. As to the question of securing a measure of any kind that will at all times, under all circumstances, guard against the possibility of a strike, or the conditions that are usually incident to a disagreement between employer and employee on vital wage questions, I regret to say that I do not believe we have come to the point where we can secure anything of that kind at present. But if my hon. friend will analyze the results that have accrued to Canada in connection with the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act he will agree that we have been remarkably fortunate, and that there has been very little loss sustained in Canada in comparison with various other countries that we might mention. I have not the slightest objection, if my hon. friend insists, to allowing this item to stand for discussion later. But I think he will concede that this particular strike in which he is interested that occurred in Sydney, Nova Scotia, in August last, was the culmination of a dispute long standing. One of the very first acts I was called upon, as Minister of Labour, to perform, was to appoint a chairman for a board that had been authorized by my predecessor in the previous government. The board was all ready to function and was just awaiting the final word to proceed. That board, as my hon. friend will recall, undertook to deal with this particular situation, with some unfortunate results for some reason or other. My hon. friend will remember also the discussion which later developed and the proposals that were made down in Sydney, with the final result that we again appointed another board in the month of April or May. That board filed its award, and that award was equally thrown to one side by the workmen as insufficient to satisfy their demands, with the result that all at once, with very little or no notice, and in repudiation of the suggestions made in the board's award, the employees went on strike. The results therefrom are, I think, familiar to my hon. friend.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Was the final settlement after the strike made in terms of the award originally submitted by the Board of Conciliation?

Mr. MURDOCK: I think not. I do not think it had any regard for the terms of the award.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Then the final settlement came about through the efforts of the men and their employers directly, without the influence of the board at all. Is that correct?

Mr. MURDOCK: The final settlement was made as between the workmen and those representing the company. They, of course, had the advantage of the two inquiries that had been conducted during six or seven months. They had the advantage of all that information brought out in those two inquiries; but the settlement was made, as all settlements should be made, between those directly concerned.

Mr. GUTHRIE: That is just the point that was brought to my knowledge during the present session in the corridors of the House. The statement was made that the men and the employers would have come to a settlement if there had been no board at all in this matter, that the appointment of the board had the effect of irritating either one side or the other and of increasing rather than diminishing the difficulty. Does the minister think that in a case such as the Nova Scota coal strike a settlement would have been reached more expeditiously had no board of investigation been appointed? I know of course that when the parties concerned demand boards, under our present law it is the duty of the minister to appoint them. But if in that respect the act is wrong, we can easily change it. It has been drawn to my attention that the Nova Scotia coal strike went from bad to worse by reason of the appointment of a board, one party or the other resenting the appointment, and the difficulty of the situation increasing from week to week; whereas it is said, that if no board at all had been appointed the difficulty would have been settled without any very serious trouble. In the end it was settled, as the minister says, by the operators and the men, absolutely without regard to the fiinding of the board. I know that in very many instances the act has proved very beneficial in operation and that small strikes and difficulties have been avoided. But when the difficulty becomes serious does the minister think that the appointment of a board merely adds fuel to the fire, or has it the effect of bringing about a speedier settlement?

Mr. MURDOCK: My hon. friend might possibly like to have the results speak for themselves. From 1907 to 1921, 558 applications were made under the act for a board. The number of boards granted was 401. The number of disputes where a strike was not averted or ended was 34 only out of that total. So I think this shows a very satisfactory average of settlements. Then my hon. friend will recall that last summer when our neighbours to the south were in the midst of the most disastrous railroad strikes that possibly they had ever experienced, Canada was free from such troubles, and I think it is not improper to take some credit for this satisfactory condition to the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act. I think the result secured through the negotiations entered into between employee and employers under the provisions of the act maintained a harmony that was evidenced in our railroad situation throughout the past year. As my hon. friend knows, the mining situation in this country has been somewhat in a class by itself so far as the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act is concerned. In other words, our miners unfortunately have not taken kindly to the provisions of the act and have not always co-operated to the extent we might hope in carrying out its provisions.

Mr. BOYS: I quite agree that the results given are most satisfactory. Will the minister state how many boards were constituted last year and in what cases they were successful?

Mr. MURDOCK: Thirty-two boards were established and strikes resulted in two mining cases, one east and the other west. My hon. friend may recall that in the West the strike began on April 1, 1922, with the general coal miners' strike all over the United States almost before we were able to get a board formed and functioning. The strike in District 18 lasted for several months concurrently with the strike in the United States coal industry.

Mr. SHAW: Does the minister suggest that the strike to which he has just referred, which involved something over 7,000 men, was settled only by reason of the settlement reached in the United States? Is it not a fact that that strike was settled independently of the difficulty in the United States, and that the work of the Labour Department in so far as the application of this particular act is concerned was ineffective?

Mr. MURDOCK: I would not say that the work of the department was altogether ineffective, nor would I agree that the settlement reached at Calgary was independent of

the settlement reached in the United States, as documentary evidence on file will indicate. A tentative arrangement, as my hon. friend will recall, was entered into by the operators and the representatives of the United Mine Workers on the 18th of August to recommence operations under certain conditions dependent upon the scale of wages finally adopted in the central competitive field of Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana and a portion of Illinois. Within a few days after entering into that agreement they appointed the Minister of Labour as arbitrator to determine when that time arrived, and within a very few days it was necessary for us to wire to both the operators and the miners in the western territory that the rates which had been in effect during the preceding year must continue in force in accordance with what had been settled in the central competitive field. But so far as the actual board is concerned, I could not indicate that it did any particular good during the time that it was investigating the trouble. It was handicapped at the start from the fact that the men in District 18 intended to be governed by what was done in the central competitive field, as the final basis of settlement indicates.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Would the minister let this item stand? I know there are some hon. members absent to-night who want to discuss it.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Does the number of days stated by the minister include strikes in Nova Scotia only?

Mr. MURDOCK: The figure includes strikes in both Nova Scotia and Alberta. The days lost in Nova Scotia were 258,354; in Alberta, 931,960.

Item stands.

Administration, Employment Offices Co-ordination Act, $30,000.

Mr. GUTHRIE: There is some cutting down in this item.

Mr. SHAW: What is the reason for the reduction?

Mr. MURDOCK: The amount asked is $30,000, a reduction of $15,000 from the appropriation for 1922-23. The appropriation is intended to cover expenses incurred in the administration of the Employment Offices Co-ordination Act. Briefly, the statute empowers the minister to aid and encourage the organization and co-ordination of employment offices, to promote uniformity of methods among them, and to establish clearing houses for the interchange of information between employment offices concerning the transfer of labour and other matters. For the purposes of such organization and co-ordination, provision is made for the distribution among the various provinces annually of $150,000. The present vote, however, relates only to expenses incurred in administration and represents disbursements on account of printing, stationery and other supplies, travelling and temporary help There were in January of this year 70 provincial offices and clearing houses, all of which are outfitted from the department with respect to stationery and supplies. It is the intention of the department to close the clearing house at Halifax at the end of the present fiscal year, and that partly accounts for the reduction of $15,000. The duties of the Halifax office are being transferred to Ottawa.

Mr. HANSON: Will the minister be good enough to indicate his attitude with respect to private employment bureaus? I understand there is only one government employment office in New Brunswick, that which is in charge of Mr. Cochrane at Moncton. Some three or four years ago an employment bureau was established at Fredericton, the provincial government paying half the cost of equipment and a portion of the upkeep, the municipality of Fredericton providing offices and so on. The provincial government refused to continue this arrangement, with the result that there was no employment office in the city. Last autumn a returned soldier who had been in the employ of the office while it was functioning opened a private employment bureau in Fredericton, thus filling a long felt want. I understand that he was waited upon by an officer of the Department of Labour and told that it would be illegal for him to continue that office. He consulted me in the matter, and I have been unable to find any statute that would prevent him from maintaining that office, and I so advised him. However, an effort has been made by some officials of this department to have him close up, but the effort has been unsuccessful, and there has been no prosecution, so I assume the advice I gave him was correct. Will the minister tell us what his attitude is with regard to private individuals opening employment offices in localities where no such offices are maintained with the co-operation of his department?

Mr. MURDOCK: My hon. friend is not quite correct in saying that there is only one government employment office in New Brunswick. There is one at Moncton, one at Chatham, and one at St. John.

Mr. HANSON: Does the province contribute to the maintenance of these offices?

Mr. MURDOCK: New Brunswick has all along hesitated to see the necessity of establishing provincial employment offices but has co-operated in the maintenance of municipal employment offices. I understand that at the St. John office they do provide the premises, the staff being chosen by the municipality, and the same arrangement prevails at Moncton and Chatham. The federal government pays no more than fifty per cent of the maintenance of these offices. I feel sure that no officer of the Department of Labour ever waited on a gentleman who was conducting an employment office at Fredericton and intimated to him that he should discontinue the office. It is true that the underlying intent of the act is to do away so far as possible with private employment agencies. All the western provinces have discontinued theirs; in Ontario I think about eleven still remain. Generally they have been pretty well abolished all over Canada.

Mr. HANSON: What I have stated to the minister is correct. An officer of his department did call upon the returned soldier to whom I have referred and tried to frighten him out of business.

Mr. MURDOCK: Could the hon. member give me his name?

Mr. HANSON: I think I could. I will do it privately; I do not want to injure the gentleman. But the minister's answer is hardly a reply to the query I made as to what is the attitude of the department in respect to the establishment of employment offices by private individuals in localities where no public offices are maintained.

Mr. MURDOCK: This is a matter over which the provincial government has control. Our suggestion to them would be, as it has been to all provinces, to discontinue the private employment agencies and co-operate with the federal government in the maintenance of proper employment offices under government regulation and control.

Mr. HANSON: I approve of that policy, but in the absence of any initiative on the part of the provincial government, what is a community to do? The only solution I can see is for the department to extend its operations into that community.

Mr. MURDOCK: The city of Fredericton has the same opportunity that any other community has of entering into an agreement with this government. We shall be glad at any time to take the matter up with them.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: The minister, under a previous item, mentioned amounts that were lost through strikes. Could he give us an estimate of the amounts lost through unemployment in this country?

Mr. MURDOCK: When the item which has been held over comes up for discussion, I imagine we may have a field day on that question. In the meantime I will try to secure the information for my hon. friend.

Item agreed to.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King, the House adjourned at 11.35 p.m.

Wednesday, March 28, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

VIMY RIDGE MEMORIAL

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the following message from His Excellency the Governor General, signed by his own hand:

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate,
Members of the House of Commons,

I thank you for the resolution you have adopted on the subject of the gift graciously made by the Republic of France of a tract of land on Vimy Ridge at the site selected for the erection by Canada of a monument commemorating the exploits of Canadian soldiers in the Great War.

I shall cause this resolution to be transmitted to the President of the French Republic.

BYNG OF VIMY.

Government House, Ottawa,
27th March, 1923.

REPORT PRESENTED

Report of the first part of the investigation held by the Royal Commission on pensions and re-establishment.—Mr. Beland.

INTERNATIONAL LABOUR CONFERENCE

Hon. JAMES MURDOCK (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay on the table of the House the authentic text of a recommendation concerning communication to the International Labour office of statistical and other information regarding emigration, immigration and the repatriation and transit of emigrants which was adopted by the International Labour Conference at its fourth session in Genoa, October 18, to November 3, 1922.

No draft conventions were adopted at this session of the conference and the only recommendation was the one to which I have just referred.

I may add, with reference to the recent inquiry of the right hon. leader of the Opposi-

tion (Mr. Meighen) on this subject, that the authentic text of this recommendation reached the Labour department on March 26. The same is being brought before parliament in conformity with the requirements of paragraph 8 of article 405 of the Treaty of Versailles and the analogous provisions of the other treaties of peace.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—RETIRING GRATUITIES

Mr. WARD:

1. Did Mr. D. B. Hanna, former President of the Canadian National Railways, receive on his retirement, a bonus, grant or gratuity of $35,000 in addition to his salary to date of retirement?
2. If so, why, and on whose authority?
3. Did Mr. A. J. Mitchell, former vice-president of the Canadian National Railways, receive a similar gratuity of $20,000?
4. If so, why, and on whose authority?
5. Did any other retiring official or director of the Canadian National Railways receive any such gratuity or bonus on retirement?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Yes.

2. In recognition of past services and by authority of the Board of Directors of Canadian Northern Railway, September 14, 1922.

3. Yes.

4. See answer to Question No. 2.

5. Yes; S. L. Shannon, Comptroller and Treasurer, Canadian National Railways, salary for six months ($3,000), preliminary to superannuation.

W. H. Biggar, K.C., Vice-President and General Counsel, Grand Trunk Railway, died on July 7, 1922, and on July 10, the Grand Trunk Canadian Board voted Mr. Biggar's estate his salary to December 31, 1922, at the rate of $20,000 a year.

Preliminary to superannuation, the following gratuities were voted by the Grand Trunk Canadian Board on the dates mentioned:

August 25, Frank Scott, Vice-President and Treasurer, salary for four months, $6,000; Sept. 11, R. S. Logan, Vice-President, salary for three months, $3,500; Sept. 11, A. B. Atwater, Asst. to President, western lines, salary for three months, $1,000.

In addition to the above, Howard G. Kelley, President of the Grand Trunk and of the Grand Trunk Pacific, was voted a gratuity of $40,000 on Grand Trunk account, and $10,000 on Grand Trunk Pacific account; R. S. Logan, Vice-President, $12,000, and Frank Scott, Vice-President and Treasurer, $25,000, by the English Board of Directors, under circumstances set out in attached extract from the Minutes of the English Board of December 12, 1919.

Further the English Board of Directors, on February 19, 1920, (the date of the ratification of the acquisition agreement by the shareholders) voted themselves, as compensation for loss of office, a gratuity of five years' directors' fees under the circumstances set out in extract from the board minutes of the date in question, copy of which is also attached.

Extract from minutes of a meeting of the directors of the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, held at the office of the company, Dashwood House, 9 New Broad street, London, E.C., on Friday the 12th December, 1919. Sir Alfred W. Smithers, chairman, in the chair:

The chairman explained the position in which many of the chief officers, who had been in the service of the company for a very long period, might be placed when the change of administration of the Grand Trunk Railway took effect in consequence of the agreement made with the Canadian government for acquiring the Grand Trunk system, and then submitted letter from the vice-president and treasurer to the president, dated 8th November, with reference to the satisfactory working of the company's fire insurance fund, which at the 30th June, last, showed a surplus of $223,957 over the amount of $1,000,000 which is considered to be ample to cover all liabilities of fund. On the recommendation of the chairman it was decided, after consideration, to vote one year's alary as a gratuity to each of the following officers:

Salary per annum $50,000, Howard G. Kelley, president.

Salary per annum $16,500, J. E. Dalrymple, vice-president.

Salary per annum $16,500, W. D. Robb, vice-president.

Salary per annum $12,000, R. S. Logan, vice-president.

Salary per annum $12,000, J. M. Rosevear, comptroller.

Salary per annum $9,000, D. E. Galloway, assistant to president.

Salary per annum, $15,000, W. P. Hinton, vice-president and general manager, Grand Trunk Pacific Railway.

Salary per annum, $7,200, H. H. Hansard, solicitor, Grand Trunk Pacific Railway.

Salary per annum $4,200, S. P. Porter, executive agent, Grand Trunk Pacific Railway.

and $5,000 each to Mr. G. T. Bell, passenger traffic manager, and Mr. H. C. Martin, freight traffic manager.

It was also decided to grant Mr. Frank Scott, vice-president and treasurer, looking to his successful working of the fire insurance over a number of years, a sum of $25,000; and to Mr. H. H. Norman, secretary, and Mr. H. Deer, assistant secretary, $12,500, and $10,500 respectively; the whole of the above gratuities to be debited to the fire insurance fund.

Extract from minutes of a special general meeting of the company, held at the Cannon Street Hotel, London, E.C., on Thursday, 19th February, 1920. Sir Alfred W. Smithers, M.P., chairman, in the chair:

It was moved by Mr. A. B. Bosher, seconded by Mr. E. Roberts, and unanimously resolved

That the board of directors be granted, as compensation for loss of office, an amount equal to five years' remuneration, to be paid to them out of the contribution to be made by the holders of the debenture and guaranteed stocks, and to be divided as the board may determine.

Note: The total remuneration paid to all of the directors per annum was £6,900, or $33,580, and for five years was equal to £34,500, or $167,800. There were nine directors on the board at that date.

A. DeWITT FOSTER

Mr. LOVETT:

1. Is A DeWitt Foster an employee of the Canadian National Railways?
2. If so, what position does he hold?
3. What salary does he receive?
4. Was the said A. DeWitt Foster a former member of the House of Commons?
5. Was he compelled to resign his seat in the House? If so, for what cause?
6. Is this the same A. DeWitt Foster who was implicated in the scandals arising out of the purchasing of horses in Nova Scotia for military purposes during the late war?
7. Is it the intention of the government to retain him in his present position?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Yes.
2. Superintendent of Resources, Chicago.
3. $450 per month.
4. Yes.
5. Mr. Foster resigned his seat on April 24, 1915, following a discussion in parliament concerning the purchase of horses for war purposes. There is no official record as to why he resigned.
6. Answered by No. 5.
7. Mr. Foster entered the employ of the Canadian Northern Railway Company on May 20, 1916, as travelling passenger and immigration agent, Chicago. The question of his retention is not a matter for the consideration of the government, but of the Canadian National Railway Management.

MR. W. J. BLACK

Mr. LOVETT:

1. When was W. J. Black appointed as Deputy Minister of Immigration?
2. What was his employment before his appointment?
3. Is he the same W. J. Black who was organizer for the Conservative party in western Canada during the recent federal election?
4. Did he resign his position as Deputy Minister of Immigration to assume the duties of Conservative organizer?
5. If so, when was he reappointed to the office of Deputy Minister of Immigration?
6. What duties are being performed by him at the present time?
7. Is it the intention of the government to retain his services?

Hon. Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil):

1. Sept. 7, 1921.
2. (a) Deputy Minister of Agriculture and Immigration for Manitoba.
(b) President of the Manitoba Agricultural College.
(c) Dominion Commissioner under The Agricultural Instruction Act.
(d) Chairman, Soldier Settlement Board of Canada.
3. Yes.
4. No.
5. His first appointment in connection with immigration is as indicated in No. 1.
6. The usual duties of a deputy minister.
7. The retention of Mr. Black, like all other government officials, is subject to the service rendered.

COLD STORAGE

Mr. THOMPSON:

1. Is the harbour cold storage a national institution?
2. To what extent is it financed by the government and at what rate of interest?
3. What are the net results profit or loss on the operating expenses of this storage for its first year's operations?
4. How will deficits be met, and in event of loss will harbour dues be increased to meet same?
5. Are the rates charged by the harbour commission lower than other public cold storages charged previous to opening the harbour commission's plant?
6. Is it the intention of the government to subsidize cold storages to be operated by co-operative associations in various parts of the country with the idea of having a chain of storages in the country to supply the harbour cold storage and thus have all under government control?
7. Would there be any discrimination against private individuals or corporations who might desire a subsidy for a cold storage plant, or is it intended to assist only rural communities that are organized?
8. Has any provision been made for the continuance of a subsidized cold storage in case of disorganization of the co-operative societies?
9. In the event of public cold storages being closed as a result of competition is there likely to be any increase in the rates charged by the harbour commission?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: As I have already stated Mr. Speaker, I cannot answer this question in its present form. I want to know to what cold storage plant the hon. gentleman refers.

Mr. SPEAKER: Stands.

PURCHASE OF UNCLEANED SCREENINGS

Mr. MANION:

1. Have there been any complaints since 1915 regarding the purchase of unscalped or uncleaned screenings from the government elevators to the Board of Grain Commissioners?
2. If so, was any action taken by the board?
3. Is the minister willing to lay on the Table of the House all correspondence and papers connected with such complaints if there were any?

Hon. Mr. ROBB: Mr. Speaker, this question has been on the order paper for some

days, and I may not have the required information until after the Easter holidays as we are waiting for a reply from Fort William.

Mr. SPEAKER: Stands.

ESQUIMALT NAVY YARD

Mr. EVANS:

1. When was the navy yard at Esquimalt closed?
2. What was the purchase price of the groceries on hand at that date?
3. How much of each of the following articles of food were on hand at the time this navy yard was closed: Pickles, oatmeal, raisins, ship biscuits, haricot beans, coffee, canned goods, hops, malt, mustard, pepper, preserved potatoes, rice, suet, vinegar, salt pork, arrowroot, pearl barley, celery seed, salmon.
4. When were these groceries disposed of?
5. To what extent were they damaged by age or other causes?
6. What were the total receipts from the sale of these groceries?
7. What was the value of all other stores at the time the yard was closed, such as rubber sheets, rubber strips, utensils, dinghy, sailing skiff, diving dress, etc., etc?
8. How were these stores disposed of and what were the receipts realized?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. The dockyard, Esquimalt, ceased to operate as a repair depot on the 1st May, 1920. As a supply base, however, the dockyard has never been closed since taken over by the Canadian government in 1910.

2. $82,306.01. This value is taken as of 1st April, 1920—the nearest date on which stock valuations are prepared.

3.

	On hand May 1, 1920
Pickles	692 lbs.
Oatmeal	2,208 „
Raisins	8,800 „
Biscuits, Ship's	24,561 „
Beans, Haricot	21,600 „
Coffee	9,860 „
Hops	70 „
Malt	4 „
Mustard	4 „
Pepper	27 „
Preserved Potatoes	2,876 „
Rice	30,965 „
Suet	18,108 „
Vinegar	65 gals.
Salt Pork	23,391 lbs.
Arrowroot	106 „
Pearl Barley	490 „
Celery Seed	187 „
Salmon	12,964 „
Beef, preserved	37,424 „
Mutton, preserved	15,432 „
Rabbit, preserved	18,564 „
Jams	13,520 „
Marmalade	5,146 „

4. In 1921-22 by public tender and succeeding negotiations $10,946.16
On March 21, 1921, by auction sale, preserved meats 971.11
In 1923 to date, by auction sale, etc. 3,406.97

$15,324.34

Also, disposal of these provisions has been in progress since the armistice, by issues to ships of naval and other services, to Imperial dockyards and by transfer to other government departments. At the present time practically all surplus provisions have been disposed of.

5. In the case of pickles, there has been depreciation due to age and chemical action; the salt pork owing to age, likewise deteriorated to a certain extent; a portion of the raisins candied owing to age; other provisions more or less affected by age, but in the main continued serviceable.

6. $15,324.34. Amount realized from sales to outside parties.

7. $666.939.04. This value is taken as of 1st April, 1920—the nearest date on which stock valuations are prepared.

8. The excess quantities of other stores were disposed of by issue to ships of the different government services, by transfer to other government departments, by sale by tender, negotiation, and auction.

$27,436.54. Receipts realized by sale to outside firms to date.

GEODETIC SURVEY EXPENDITURE

Mr. FAFARD:

1. What amount of money has the Geodetic Survey branch expended in the Dominion of Canada during the years 1900 to 1922?
2. What amount of such money was expended each year, in each province?

Hon. Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil):

1. From 1905 the year the Geodetic Survey branch was instituted to the 28th February, 1923, the total expenditure has been $2,616,044.89.

2. Statement attached.

EXPENDITURE ON GEODETIC SURVEY OF CANADA

Year	British Columbia	Alberta	Saskatchewan	Manitoba	Ontario	Quebec	New Brunswick	Nova Scotia	Prince Edward Island	Total
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
1905	.....	.....	.....	.....	3,876 63	.....	.....	.....	.....	3,876 63
1906	.....	.....	.....	.....	5,237 65	1,846 29	.....	.....	.....	7,083 94
1907-08	.....	.....	.....	.....	42,531 90	9,884 85	.....	.....	.....	52,416 75
1908-09	.....	.....	.....	.....	36,179 39	24,119 59	.....	.....	.....	60,298 98
1909-10	.....	.....	.....	.....	22,366 52	21,601 79	9,119 54	2,403 97	.....	55,491 82
1910-11	3,107 01	.....	.....	2,221 76	49,942 77	9,133 33	1,664 88	1,664 88	.....	67,734 63
1911-12	13,669 33	.....	3,315 81	3,315 11	54,875 15	4,094 28	10,611 54	4,001 16	.....	93,882 38
1912-13	18,379 61	.....	13,215 40	.....	49,609 35	6,367 91	4,354 66	.....	.....	91,926 93
1913-14	19,792 23	.....	.....	4,057 27	61,933 53	46,106 46	.....	3,750 26	.....	135,639 75
1914-15	23,779 89	19,914 50	4,510 07	.....	57,681 56	14,966 06	15,754 68	13,726 83	.....	150,333 59
1915-16	78,647 99	15,803 21	.....	.....	61,370 66	21,522 35	14,420 84	7,996 06	.....	199,761 11
1916-17	68,376 46	.....	.....	.....	51,059 09	8,782 10	9,788 36	8,505 11	.....	146,511 12
1917-18	44,358 93	.....	.....	13,337 69	21,812 40	20,479 36	20,009 32	11,440 13	.....	121,437 83
1918-19	47,212 25	.....	10,076 16	10,134 63	9,532 84	22,053 64	27,564 74	5,903 44	.....	132,477 70
1919-20	58,866 30	11,185 08	16,317 61	.....	12,827 96	55,250 26	2,197 39	53,793 86	438 89	210,877 35
1920-21	65,405 32	12,286 21	25,664 14	4,867 26	43,164 05	163,219 12	4,263 46	46,152 69	4,360 73	369,382 98
1921-22	77,712 28	.....	36,875 24	10,227,29	49,813 45	134,507 44	3,944 61	52,944 63	.....	366,024 94
1922-Feb. 28, 1923	71,645 54	9,365 82	32,794 54	21,145 80	60,250 41	104,636 56	4,153 93	46,893 86	.....	350,886 46
	590,953 14	68,554 82	142,768 97	69,306 81	694,065 31	668,571 39	127,847 95	249,176 88	4,799 62	2,616,044 89

UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR PAPERS

EASTERN LANDS DEVELOPMENT CO.

Mr. CARRUTHERS:

For a copy of all papers, documents, telegrams, letters and other correspondence, exchanged between the Minister of Railways, or any official of his department, and the Land Commissioner of the Canadian National Railways, relating to the transfer of the government lands to the Eastern Lands Development Company near Capreol and Poleyet.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

PROPOSED AGREEMENT RESPECTING DAMAGE TO MORTGAGED PREMISES

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Acting Minister of Railways and Canals) moved that the House go into committee at the next sitting to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that the Governor in Council may from time to time cause an agreement or agreements to be executed by or on behalf of His Majesty the King, undertaking or guaranteeing that any company mentioned or referred to in chapter thirteen of the statutes of 1919 (first session), entitled: An act to incorporate Canadian National Railway Company and respecting Canadian National Railways, and in chapter thirteen of the statutes of 1920, entitled: An act to confirm the agreement dated the eighth day of March, 1920, between His Majesty the King and the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada for the acquisition of the capital stock of the said Grand Trunk Railway Company, except the four per cent guaranteed stock, will restore or make good all loss or damage to the mortgaged premises comprised in any mortgage or deed of trust (hereinafter called "such mortgage") at any time executed by any such company occasioned by fire or other casualty against which such company covenanted in such mortgage to insure, and indemnifying the trustee or trustees of any such mortgage against any consequences arising from any failure—(a) on the part of such company to comply with such covenant to insure, and (b) on the part of such trustee or trustees to take any action in respect thereof. The times and manner of the giving of any such agreement or agreements, and the form and terms thereof and the person who may sign the same on behalf of His Majesty shall be such as the Governor in Council may from time to time approve or direct.

He said: His Excellency the Governor General has been apprised of the subject matter of the resolution and has given his consent thereto.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): I merely call the minister's attention to the impression the resolution makes on me at the moment. I think it is more comprehensive than is necessary. The resolution provides not that any damage suffered will be made good to the mortgage company, but that any loss by fire will be restored. The words used are:

Will restore or make good all loss or damage to the mortgaged premises comprised in any mortgage or deed of trust. . . . at any time executed by any such company.

It would seem to me that the government does not need to undertake to make good the loss to the mortgaged premises. That would require the government to restore the property, and it might not be wise to see that the property was restored. I would think that the only obligation the government would need to enter into would be this: that the mortgage company to whom there is a covenant to insure would not be allowed to suffer loss because of destruction of premises by fire.

Mr. GRAHAM: I think my right hon. friend has the crux of the matter. But I suggest that the motion be allowed to pass—

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am not objecting.

Mr. GRAHAM: —and I will refer his remarks to the solicitor, Mr. Ruel, who drafted the bill. The desire is only to cover the necessary points. The purpose of the resolution, on which a bill will be based, is, of course, to protect the mortgage holder.

Motion agreed to.

BREWERIES AND LIQUOR HOUSES.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. BROWN: I wish to call the attention of the government to a question that has been on the order paper for a few days—it is No. 19 on the order paper for today—referring to the further licensing of breweries that have violated the law. If I am not misinformed, these licenses are issued on the first of April. This is the 28th of March, and it seems to me the government might well have its policy formulated in the matter.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The Minister of Customs (Mr. Bureau) is not in the House at the moment. This matter comes under his department I think. As soon as I see him I will draw his attention to what my hon. friend has said.

Mr. MEIGHEN: May I ask if it is true that since this government came into power the number of export liquor houses in British Columbia authorized by the government has been increased from four to thirty?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I have no information on the subject.

INQUIRY FOR RETURN

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): I would like to ask the government, particularly the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart) if it would be possible by the time Easter recess comes to an end to have a return to an order made on the 12th of February concerning the proceedings of a sub-committee of the Privy Council appointed to regulate mining fees in the Yukon. A departmental clerk could prepare the information in a short time.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I will see that the return is brought down. I had not noticed that it had not been laid on the table.

WHEAT BOARD

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. JOHNSTON (Last Mountain): I would like to ask the government what action, if any, is being taken to give effect to last year's wheat board legislation for handling this year's crop?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I might say that the government is prepared to pass an order in council, which it has authority to do under the legislation of last year, to renew the wheat board in accordance with the existing legislation, provided that two or more of the provinces are desirous that such a step should be taken. One province has already communicated its desire to the government that this be done, and I believe that one other is about to indicate its view in the affirmative. When that is done the government will take action by order in council in accordance with the powers given by legislation.

Mr. FORKE: I was informed by the premier of Alberta that Saskatchewan and Alberta have both made application.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is what I understand. I know that one has been formally received, but I could not be sure about the other.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The purpose of the government, then, is to leave the legislation as it it is?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is not very material, then, what the requests are.

SUPPLY—STEAMSHIP SERVICE TO MEDITERRANEAN

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. DAVID SPENCE (Parkdale): Mr Speaker, I wish to say a word in connection with a question I put on the order paper the other day and the answer I have since received. The matter has reference to the establishing of a steamship service between Mediterranean and Canadian ports. I am afraid that questions of this kind do not receive the consideration that they deserve; the answer given in this case simply makes a perfect farce of the whole situation. I did not put this question on the order paper for the purpose of embarrassing the government. I was not criticizing the government nor do I propose to do so now. But knowing something of transportation by land and by water I feel that a service should be established between Mediterranean and Canadian ports. I believe that Mediterranean ports are anxious to ship to Canadian ports and importers are desirous of receiving goods from that part of

the world through Canadian ports. It is said that we have a great merchant marine to-day that is doing no business. The answer to my question states that this is not the opportune time to establish such a service. I say that this is the time and this is the opportunity. The spring season is coming on. On account of frosts in California last year, 90 per cent of the lemons imported into Canada this year will come from Mediterranean ports, particularly from Italy. These lemons will have to be brought to Montreal and shipped inland as far as Calgary and Edmonton and probably to Vancouver. If a steamship service between Mediterranean and Canadian ports were established the result would be a benefit to our own Canadian transportation lines and the keeping of the transport business within our country. I would point out also that in the past we have lost a great deal, through breakages and otherwise, in the carriage through United States ports. The congestion at New York, for instance, is so bad that sometimes cargoes have to wait two weeks before getting a boat to take them to their destinations; or there may be a lapse of a week or two before cars can be got to transport the goods to inland points throughout this Dominion. I feel that some consideration should be given to this question, and I hope the Minister of Railways and Canals will consider it with the management of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine, and if possible establish a service between the ports of the Mediterranean and this country. It is very necessary that we should have such a service. The loss in breakages alone at New York is very considerable owing to the very heavy traffic and congestion. There is no reason why such a service cannot be established. It would not only help to make the government merchant marine a better paying proposition than it is to-day, but help build up our National railway lines by keeping the money in our own country.

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Trade and Commerce): I understand that the objection of my hon. friend is that Canada has done nothing to put on a service or subsidize a service between the Mediterranean ports and Canada, and his argument largely is that this service should be established because Canada imports from countries along the Mediterranean.

I submit to my hon. friend that Canada does all that it is possible to do to encourage and subsidize services from Canada to countries that buy Canadian products. If there are countries desiring to sell their products to Canada, I think it should be up to those countries to see that they establish a service to carry those products to this country. We have a subsidized service between the West India Islands and Canada carrying fruits such as come from the Mediterranean. We have also a subsidized service between Australia and Canada, and Australia also produces products similar in a very large degree to the products of the Mediterranean region. We have a service established between South Africa and Canada, and South Africa, one of the sister dominions, also produces commodities similar to those coming from the countries along the Mediterranean. I realize the importance of doing all that we can to establish connections that will give as cheaply as possible to our own people the products that we require and do not produce in this country, but may I repeat again to my hon. friend that we in Canada are more interested in encouraging services from Canada to countries that buy our products than encouraging services from countries exporting to Canada. It seems to me it would be good business upon the part of those countries themselves to establish better trade communications with Canada if they desire to put their products into this country.

Motion agreed to and the House went into Committee of Supply.

SUPPLY

DEPARTMENT OF LABOUR

The House in committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

Labour—Administration, Technical Education Act, $3,000.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Would the minister please inform the committee why there is a reduction of $4,000 from the vote of last year?

Hon. JAMES MURDOCK (Minister of Labour): Heretofore in the civil government estimates we have provided for a director and an assistant director of technical education. Last year I intimated to the committee we would endeavour to get along with one officer. That has been done. This year we come to you with a request for provision for a director of technical education only. We have only had the one officer during the year, and he has been the assistant director of technical education. It is believed that the sum of $3,000 will be sufficient to cover the expenses that will be incurred by the director of technical education in visiting the different provinces in connection with his work.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Who is the director at the present time?

Mr. MURDOCK: There is no director at the present time. Mr. Crawford has been assistant director for some time. The Civil Service Commission have had an examination before them, the applications for which closed on the 8th day of March. Unfortunately Mr. Crawford has been confined to the hospital by a serious illness, and the appointment is being held up until such time as he can come before the commission.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I understand that the appointment of this officer became necessary by reason of the statute 9-10 George V, chapter 73, whereby a grant is made from the Dominion government to each of the provinces. That grant is not in the nature, I believe, of a permanent grant. It was for a limited number of years, if I remember right. When does that provision run out, may I ask?

Mr. MURDOCK: In 1929. While on the subject of technical education, may I call attention to a typographical error further down on the same page where it appears that there is $1,000,000 authorized by statute for technical education. That should be $1,100,000 in accordance with the law. It was $1,000,000 last year, and the law provides that it be increased to $1,100,000 this year.

Mr. BOYS: I do not know whether this would be the proper time to mention it or not, but my friend the minister has just referred to an item lower down on page 49. Do I understand that Item No. 266 is passed?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. BOYS: I am free to admit that I understood it was. I do not know whether the minister and the Chairman want Hansard to accord with the business done last night, but on glancing over yesterday's Hansard I see no reference whatever to that item. I remember quite well pointing out that the minister had made very considerable progress and that as it was getting late he might very well move that the committee rise and report progress, and I remember the Prime Minister answering by suggesting that the next item be taken up as it was in the same class. I understood that that item was then proceeded with, but I find that Hansard is silent as to what I said, silent as to what the Prime Minister said, and silent altogether as to this item No. 266. It seems to me something should be done to put that right.

The CHAIRMAN: I would draw the hon. member's attention to page 234 of the Votes and Proceedings, recording what was done on Tuesday, 27th March, from which it will be seen that Item No. 266 "To supplement amount provided by Statute 8-9 George V, Chapter 21, Employment Offices Co-ordination Act, $50,000" was passed and reported. Hansard is in error that it does not include Item 266 as reported to the Speaker.

Mr. BOYS: I am not for one moment disputing the fact that the item was passed; I certainly think it was. But it is somewhat extraordinary that there is no reference to what was said by myself or the Prime Minister as regards this item; I cannot understand how all that could be omitted. I think something should be done to put the matter right, and to show that the item was considered.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: We had absolutely no opportunity of discussing the item last night, and right along we notice these figures in connection with almost every department. It seems to me that we have a right to expect from the Minister of Labour some statement as to his reason for offering us these decreases in each item. If it means efficiency and economy I presume we are all in favour of it, but if it means—as would seem to be the case—that there is a lessening of the work of the department, I think that is a matter that requires careful consideration. If I understand aright, one of the leading officials of this department was allowed to go last year to a private enterprise; and to-day we do not have the same investigations, the same studies of these questions, being carried forward. That would seem to be a serious thing; a serious impairment of the usefulness of the department. I think we ought to have a statement not merely as to the particular items we are considering here one by one, but also as to the policy of the Labour department. There are big questions like unemployment insurance, like old age pensions, like the bringing in of the eight hour day across Canada. Surely we have a right to look to the Labour department for legislation that will protect the workers and advance their cause. I cannot see that the department is bringing down any legislation of this kind; I cannot see that they are tabulating the necessary reports and preparing the necessary data. It would seem to me that at some point in his presentation of the work of the department we ought to have a statement from the minister as to his policy and the policy of the government in this regard.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Item agreed to.

Administration of the act respecting annuities for old age, $25,000.

Mr. MURDOCK: The expenditure under this heading covers disbursements for travelling expenses of officials, printing and stationery, advertising and sundries. It is expected that the entire appropriation for the present fiscal year will be used, and as more activity in this branch is contemplated for the coming year it is thought advisable to increase the appropriation by $10,000, as an expansion in this branch would entail heavy charges for advertising and travelling expenses. The expenses up to January 31st of this year have been as follows: Travelling expenses, $35; sundries, $47.67; printing and stationery, $2,237.15; advertising—that is advertising the government annuities—$7,295.96. It is hoped and believed that with additional opportunities for bringing the features of the Dominion government annuities to the attention of the public in Canada a material improvement can be made in the work of that branch.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Would the minister inform the committee as to the number of parties who have taken advantage of this proposition during the past year, and the total number of annuities in force?

Mr. MURDOCK: The total number of annuitants to-day is 5,642. According to provinces, if my hon. friend would like that information, the numbers are as follows: Ontario, 2,942; Quebec, 1,042; British Columbia, 468; New Brunswick, 313; Nova Scotia, 296; Alberta, 215; Manitoba, 183; Saskatchewan, 147; Yukon, 18; Prince Edward Island, 18. The total receipts to the 26th March, 1923, were $6,682,080.92. The receipts from the 1st April, 1922, to the 26th March, 1923, were $1,021,775.52.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): I would like to ask the minister further, what steps are being taken to bring this very desirable form of insurance before the public and to make known to them the advantages it possesses?

Mr. MURDOCK: As I said a moment ago, and as indicated by the figures quoted, we spent something over $7,000 on advertising last year in various papers throughout Canada. We also have in mind the running of advertisements on the slides of the moving picture houses of the Dominion—we can do that fairly cheaply—and in other ways we propose to enlarge the advertising that has been carried on in connection with this work. That is why we are asking for a sum of $10,000 additional to promote a proper campaign of advertising.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): I think it is very desirable that this work should be extended and the public made more familiar with its advantages. I do not think the minister answered the question I asked as to the number of applicants during the past year?

Mr. MURDOCK: I do not think we have data in a form which would disclose the actual number of applicants during a given year. The receipts, though, will indicate somewhat the volume of the business. As I have already stated, the sum of $1,021,000 odd was received during the fiscal year.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Would the minister inform the committee how the receipts for the last year compare with the receipts for the year previous, so that we may learn whether the business is increasing or decreasing?

Mr. MURDOCK: I understand there has not been any great change from year to year during the past few years. The act, as my hon. friend doubtless knows, was passed in 1908. Its advantages, as I believe they can be regarded, have not been sufficiently impressed on the public of Canada—at least that is my personal belief—and it is with the hope of enlarging this field of effort, which we think would be to the advantage of many people in the Dominion, that we are asking for additional money to launch a campaign of extended advertising. We have been handicapped for the funds necessary to do what we think should be done.

Mr. WHITE: Would the minister give the committee any information as to the total number of annuities taken out five years ago compared with the number taken out last year?

Mr. MURDOCK: I have not that information before me, but I could get it, of course, for the hon. member from year to year.

Mr. WHITE: Will the hon. minister have that information for three years?

Mr. MURDOCK: My hon. friend will realize that this particular branch has not been in the Department of Labour for one year yet. Prior to May last it was in the Post Office Department, I am told, relegated to a back room, out of the way, where it would not come too prominently to the attention of people. I do not know how much there is in that statement, but that is what I am told. When it was handed over to the Department of Labour, we found it in another building, away down the street, and it has now been brought over and housed right in the

Department of Labour building, on a separate floor, and we hope to boost the Dominion government annuities if we can get a chance and find out if any enlargement of the functions of this branch can be made.

Mr. BOYS: When was the act passed?

Mr. MURDOCK: 1908.

Mr. BOYS: The law has been in force about fourteen years. Can the minister say whether the department has made or lost money during that period?

Mr. MURDOCK: I do not think I could properly pass on a question of that kind. The annuity system is conducted on an actuarial basis and on a safe basis so far as the government is concerned according to my best knowledge. I do not think it is reasonably possible that there should be a loss by the government. That phase of it, in my judgment, should be taken into consideration, and we should see if we could not improve the scheme and make it more attractive to the public generally.

Mr. BOYS: That is just exactly what I have in mind. It was only yesterday I was making certain inquiries regarding annuities and it seemed to me that the sum of money asked was excessive, and that if the department was making a considerable sum of money they might see their way clear to reduce the rates. It might not be amiss that I should state just what took place. I wanted to ascertain what an annuity of $1,000, payable quarterly to a man for his lifetime, and after his decease to his wife, or vice versa—for that matter for the lives of both of them—would cost, and I found the figure was something over $15,000. Now $15,000 at 6 per cent will produce $900, and you would be getting, without the annuity, within $100 of what the annuity produced, and at the end of the period you would have your $15,000. It seemed to me there should be more difference than that. I discussed the matter with Mr. Bastedo who is in charge. I heartily approve of these annuities, but if the department is making considerable money, it seems to me it might reduce the rates for, I think, on reflection the minister will admit that that difference is very slight.

Mr. MURDOCK: Would it not be a question of increasing the interest allowance rather than decreasing the rates, as you suggest? For example, Dominion government annuities only pay on the basis of 4 per cent interest. If you place the interest at 5 per cent, it would be substantially better than it is at the present time. I may say that considerable thought has been devoted to this question for some months now, to see if that could be reasonably done. I have personally been pressing to have it done.

Mr. BOYS: I am very glad to hear the minister say that. Of course that is only another way of stating it, because that would reduce the payments. Instead of paying $15,000 one would only have to pay, say, $13,000. So far as this particular application to which I refer is concerned, if the figures had been $13,000 the annuity would have been purchased, but it was not attractive at $15,000. It will be good news to those interested in the purchase of annuities that the minister has the matter in contemplation. I can only say that I hope he will be successful. I should think in reaching a conclusion the minister would be guided to some extent by the success of the operations up to the present time, and I am rather surprised the deputy cannot inform the minister whether, during the fourteen years' operation, money has been made or lost. As the average person purchasing an annuity would, I think, be over 50 years of age, and the expectation of life would not be over 14 or 15 years, according to this estimate, the department would have the matter down to a working basis.

Mr. MURDOCK: I think we are on a working basis and it is only a question whether the interest rates should be 4 per cent, as they have been for many years, or whether we should improve on that interest allowance. If the interest were 5 per cent unquestionably there would be a great increase in investments in Dominion government securities. I am very much obliged to the hon. member for his suggestion.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Could the minister inform the committee as to whether there is a classification of the parties taking advantage of this insurance, giving information as to the different occupations of the parties purchasing annuities?

Mr. MURDOCK: The card index files for each annuity would, I think, contain those particulars, but I have not the information here.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Can the minister tell the committee what considerations led to this work being taken over by the Labour department?

Mr. MURDOCK: I could not give that information. It came to me entirely unrequested. Probably the Prime Minister could answer that question.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I might say to my hon. friend that the Department of Labour seemed to be the appropriate department with which to associate this work. It was originally in the Department of Trade and Commerce, and then for a short time in the Post Office Department, but after the present government came into office we thought the Department of Labour would perhaps have opportunities of making the work of the annuities branch better known than any of the other departments, and that on the whole it would be in the public interest to have it transferred to that department.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I think one of the difficulties in the system so far has been the lack of publicity. I think the minister has the right idea when he says that he is going to give it more publicity by means of newspaper advertising and by means of moving pictures established throughout the country. It is rather astonishing to see how many people in Canada do not know that there is such a scheme in existence and that they can obtain government annuities. Most people know, I think, that they can purchase annuities from the ordinary old line insurance companies, but very few business people of this country know anything about the government annuity branch which has been in existence in this country for fourteen years. I think if the business has been carried on up to the present time on a basis of 4 per cent, it is highly probable that the government has made a fair amount of money out of the scheme. I remember when the bill was brought forward by Sir Richard Cartwright who was Minister of Trade and Commerce, and in the Senate at the time, he stated that it was not intended to conduct the department with the idea of making any profit; in fact it was stated that, being a government venture, and the ordinary expense being paid by the government, annuities could probably be granted to applications on better terms than could be obtained from old line companies, which, of course, would charge the annuitants with a proportion of the expense. It would be of great interest to know just how the matter has worked out as regards profit or loss after an experience of fourteen years. We are agreed that the matter is one worthy of consideration; we are agreed that the system is a good one, and the more extensively it will obtain throughout the Dominion, the better for the country and the people. I would heartily agree with the suggestion of the minister that he devote a considerable amount of the money at his disposal during the next twelve months to advertising the fact that the government of the Dominion of Canada issues annuities, guaranteed by the whole Dominion of Canada, and just as good as the Dominion bonds which are so greatly in demand by the people at the present time. But while we are on the question, perhaps the minister might go a step further and state whether he has developed any scheme in the way of old age pensions such as that referred to a moment ago by the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth). Many people feel very much interested in that question, and if the minister has anything in mind in regard to it, the committee would like to hear of it.

Mr. MURDOCK: That is a matter that has been given very careful attention from every possible angle during the past several months, in fact, since I have been Minister of Labour. The important question confronting this government at the present time and, indeed, that would confront any government that happened to be in power at this time, would be the matter of finding the wherewithal to do the things that it might be thought desirable or right to do as regards adopting an old age pension plan. The matter is being given the most careful attention with the end in view of seeing what it may be possible to do; but no definite plan is in contemplation at present.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The first question would be: How much would it likely cost? Has the minister arrived at any conclusion as regards that question?

Mr. MURDOCK: That would depend entirely upon what basis the contract was undertaken.

Mr. BOYS: The government tables showing the cost of annuities at various ages should be distributed, and I should think as good a place as any for that would be the post offices. I have tried many times to get these tables, and you cannot get them locally. This leads to great delay when you have to wait and write to Ottawa for them. The minister, in his advertising scheme, should arrive at some plan whereby every post office in every town and village should carry these tables, and the advertising should show that the tables may be had at any post office. The minister will realize that once the people get the notion, they want to act very promptly; they do not want to wait for a week to find out what an annuity will cost. If these tables are made available in this way, any man taking them can find out from the age of the man or woman desiring the annuity what the cost is per $100.

Mr. MURDOCK: The postmasters have all been agents of the government annuities, at least until the time when this branch was transferred from the Post Office department in May last. As a matter of fact the act was passed in 1908 adopting the plan on a 3 per cent basis, which remained in force for a time. Then by order in council that was increased to a 4 per cent basis, and then apparently the matter was shelved, and as little as possible said about it. I hope that can be changed.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Will the minister be good enough to inform the committee whether he proposes to continue to make use of the postmasters in connection with this work, or to improve the plan, or to abandon it or what other scheme he has of bringing this more prominently to the attention of the public?

Mr. MURDOCK: Of course, I would not be in a position to utilise the services of postmasters to the same extent as when this work was under the Post Office Department. Considering the results that were secured when all postmasters were agents of Do-
4 p.m. minion government annuities. I do not know whether that plan would be very practicable. I imagine we might have to offer larger inducements than we could afford with any appropriations that we have before us. But whatever steps can be taken to make the benefits of Dominion government annuities known to the public generally, will be taken, and any other plan that can be suggested will be accepted if it will bring about that desired end.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Do I understand the minister to say that he proposes to cease this agency of the postmasters, or is he going to continue them?

Mr. MURDOCK: We shall be glad, indeed, to have their help. What I said was that the annuities branch was under the Post Office Department until May last.

Mr. ARTHURS: Only for a time.

Mr. MURDOCK: For some few years. During that time the postmasters were agents for Dominion government annuities. Whether they are now or not is a question possibly for discussion. Probably most of them take the position that they are not.

Mr. BROWN: The suggestion made by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Boys) surely ought to be acceptable to the minister. There should be sufficient co-ordination between the departments that the postmasters could distribute the advertising and literature in connection with these annuities, as they do in connection with the income tax.

Mr. MURDOCK: We will endeavour to see whether that can be done.

Mr. BOYS: I can see the difference between postmasters acting as agents for such work and their merely distributing the literature. If they were agents, it would be their duty to sit down with intending purchasers and explain the plan to them. I do not believe that is necessary but there ought to be some place where we can go and get these tables if we want them. In every town and village insurance companies have agents with all the information at hand. If the government want to increase this annuity business, as is desirable from the standpoint both of the government and of the public, something must be done to have the literature, figures and tables available in every community. I do not see why the postmasters cannot be used in that way. If they can act as agents, so much the better; but at least the literature can be left with them and had when called for by anybody.

Mr. MURDOCK: The hon. member is entirely right and we will see if that cannot be done.

Item agreed to.

International Labour Conference, $15,000.

Mr. BOYS: Was the appropriation of last year all expended? Could the minister give us the details of that?

Mr. MURDOCK: The expenditures until January 31 on this item were:

Services for allowances and travelling expenses of delegates, $12,616.58; sundries, $27.00.

Leaving a balance of $2,356.42 for the two months.

Mr. BOYS: Who were the delegates?

Mr. MURDOCK: At the International Labour Conference in Geneva, October 18 to November 3, last, the government representatives or delegates were the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the Minister of Labour. The employers' delegate was Mr. Coulter of Toronto, and Mr. H. C. MacDonald was the adviser to the employers' delegate. The workers' delegate was Mr. Tom Moore, president of the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada, and Mr. John Bruce was adviser to Mr. Moore. There were six present all told, two representing the government, two the employers and two the workers. In this are included certain expenses for attendance at

meetings of the governing body of the International Labour Office which are held every three months, and at which Canada is usually represented, although she was not represented at the January meeting.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: From a practical standpoint it would seem to me as if there ought to be some more definite way of giving effect to the findings of this conference. Canada, as one of the signatories of the League of Nations, accepts these various conventions, for example, the eight-hour day. I understand the government of Canada thinks its duty is done when it reports the findings of the conference and suggests that the various provinces can carry out certain of those findings. The whole difficulty there would seem to arise because of a certain jurisdictional dispute as regards how far the Dominion can act and how far the provinces should act. In the meantime, great evils are going unremedied. I think I have already this year called the attention of the House to the fact that in the steel works in Nova Scotia, and I believe elsewhere, men are working eleven and thirteen-hour shifts, eleven by day and thirteen by night, every other week working twenty-four hours on end.

We have said that men ought to have an eight-hour working day and one day's rest in seven. We find every once in a while an industrial strike takes place. We had a strike in the steel works at Sydney not very long ago. Technically it was in regard to the reinstatement of certain workers, but I am told in reality it was a protest against the abominable working conditions which the men have to endure in that part of the country. A deputation of the clergy of the town a short time ago waited on the manager of the plant and asked him if there was any way by which an eight-hour day could be brought into effect. They were told that nothing could be done until Mr. Gary and the other steel magnates of the United States had decided on readjusting the working conditions and putting on three shifts in the twenty-four hours. Thus in this country our workers are exploited and practically forced to labour under the worst possible conditions for twenty-four hours on end. And yet it would seem that although we have signed a convention which concedes that the workers ought not to be subjected to these unjust conditions, we are powerless to effect a change. I suppose all we can say to these workers is that we will have to let things go from bad to worse until there is a riot in Sydney. Then this government, which now says it has no power in the matter, will find it has power to send down a military force to suppress the disturbance.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it does seem to me that before we reach such a crisis we should calmy consider if we cannot work out some principle by which these evils—and I think everybody will acknowledge they are evils—can be removed in a regular manner. Therefore under this item I would suggest that the time is more than ripe for the government to definitely decide what action it will take to put these conventions into effect, some of which were drawn up at least two or three years ago.

Mr. GOOD: Mr. Chairman, the member for Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth) has already asked the minister (Mr. Murdock) to make some explanation regarding his general policy in view of the remarkable decrease in his appropriations this year. I note that there is a decrease in these estimates from a million and a half to about a quarter of a million. Of course, if this means efficiency and economy we are all delighted; but I want to know what it does mean. Does it mean a very large reduction in the work of the department? Does it mean that we have no need of an appropriation for relief? If that is so we are certainly very much pleased. But I do think it is in order for the minister to give us some explanation of this drop from a million and a half to a quarter of a million. I have not heard any explanation yet, and if it is coming I shall be glad to wait for it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think the point which my hon. friend has just raised comes under another item. This is the international office we are speaking of.

Mr. GOOD: I see no item, Mr. Chairman, under which my question could be answered, so I thought I would bring it up now.

Mr. MURDOCK: I shall be very glad indeed to give the reason for this reduction as I have tried to do in respect to each item which we have dealt with. For example, in vote 265 we made a reduction of $15,000, and I indicated the reason, that is, that we were not in any way hampering the work of the employment service, but that we thought there were certain unncessary expenditures and possibly certain unnecessary officials. My hon. friend from Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth) a little while ago referred to a prominent official who had to seek another position last year. I presume he was referring to the former director of the employment service, who prior to July 7th last spent a good deal of time out of Ottawa looking for another position, and on that date he told

me that he was leaving the department at the end of the month to accept a $10,000 job with a private concern in Chicago. I said to him, "All right, Sir, you can go at once if you like." I immediately wired for the western superintendent to come down and take charge. I only mention this incident because my hon. friend would almost appear to suggest that an injustice had been done to a capable employee. The gentleman in question was a capable employee no doubt, but, as indicated, he was out looking for and secured another position, which I am sure he will fill satisfactorily. The work of the employment service has continued uninterruptedly and to the general satisfaction so far as I know of the various provincial authorities and others concerned throughout Canada.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I made no reference to any injustice having been done. What I want to know is whether the department is being weakened by efficient men being allowed to go over to private agencies.

Mr. MURDOCK: Of course, that is a question which neither my hon. friend nor I can determine. If he takes the position that some men in the service are not getting all they are worth, I will say he is right. At the same time I will say that possibly some men are getting more than they are worth. But that is a question under the jurisdiction of a properly constituted body known as the Civil Service Commission, which classifies the salaries of the service. Possibly it was unfortunate that the director of the employment service was only rated as a $4,200 man, but, as I say, that is something that we cannot in any way control.

The next item in which there is a reduction is No. 266, which is $50,000 less than the appropriation for 1922-23. This is to supplement the amount provided by Statute 8-9, George V, chapter 21, Employment Offices Co-ordination Act. In that act there is statutory provision for $150,000 to be used in organization and co-ordination of employment offices in co-operation with the various provinces, and this, it will be noticed is provided for further down on page 49. The position has been taken that it might reasonably be assumed that when $150,000 was provided by statute it should not be necessary to appropriate an additional $100,000. Last year the hon. member for Centre Vancouver (Mr. Stevens) embarrassed me somewhat during the consideration of the estimates in presenting that view, but upon further thought I had to agree that there was some ground for the claim made. I decided, therefore, that we could get along with $200,000 for the coming fiscal year and at the same time meet our obligations with the provinces in which these employment offices were maintained. I believe that $50,000 added to the amount provided by statute will be amply sufficient. The amount provided last year in connection with the offices of director and assistant director of technical education, $7,000, has not all been spent. With only one officer in the future, the Director of Technical Education, $3,000 should be sufficient. As a matter of fact, up to January 31 last only $936.64 had been expended of the $7,000 during the fiscal year. So it seems reasonable to cut that appropriation down from $7,000 to $3,000.

Mr. GOOD: The minister seems to have misunderstood my question. I am not complaining about any particular reductions that have already been explained. I want some explanation about the reduction of $1,300,000 that has not been explained.

Mr. MURDOCK: I was coming to that later, but I will explain it now if my hon. friend wishes. We are not asking for any money this year to provide for unemployment relief. We believe conditions have changed for the better, and whereas last year $1,200,000 was asked for in the Supplementary Estimates to meet expenditure that had been incurred in connection with participation in unemployment relief schemes, it is believed we do not need any such appropriation at this time. Except under P.C. 220, we have paid out no money during this winter for unemployment relief; that is, we have discontinued entirely the plan in effect during the two previous winters. That represents the item of $1,300,000 that my hon. friend refers to.

Mr. GOOD: What was the total amount spent for relief during the present fiscal year?

Mr. MURDOCK: $902,576.79. We have on hand something like $380,000 of the amount voted in last year's Supplementary Estimates.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I would call the attention of the minister to the rather serious condition which has prevailed in Winnipeg during the last winter and to the earnest representations made to the government, not only by the city council of Winnipeg but also by the province of Manitoba, urging that conditions, at least in the city of Winnipeg, were similar to those which prevailed a year ago and pointing out that the joint conference called by the Dominion and the provinces had agreed that if conditions were

similar, relief would be granted. Whatever may be true of other parts of Canada, if conditions are similar in Winnipeg to what they were a year ago—and I believe they are in some other parts as well—the government should explain why the arrangement of a year ago is discontinued.

Mr. MURDOCK: Shall we proceed, Mr. Chairman, with a discussion of unemployment relief, or shall we deal with this item, International Labour Conference?

The CHAIRMAN: Shall item 269, International Labour Conference, carry?

Mr. SHAW: The hon. member for Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth) has asked a very important question which has not yet been answered, namely, what steps are being taken by the department to carry into effect the various labour conventions. If it is because of lack of jurisdiction on the part of this parliament that nothing has been done to give effect, for instance, to the eight-hour law, why not let the provincial governments be represented at those conferences and the Dominion government discontinue their efforts in that direction?

Mr. MURDOCK: It has always been the desire of the federal government that the provincial governments should be represented at those conferences. At the Washington Conference in 1919, a representative from each province acted as adviser to the two federal government representatives. Manitoba, Ontario and Quebec were represented at the Geneva Conference of 1921. Last year, when the conference for 1922 was pending, the department urged that the provinces should be represented also on that occasion, but in each case the provinces considered such representation inadvisable. I assure the hon. member for Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth) that I am just as much interested in the questions he has in mind as he can possibly be. It is my desire to see the things dealt with in a businesslike way that are securing results for those interested, namely, the classes referred to by conventions resulting from the International Labour conferences. Unfortunately, so far as my hon. friend's views and desires are concerned, the British North America Act has some material bearing on this question as it precludes the possibility of the federal government doing certain things that it might desire to do in regard to some of these questions. In short, there is a dual or intermingled authority and responsibility as between the provincial government and the federal government on a number of these questions. I laid on the Table of the House a few days ago the decision of the Department of Justice in regard to certain matters dealt with at the 1921 convention in Geneva, and prior to that time the decision of the Department of Justice had been laid on the Table in reference to the conventions emanating from the International Labour Conference at Washington in 1919. Some of the questions in which my hon. friend is deeply interested as emanating from this International Labour Conference cannot be dealt with by this government, I am told, under the provisions of the British North America Act, and therefore it is a question of getting the representatives of the provinces and those in authority in the Dominion together, if possible, to determine how far we can go in doing what is desired and should be done in connection with these conventions.

Last fall, on September 5, 6 and 7, it is true as my hon. friend says, that a conference was called here in Ottawa with the provincial authorities. The first question to be considered was deciding what we should do on the question of unemployment relief, if any, during the then coming winter. Among other important questions to be considered were the conventions and recommendations that had emanated from the International Labour Conferences to this federal government, and through the federal government to the several provinces. No definite action was taken upon the questions emanating from the International Labour Conference for the reason that the conference here in Ottawa after some discussion decided that it was not fully enough advised and in proper form to deal with these matters, but it was decided to arrange for getting together and dealing with these matters just as soon as possible. Some months ago we moved in the direction of bringing about a conference that would really deal with these matters, and suggested the latter part of February or early in March for the conference to meet and decide what should be done. The majority of the provinces indicated that the time proposed would be inopportune because their various legislatures would be in session, and the result is that the matter now stands until the various legislatures and this House have adjourned. The hope and expectation now is that within the next two or three months a meeting will be held as between those representing the provinces and empowered to discuss and deal with these questions and the federal government to see in what way we can ratify or deal with the conventions and recommendations that have emanated from the first, second and third

International Labour Conventions. That is briefly the status of the matter at this particular time.

So far as the Labour department is concerned, as my hon. friend wanted to know its position, I may say the department and its minister are deeply interested in going as soon as possible just as far as it is possible for us to go in doing the things that should be done in regard to these matters. If there has been any delay, or if there appears to be any lukewarm or indifferent attitude in the matter, it is simply because of a lack of opportunity to go forward and do the things that it is hoped and believed should be done.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Has not the Dominion government taken authority, for instance, in the case of the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act and the Lord's Day Act? Do not these questions come in pretty much the same category as the eight-hour day or the one day's rest in seven?

Mr. MURDOCK: As my hon. friend knows, the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act applies only to public utilities, such as railroads and coal mines. Unquestionably, I am told, the federal government under the British North America Act has jurisdiction to determine certain questions, but it has not been considered that we have authority even under the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act to go so far as to deal with some particular concern in a particular province, as witness the British Empire Steel Corporation to which my hon. friend referred a short time ago. Jurisdiction under the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act does not, as we understand it, rest in the province to say that a board of investigation shall be appointed in a steel works controversy, for instance. So far as the Lord's Day Act is concerned, I think my hon. friend will agree that there are many and various Lord's Day Acts in the Dominion, or at any rate references to Lord's Day Act provisions. If my hon. friend will get whatever legal advice he desires to secure in this matter, I think he will find that on most of the questions that have emanated from the International Labour Conference the best legal opinion is that the provinces have jurisdiction, rather than the federal government.

Mr. SHAW: I quite readily appreciate the legal difficulties in which the minister finds himself. I am only anxious with the minister that effect be given at the earliest possible opportunity to such of these conventions as are found desirable. May I ask the minister, therefore, of the matters which have been found to be within the sole jurisdiction of the Dominion parliament, which ones have received consideration by this parliament?

Mr. MURDOCK: One of the most important questions emanating from the 1919 International Labour Conference at Washington was in reference to employment service. The federal government, as my hon. friend knows, promptly moved in the direction of making effective the general intent of that convention, which in substance provided that all possible assistance would be given to securing work for the unemployed without cost to the unemployed. In that direction the federal government has had the co-operation, generally speaking, of the provinces in so far as that was necessary, and it has been necessary because the western provinces all proceeded by regulation to discontinue private employment agencies. A commendable movement in that direction has been under way also in the eastern provinces, so that to-day in Nova Scotia there are no private employment agencies, but very few in New Brunswick, and in Ontario only some eleven or thirteen, I am not sure which. In that particular matter the federal government has, it is thought, gone a fair share of the way in doing the things it was contemplated would be done under that convention. On certain other matters the federal government has believed—or I should say the Labour department has believed and held all along—that we should have some reasonably distinct co-operative understanding with our partners in regard to the proposal and the necessary action to be taken in connection with these conventions. That, it seemed, could only be done by bringing about an understanding at meetings held for that purpose, and my personal hope is that within the next two or three months, or as soon as this provincial-federal conference can be arranged, we will be in a position to know how we are going to proceed in regard to certain of these matters that have not yet been dealt with.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Does the matter of old age pensions come under the federal government?

Mr. MURDOCK: As to that there is a legal point involved and I would not care to give my hon. friend an opinion. It concerns a disputed point, and in any case it is a matter for parliament to decide rather than—

Mr. WOODSWORTH: All I want to get at is where we decide these things. We are told it is a disputed point, but is there no

clear line of demarcation or can we not, by means of the courts, or otherwise, decide what the powers of this parliament are and cannot we expect the government to take action within those powers?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: On this item of the International Labour Conference, I think it would be appropriate for me to say a word in reply to some exception which the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) appeared to take the other day when mention was made of the circumstance that Mrs. James Carruthers had been appointed to represent the Minister of Labour at the meeting of the governing body which is to be held within the next few days at Geneva. I was responsible for suggesting the name of Mrs. Carruthers to the Minister of Labour, and I think I ought to let the House know the reasons that actuated me. First of all, I might mention that the minister spoke to me a couple of weeks ago about the representation of Canada at this conference. He said that he would be unable to attend himself, and asked for a suggestion as to the person to represent Canada. I suggested that he follow the course that had been followed on previous occasions; that if the minister himself was unable to attend to have, if possible, one of our representatives in England appear on behalf of Canada; and I suggested that Mr. Pacaud, the Secretary of the High Commissioner's office in London, should represent the Dominion at that gathering.

May I say here, by way of parenthesis, that the governing body of this conference meets four times a year. Its sessions last for only three or four days. It is not a great international conference at which special delegates appear, but is a permanent body. Under existing arrangements the Minister of Labour himself is a member of the governing body. I understand this was also the case under the previous government, though the minister, I think, attended only once; on all other occasions Canada was represented by some person who was resident in England or in France.

As I have mentioned, when the minister took the matter up first, Mr. Pacaud was spoken of. He was communicated with by letter and, as the correspondence which has been brought down shows, at the end of several days a cable was received from him mentioning that he would not be able to find it possible to attend the gathering himself. The minister then spoke to me again, pointing out that the time was very short, and I suggested to him a name that would be suitable. I suggested the name of Colonel Cunningham who has represented the minister on three or four occasions. The minister said to me that he would prefer to have another nomination this time, and I then suggested to him the name of Mrs. Carruthers as one who, I thought, was very specially qualified to represent Canada at that gathering.

The main reason why I suggested Mrs. Carruthers' name was because she is the author of one of the best known books on labour legislation which has been published—one of the very few books that I know of that deal with labour legislation in Canada. I should be obliged if any member of the committee can tell me of any other author, or authoress, who has published a book, particularly on labour legislation, in the British dominions. I have in my hand a book entitled The Factory and Shop Acts of the British Dominions. It is by Mrs Carruthers, who at the time it was written was known as Miss Violet Markham. The contents are divided into three parts: Part 1, General View of the English Law; Part 2, New Zealand and Australia; Part 3, Canada—General Review of Federal Law; General Review of the law in Quebec, the law in Nova Scotia, the law in New Brunswick, the law in Manitoba, and the law in British Columbia. When Mr. Thomas, Director of the International Conference, was in Ottawa, he mentioned to me that one of the subjects which had occasioned most embarrassment and confusion to members of the conference was the very question we have been discussing this afternoon, that namely, of jurisdiction as between the federal and provincial governments; and having in mind the conversation I had with him at that time, it occurred to me that no person would be better qualified to make a satisfactory explanation and give a satisfactory exposition of that important matter than Mrs. Carruthers, who is thoroughly familiar with the labour questions of our country both in the federal and the provincial fields. That was the reason I suggested Mrs. Carruther's name—the fact that she has taken a very important part in labour questions generally.

It is perfectly true, as the leader of the Opposition mentioned that she was a candidate for parliament—not at the last election, as he said, but at the election before last. She was one of four candidates, I think, in a particular constituency, not supporting any party, but running as an independent Liberal. That, however, should not disqualify anyone from representing this country at such a conference. In addition to that, Mrs. Carruthers has been a member of the Central Committee

on Womens' Employment in Great Britain; a director of the womens' section of the National Service Department during 1917; is at the present time a member of the Industrial Court—I think an appointment made under the present government in England—and has served on different commissions dealing with industrial and other problems. As there was very little time in which to give instructions to any person, it seemed to me that no one was better qualified—and I still hold that view, having regard to all the circumstances—to represent the minister in an effective way with regard to the questions that are likely to come up during these three or four days meetings of the governing board.

Perhaps I ought to mention another circumstance, I had in mind at the time I made the suggestion of Mrs. Carruthers' name. Only a short time ago, I had a conversation with the president of the Women's National Council of Canada, and she mentioned to me that at a recent meeting of the council the committee had desired the attention of the government to be drawn to the desirability of having a woman represent Canada, as occasion might afford opportunity, at one of these international conferences in Geneva. It seemed to me that Mrs. Carruthers, with her knowledge of labour legislation and industrial questions, would be particularly suitable as a woman to fill that place during this brief period. I might also mention that the questions coming up for consideration at the meetings have to do largely with problems relating to women's work in industry. Altogether, these circumstances seemed to render it advisable to suggest the name of this particular lady to represent Canada. Had we sent anyone from this side it would have been an entirely new departure.

I may say that Colonel Carnegie, who represented us on three previous occasions, is not a Canadian. He was employed here in Canada, during the period of the war, with the Imperial Munitions Board. After his return to England he published a book dealing with industrial questions, relating in part to matters in this country. I think his appointment to represent the Minister of Labour was regarded as a very good one, and that he did splendid service in that capacity. Mrs. Carruthers is in much the same position. She is not a Canadian but is familiar with Canadian law and Canadian conditions, and I think, will be distinctly helpful to our country in representing it at this particular meeting of the International Conference.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: I cannot say that I am much impressed by the defence of the government in regard to the appointment of Mrs. Carruthers. I do not think, in the first place, that a knowledge of Canada, of Canadian labour conditions and employment conditions, can be gained by a study of provincial or Dominion statutes. It can be gained by residence in this country, by contact with actual affairs and by study resulting from that contact. Such advantages and such qualifications Mrs. Carruthers, no matter how brilliant she may be, cannot possibly possess. Such qualifications Colonel Carnegie did possess. Though not a Canadian, he lived here through very strenuous periods and was himself very closely associated with questions such as this. But Colonel Carnegie is not the only one. I think Mr. Obed Smith, a Canadian residing in London, represented us on previous similar occasions. I know of no reason why Obed Smith or Colonel Carnegie could not have accepted the position. Apparently no name was suggested and none of them was communicated with.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I mentioned a moment ago—perhaps my right hon. friend was not in the House—that I did suggest Colonel Carnegie before I suggested Mrs. Carruthers.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I though the hon. member said "Cunningham."

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No. Carnegie.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think the Prime Minister made a mistake; I think he said "Cunningham." Then Colonel Carnegie was suggested by the Prime Minister and rejected by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock) I did not know who Colonel Cunningham was, but I understand now. Apparently the Minister of Labour did not want Colonel Carnegie, I do not know why. However, Mr. Obed Smith was in England, and as far as I know his duties were there. Why he could not have represented the country I do not know. Certainly there could have been no political objection, which usually weighs heavily with the government, to the appointment of Obed Smith. The request came and was received on the 6th March. The government could have ascertained if Mr. Pacaud could have attended. No objection could have been taken to him. They could have ascertained in a day or two whether he could have attended. A long letter was written to Mr. Pacaud which he received on the 20th and answered on the 21st. There was no delay on his part. The delay was occasioned by the methods adopted

by the government. But even after the delay there was plenty of time to have had a Canadian gentleman, and plenty of time to have had a Canadian woman appointed, if a woman were more desirable than a man. But no, an English woman politician, who forsooth had written a book, must represent this country. I have no knowledge of this woman. She has, I suppose, written this book—

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is a self evident limitation of the right hon. member's knowledge, unfortunately.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, and I have many limitations of the same kind.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Hear, hear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: She has written a book on Canadian law, provincial and federal. I doubt if very many in this country have had the advantage of a perusal of that book. I have not, but I repeat that that is a long way from qualifying to represent us on this important body. Besides, as everybody knows she is a member of a large coal-owning family in that country. That does not disqualify her, but it would at least tend to give her views, or perhaps a leaning, away from what would make her a fair judge of labour conditions, even in her own land, to say nothing of being a judge of conditions in this country. The appointment seems to me one of the most remarkable things the government has done, and when I say that I make a very strong statement indeed.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I must confess to a sense of gratification in not viewing these and kindred matters in as narrow and small-minded a way as my right hon. friend. I think when the leader of a great party has to take exception to a woman's appointment to deal with industrial matters on the ground that she belongs to a family which happens to be associated with a certain coal industry, he can be left to the measure of his own view of the situation. If my hon. friend, instead of having to confess his ignorance as to what Mrs. Carruthers has accomplished in the field of industrial relations, had a knowledge of her position in England and the esteem in which she is held among the working people there, he would be pleased to stand up in this House and say that Canada was fortunate in having one of Mrs. Carruthers' large sympathies and wide knowledge of industrial problems, to represent us at the conference in Geneva. More than that, I hope this country is large enough in its outlook to be prepared, when opportunity offers, to extend something in the nature of a recognition by courtesy to those who are helping to make the work and industrial position of this country known throughout different parts of the world. Mrs. Carruthers, as I have intimated, has helped to make Canada's labour laws known throughout the dominions of the British Empire and known to other countries, and when opportunity comes to recognize a service of that kind in so slight a way as this, I cannot but express my amazement that the leader of a great party should find it necessary to take exception in this House on grounds so small as those my right hon. friend has just mentioned.

Mr. SHAW: Can the minister tell me if, under one of the orders in council, the matter of old age pensions was not found to be peculiarly within the jurisdiction of the Dominion parliament? I am referring to the order in council, I think, of November, 1920—I am not sure of the date.

Mr. MURDOCK: I do not think an order in council could deal with the question of old age pensions. My hon. friend possibly refers to the eight-hour day matter. That possibly could have been dealt with by order in council applying to the federal government works, such as railroads and so forth, but in any case the question of old age pensions is not one emanating from the International Labour Conference, and, therefore, it is not one of those matters that can be dealt with in order to determine what we are going to do in our relations between the provinces and the federal government, although it is still all important for somebody to determine what is to be done with it.

Mr. SPENCER: Is it a fact that during the session an hon. member brought up the matter of old age pensions in this House, and that the Prime Minister made the statement that the government was giving it favourable consideration? Would not that in itself prove that they considered it a federal matter?

Mr. MURDOCK: I do not want my hon. friend to understand me as taking the position that old age pensions is not a matter the federal government should deal with. I do not take that position. I rather incline to the view, from all the information I have received, that it is a matter that this federal government could deal with, if and when it is prepared to do so, when it finds that the money is available for this purpose and a proper method of dealing with it can be devised.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Several times during the course of the debate this afternoon the minister has referred to the divided juris-

diction of the Dominion and the provinces with respect to labour matters. There has not been, as I understand it, any very clear or concise statement of the line of demarcation or division between those authorities. Could the minister give the committee a short, clear statement of the jurisdiction of this parliament and the jurisdiction of the provinces in this matter?

Mr. MURDOCK: My hon. friend of course appreciates that all of that information has been laid on the Table of the House by the previous government and this one, indicating the line of division between the provincial and the federal authority as alleged by the Department of Justice. I am quite sure that that hon. gentleman would be better informed if he would read the decisions of the Justice department as regards these matters, from documents already laid on the Table of the House, than he would in listening to me as an ordinary layman undertaking to give my views as to where federal authority ceased and provincial authority commenced. But I can, for the information of my hon. friend, deal with one particular question as it has been presented to us. Take the draft convention limiting the hours of work in industrial undertakings to eight in the day and forty-eight in the week. That is the one in which the hon. member for Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth) has, on several occasions, expressed great interest, which I know he feels.

The object of the draft convention is to secure the adoption of a maximum working day of eight hours and week of forty-eight hours for persons employed in any public or private industrial undertaking. Various exceptions to this proposed rule will be noted in the text of the draft convention. In an order in council of November 6, 1920,—

Which my hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. Shaw) referred to a moment ago.

—adopted on the report of the Minister of Justice, it was declared that the proposals of this draft convention involved legislation which is competent to parliament in so far as Dominion works and undertakings are affected, but which the provincial legislatures have otherwise the power to enact and apply generally and comprehensively. The proposals contained in this draft convention could probably be made effective by order in council in so far as regards hours of labour in Dominion works and undertakings are concerned.

That is the ruling received on that particular question from the Justice department and some time ago placed on the Table of the House.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Are there any other rulings which the minister could give to the committee?

[Mr. H. A. Stewart.]

Mr. MURDOCK: They are all here. All of them have been dealt with excepting what took place at the last conference.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): How many of them are there?

Mr. MURDOCK: There are many pages of these, if my hon. friend wants to go into them.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): I just wanted, if I could, to get some clear, concise statement in a general way outlining the division of authority. It is quite clear that as regards public works, this Dominion has jurisdiction.

Mr. MURDOCK: I would not care to be charged with undertaking to give a concise statement in a general way on an important legal question of this kind, defining the dual responsibilities as between federal and provincial authorities. I would rather read from the written legal definition given to us by the Justice department, and my hon. friend has, for these many months, had access to that on the Table of this House.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): My reason for asking the minister that question was that I would gather from his statement that he had made a special study of the matter as Minister of Labour, and that he had referred on different occasions to this division of authority.

Mr. MURDOCK: My hon. friend is correct in his supposition that, within the limits of time at my disposal, I have made a special study of all these questions that are of interest to the Department of Labour.

Mr. HALBERT: Supposing the Dominion government had full power, does the minister think it would be an excellent thing in the interest of Canada to introduce an eight-hour day for all the people of Canada under present conditions?

Mr. MURDOCK: That, my hon. friend will concede is under the circumstances, an hypothetical question and rather an unfair one to me, although my hon. friend does not intend it to be so. My hon. friend would naturally know where my sympathies might be on a matter of that kind. At the moment, though, I am only one member of a
5 p.m. government, undertaking to represent many and varied interests throughout Canada, all of which are entitled to equally fair consideration for their viewpoints and their interests involved. Therefore, it is not specially a question of my per-

sonal inclinations, judgment or desires on some particular matter that is going to govern.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Has the hon. gentleman any recollection at this late date of the engagements with respect to labour legislation made by the Liberal convention of 1919? Could he give the committee what those engagements were—I wonder if he has any idea of them at all—and then tell us whether they are now repudiated or just forgotten?

Mr. MURDOCK: I did not have the privilege or pleasure of attending the convention my right hon. friend speaks of. As a matter of fact, it was held in advance of the time that I was born into the political arena, and while I have read what my right hon. friend refers to, I would rather let someone more fully informed and equally interested in those matters answer the question of my right hon. friend.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I would think the minister is the one who ought to be best informed and best able to answer. He is the Minister of Labour. Surely, he did not assume his duties without thoroughly acquainting himself with the obligations of the party with which he was connecting himself, as regards that special subject. I am asking him now only with respect to labour matters, for instance, old age pensions, women's pensions, the eight-hour day, all those cognate subjects. The minister is the one who should be best acquainted with those, because he must have studied them. He must have come to some conclusion as to his obligations in respect of those engagements. I ask him: What is his recollection of them? Has he any at all? Can he give the committee a rational statement of what he is committed to as labour leader in respect of those matters? If he can, what does he intend to do about the matter?

Mr. MURDOCK: I do not, for one moment, expect that any statement that I might make would be regarded by my right hon. friend as a rational statement.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If it is rational, it would.

Mr. MURDOCK: I have already, on several occasions in the discussion of these estimates, indicated what was being done or what was hoped to be done in connection with old age pensions; I have indicated the position that we find ourselves in as regards the eight-hour day, forty-eight hour week convention, emananting from the 1919 International Labour Conference at Washington.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is our position now different from what it was in August, 1919?

Mr. MURDOCK: I would hold that our position and desires are not one whit different. The question is only one of time and reasonably consistent opportunity, having regard to the rights and interests of all concerned. As regards the matter of old age pensions, no one knows better than my right hon. friend that it would mean the assumption of an enormous burden of additional financial responsibilities to Canada, were we to undertake to adopt at the moment an old age pension scheme. No one in this House, not even the member for Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth) would be more delighted than I would be to know that it was possible to do that right now, but that is a question for parliament to determine. I have repeatedly stated that these matters have been and are being given all possible consideration with a view of seeing what can be done.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not know that I am much enlightened. I have not had even a pretence of an answer to the question I asked. The minister did presume to say what the government's policy now is, and if I got his words correctly it is this: To do what is most consistent under all the circumstances with the general public interest. That is the government's policy.

Mr. MURDOCK: That is only your definition of it—and I never knew you to get anything right.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I tried to repeat the minister's exact words. Perhaps he said satisfactory instead of consistent. Now will he give us again in his own words—and I will guarantee to get them exact—that fine specific definition of government policy which he gave us a moment ago.

Mr. MURDOCK: My right hon. friend has asked for so much and changed his question so often that really I do not know, and I do not think anyone else in the House knows, what it is he wants. Personally, I think what he wants is to delay, to haggle and try to get something that he can make capital of, and possibly present a view that was never intended. Now, I wish him luck in his undertaking.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think I can give my right hon. friend the information he asks for. It is well-known to him, but perhaps he will not mind my quoting the resolution of the Liberal convention in the exact language in which it was passed.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am glad the Prime Minister knows what I am asking for. The Minister of Labour has just got through saying that nobody does know what I want.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The resolution is as follows:

Resolved that the committee recommends that the National Liberal Convention accept in their entirety as a part of the Liberal platform, in the spirit they have been framed and in so far as the special circumstances of the country will permit, the terms of the labour convention and general principles associated with the League of Nations and incorporation in the conditions of Peace.

These methods and principles for regulating labour conditions so set forth in the treaty are as follows:

First.—The guiding principle that labour should not be regarded merely as a commodity or article of commerce.

Second.—The right of association for all lawful purposes by the employed as well as by the employers.

Third.—The payment to the employed of a wage adequate to maintain a reasonable standard of life as this is understood in their time and country.

Fourth.—The adoption of an 8-hour day or a 48-hour week as the standard to be aimed at where it has not already been attained.

Fifth.—The adoption of a weekly rest of at least twenty-four hours, which should include Sunday wherever practicable.

Sixth.—The abolition of child labour and the imposition of such limitations on the labour of young persons as shall permit the continuation of their education and assure their proper physical development.

Seventh.—The principle that men and women should receive equal remuneration for work of equal value.

Eighth.—The standard set by law in each country with respect to the conditions of labour should have due regard to the equitable economic treatment of all workers lawfully resident therein.

Ninth.—Each state should make provision for a system of inspection in which women should take part, in order to ensure the enforcement of the laws and regulations for the protection of the employed.

And further resolved

1. That the introduction into the government of industry or principles of representation whereby labour and the community, as well as capital, may be represented in industrial control, and their interests safeguarded and promoted in the shaping of industrial policies.

2. That in so far as may be practicable, having regard for Canada's financial position,—

And here I might draw the attention of my right hon. friend to the words just used by the Minister of Labour. I think they are almost identical with those used in referring to this question.

—an adequate system of insurance against unemployment, sickness, dependence in old age, and other disability, which would include old age pensions, widows' pensions, and maternity benefits, should be instituted by the federal government in conjunction with the governments of the several provinces; and that on matters pertaining to industrial and social legislation an effort should be made to overcome any question of jurisdiction between the Dominion and the provinces by effective co-operation between the several governments.

3. The representation of labour on federal commissions pertaining to labour matters.

4. Effective legislation for the conservation of human life and health.

5. The representation of labour on the board of directors of the Canadian National Railways.

6. That the system of re-training soldiers, unfitted for their past work because of physical injuries, be extended to disabled workers in industry.

7. More effective restriction of Chinese immigration.

8. The federal incorporation of co-operative associations.

9. The acceptance of the principle of proportional representation.

10. Immediate and drastic action by the government with respect to the high cost of living and profiteering.

11. Restoration of the control of the executive by parliament, and of parliament, by the people through a discontinuance of government by order in council and a just franchise and its exercise under free conditions.

If my right hon. friend will be quite frank he will agree with me that some of the features of this resolution have already been carried out—some of the planks in this platform if he wishes to so term them.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Which one?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: First I put administration by parliamentary government instead of by an autocratic executive. Then I think my right hon. friend will agree that we have representation of labour on the Board of Directors of the Canadian National Railways. I could mention others. These "planks" have already or are being carried into effect. For example, more effective restriction of Chinese immigration is in course of being dealt with, there being legislation before the House at the present time with that end in view. And, "in so far as may be practicable having regard to Canada's financial position," the government will continue to put into effect one by one the several clauses of this resolution passed at the Liberal convention.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The resolution, as will be seen, affirms, subject to some pretty vague conditions, adherence to the International Labour Congress charter. That, of course meant nothing because Canada's adherence had already been given long before. Then the resolution goes on and recites, I think, about eleven commitments of the Liberal party. The Prime Minister says they have carried into effect the last—parliamentary government is restored; order in council government is gone. The returns brought down in this House show that in the first three months of my right hon. friend's administration—

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I said parliamentary government had replaced an autocratic executive.

Mr. MEIGHEN: —there were more orders in council passed than in any three months before in the history of the country, and I venture to say that the year 1922 will show

more orders in council, and more extreme orders in council, passed by this government than ever were passed in any year in our history.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do not want to interrupt my right hon. friend, but that question was asked and answered in the House yesterday. The returns were given and showed that the orders in council last year were fewer than those of the preceding year.

Mr. MEIGHEN: By about what?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am not saying by about what. I am answering my right hon. friend's statement.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I will look into it. I have not seen the return. But I will undertake to say that it will show one of the largest returns of orders in council passed in the history of this country. But if the number were twice, or half, as large it would not make one iota of difference; the number of orders in council only represents the number of decisions, small or great, which the government makes in accordance with the legislation of parliament. But this government time and again—and at this point I am not criticizing—has gone beyond legislation, and has presumed to act in the belief that the circumstances warranted such action and to wait for legislation in the future. It has done just the same as every other government, but in cases more extreme than even under the exigencies of war were ever acted on before. The fact is that all this talk about the restoration of responsible government was just so much froth and fury in the absence of any categorical indictment of the government against which it was raised.

Then the Prime Minister says, "Oh, but we have appointed a labour director on the National Railway Board." The previous government stated over and over again that on the reorganization of the Canadian National Railway Company and the bringing in of the Grand Trunk there would be a director appointed directly representing labour. Subsequent to the passing of this resolution the Liberal party in parliament set to work to state just specifically what that resolution meant. A motion was made by a member of the present government, by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe) that two representatives should be appointed to the National Railway Board representing labour.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My right hon. friend is wrong again. The motion that he has reference to by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries that labour should be represented on the board of directors was a resolution moved in this parliament before the Liberal convention was held at all.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I was pretty certain it was later. Anyway it makes it worse if it was before, because if so this resolution was merely to implement that. That stands as a parliamentary pledge of the Liberal party and is entirely consistent with the resolution of the convention. It was moved by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that there be two representatives, and that those representatives be recommended by the employees of the system. Does anyone dispute the correctness of that? Moved by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, seconded by an hon. member whose name at the moment I forget, and supported by the entire Liberal party in the House—save, I think, the present Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), who at that time was seated about half way on his road across the House. That resolution pledged the party and called upon the government then and there to appoint two directors representing labour.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Will my hon. friend quote that resolution?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, I will give the resolution. There were to be two representatives, recommended by the employees of the system. What was done to carry that out? One man was appointed. He is a labour man; against him as a labour man I say not a word. But he certainly was not recommended by the employees of the system; he is not on the system at all, and never was, so far as I know. And he is one, not two; so there is a direct, a flagrant violation of the commitment of the party in this House. That is the extent to which that undertaking has been complied with; the others they simply forgot—said the time was not opportune. Well, the situation in the country is just the same as in 1919 they declared it was, because their resolutions and the other pages of their proceedings abound with statements that the country is overloaded with the burden of debt, and that—by intimation if not in so many words—it is on the road to collapse and bankruptcy. That was the condition declared by themselves to exist, when all these things were held out to the labour population of Canada. In a word, the so-called principles that were embalmed in these resolutions of the convention were not really principles, but only baits.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Do I understand that my right hon. friend is taking ex-

ception to the appointment of the president of the Dominion Trades and Labour Congress to represent labour on the Board of Directors of the Canadian National Railways?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Prime Minister understands exactly what I said; I could not have made myself clearer. I say his appointment is in no way a fulfilment of the pledge that the Liberal party made in this House, of the motion that they supported.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Is my hon. friend taking exception to the appointment, or does he endorse it?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have nothing against Mr. Tom Moore at all.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Does my right hon. friend endorse it?

Mr. MEIGHEN: There was nothing in the world to prevent our appointing him; we had never committed ourselves to anything else. I am neither endorsing nor supporting it; I say it is a violation of the commitment made by the opposition of that time, now the government of the day. The Prime Minister's effort is only an imitation of the effort of his follower from Hants (Mr. Martell) to get away from the point we are discussing and to try to trail the discussion into something else.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No, it is not.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the Minister of Labour tell us one concrete step that his government has taken, or, to put it more liberally, one concrete step they expect to take, even within the next two years, to fulfil in any substantial way the labour pledges of his government?

Item agreed to.

Joint Industrial Councils, $10,000.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: How is this money being spent, and what is the reason for the reduction?

Mr. MURDOCK: The expenditure under this head for the ten months ended January 31, 1923 was $3,102.48. The appropriation is needed to meet changes arising out of work done for the promotion of a system of joint industrial councils as between employers and workmen. The system is largely identical with that known in Great Britain as the Whitley Councils and is thought likely to be helpful in meeting difficult situations arising out of the industrial unrest. The appropriation is intended to meet charges for printing, stationery, travelling expenses and temporary assistance. The appropriation had been $15,000. During the past year or two the department has found it inadvisable unduly to press, through the assistance of officers of the department at least, the creation of these industrial councils. We found a commendable desire on the part of employers and workmen in many of the industrial activities throughout Canada to get together. The department have always been ready to give assistance or advice in furthering the joint industrial council idea, but it is thought that $10,000 will be sufficient for the coming fiscal year, particularly in view of the fact that there has not been opportunity for the expansion of the proposed effort that might have been expected when the matter was originally before parliament.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: How many industrial councils have actually been organized during the past twelve months?

Mr. MURDOCK: None. Only one or two could be called joint industrial councils under this proposed plan or the Whitley Council plan, and they have not been very active. There is no necessity of adopting the joint industrial plan where there is a disposition on the part of workers and employers to get together and straighten out their own differences. That is the condition we have sought to bring about and to maintain, rather than to press a plan which in many cases has appeared to be objectionable to employers and to employees.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Has any effort been made to institute these councils in any of the government departments?

Mr. MURDOCK: Representations have been made in the form of memoranda submitted by local civil service organizations rather favouring the industrial council idea. I understand there is a joint industrial council in the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment. So far as many of the other departments are concerned—I know this applies to the Printing bureau, with some seven hundred employees, and the Labour department—there is no employee who has not ample opportunity to present any views or representations he may wish to make to the minister or to the deputy minister.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: The minister would hardly claim that was an industrial council. As I understand it, the very basis of an industrial council is, as was very well expressed in the document the Prime Minister read, that labour in the community as well as capital should be represented in industrial control. I take it that merely the fact of mak-

ing representations or having the right to make representations to the governing body does not constitute carrying out the principle of industrial councils.

Mr. MURDOCK: Parliament is maintaining industrial control here.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member for Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth) will be impressed with the progress made in carrying out that resolution. He must be impressed with the answer of the Minister of Labour. I rose to draw attention to the return to which the Prime Minister called my attention a moment ago, the orders in council passed in 1921 and 1922. The question was asked by the hon. member for Fort William:

(1) What were the number passed in the year ending December 31, 1921?
(2) What were the number passed in the year ending December 31, 1923?

The answer appearing in Hansard is as follows: (1) Year 1921, 5,861; (2) March, 1922, 5,621. I do not know what the significance is, and no one else can tell, of that word "March," but it would look to me as if the number given for 1922 was only from March onward.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do not think March appears at all.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The word is here in Hansard.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: There was no March in the reply. That is a misprint.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It would look as if it was from March onward, or that the figures were given to the end of the fiscal year in each case, in which case there would be no comparison as between the two governments At all events, it will be seen by these figures the progress that has been made in the "restoration of responsible government."

Mr. GOOD: Did I understand the minister to say that out of the $15,000 voted last year only some $3,000 was expended?

Mr. MURDOCK: $3,102.14 up to January 31st.

Mr. GOOD: May I inquire then as to the significance of asking for $10,000 this year? There seems to be a considerable expansion of the work in contemplation.

Mr. MURDOCK: The vote was $15,000 last year, but as I have just intimated to my hon. friend for Centre Winnipeg there were not the opportunities last year that it was believed there might be to extend the efforts in connection with joint industrial councils. It is hoped and believed that there may be greater opportunities to do something in that desired direction this year, and that more sympathy will be shown by employers and workers in this connection. Therefore it is thought that about $5,000 off the estimate of last year, of which only $3,000 odd has been spent, would be about right. That would leave a margin of $10,000 with which to work during the next fiscal year, in the event of our having greater opportunities than we had last year of doing something in the desired direction.

Mr. GOOD: I suppose that the principle is that we should have plenty of money to draw on in case the opportunity should present itself.

Mr. MURDOCK: That we should have a sufficient amount so as not to handicap possible results that might otherwise not be secured. I discussed that particular phase when dealing with the Annuities branch question a little while ago.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Does the government contemplate introducing any legislation this session looking to the carrying out of this idea of the joint control of industry?

Mr. MURDOCK: That matter also is under consideration, but I think it is only fair to my hon. friend to say that my personal opinion is that there will not be any legislation of that kind initiated at this session of parliament.

Item agreed to.

Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, $35,000.

Mr. BOYS: That was arranged to stand over, I think. There are some members who are not here, having gone away for the Easter recess, who want an opportunity of addressing themselves to this item.

Item stands.

Mr. BOYS: In connection with the appropriations not required for 1923-1924, I thought there was to be some discussion of that, but whether that be so or not, I understood the minister to say that there was nothing expended last year on unemployment relief. Were any applications received for unemployment relief?

Mr. MURDOCK: My hon. friend misunderstood me. There has been a great deal of money expended for unemployment relief during the past fiscal year, but it was decided that for this last winter it was unnecessary to adopt any plan of co-operation with the municipalities and provincial governments such as was in effect during the two previous

winters, and that is the reason we are not asking for any appropriation this year on account of unemployment relief. There is already in the funds up to the 31st of March some $380,000 odd of the amount voted by parliament last year in the Supplementary Estimates. That vote has not been all used, and will not be used, I might say.

Mr. BOYS: I appreciate that, but I do not understand the item as it appears here. It is for $1,300,000. In the Supplementary Estimates for unemployment relief it was $1,200,000. If you have spent all of that but $300,000 odd I do not see how you can have as large an item as you have now opposite the heading "Appropriations not required for 1923-1924."

Mr. MURDOCK: The sum of $100,000 was voted in the Main Estimates, and then I asked for $1,200,000 in the Supplementary Estimates to meet liabilities that it was said had accrued. That makes $1,300,000. As a matter of fact, the estimates that were given to us were rather over-estimates, and we found out that actually it cost us about $400,000 less than was estimated.

Mr. BOYS: That accounts for $400,000. Where did the other $900,000 go? The item as it stands now is $1,300,000.

Mr. MURDOCK: With $902,000 expended, and approximately $400,000 still remaining unexpended, you get $1,300,000.

Mr. BOYS: But if you have spent it, you require it.

Mr. MURDOCK: Oh, no. We are not engaging in any unemployment relief whatever this winter. We do not propose to. It is regarded as unnecessary to do so. We are not asking for any unemployment relief funds.

Mr. BOYS: I understand that all right. I may be very stupid, but I cannot appreciate the minister's explanation. You get $1,300,000, and spend $900,000. That leaves $400,000. I could understand this item for Appropriations not Required standing at $400,000 but if you have spent the money you certainly must require it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think my hon. friend has not gathered the form in which the estimates are presented. Last year there was an item for unemployment relief. This year there is none. This is a comparison of the estimates of last year with the estimates of this year. Last year the total estimate came to $1,300,000. This year we are not asking for anything for unemployment relief, so compared with last years' estimate the amount not required is what was voted last year. That is the explanation.

Mr. MURDOCK: At page 49 my hon. friend will notice two columns, one for the present fiscal year and one for the coming year. In the column for the coming year, he will notice, a blank opposite the item "Appropriations not Required for 1923-1924" and $1,300,000 as the vote for 1922-1923. That amount is not required this year and is therefore carried over into the "Decrease" column.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I promised a moment ago to give the Prime Minister the resolution that was voted for by his party on the motion of the hon. member now the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I find the date is April 23, 1919. That was three or four months prior to the celebrated convention. It reads as follows—and I ask hon. members to compare it with my words given from memory. It was an amendment to be added to a clause of the Canadian National Railways Act, in these words:

> At least two of the directors shall be appointed upon the recommendation of the employees of the Canadian National Railways.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My right hon. friend will observe that the resolution adopted when the Liberal convention was held was the resolution on which the party appealed to the country. It called for representation of labour on the directorate of the Canadian National Railways and that has been carried out by the appointment of the president of the Trades and Labour Congress to that position.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What a facile organization this party is? Here is a particular resolution of the party voted for and supported by the Prime Minister and every present member of the government. Three months afterwards their policy in this regard takes another form. It is only about two weeks possibly three weeks, since we were informed by the same government that where there was a difference between the resolution of the party in convention and the parliamentary commitments in the House, the latter governs.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It depends upon when the matter is proposed.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It depends entirely on what the subject is. They deal with it in another shape when they come to parliament, and the Minister of Finance tells us that is what is to govern, although they may have voted for another policy in convention. On

the other hand the Prime Minister tells us it is the policy in convention that governs. Again I say what a facile organization! In other words what a sham?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Marcil, Bonaventure): I would like to remind the committee that there is nothing before it at present. What item shall be called?

Mr. MURDOCK: The Civil Government estimates to be found on page 84.

Salaries, $231,735; contingencies, $45,500.

The CHAIRMAN: The details are to be found on page 35 of the reprinted Estimates.

Mr. LADNER: I wanted to ask the minister if I understood him rightly in saying that no provision would be made by the government with respect to unemployment for the next year, or for the contingency of unemployment. I did not quite catch his answer on that point.

Mr. MURDOCK: We are not asking the government to vote any money at this time on account of possible unemployment for the future or for the present.

Mr. LADNER: Is there any provision for unemployment should the situation require assistance in any portion of Canada, or has the government decided to leave that question in the hands of the provincial governments?

Mr. MURDOCK: We do not anticipate any condition of unemployment that will warrant the participation of the federal government, either now or in the immediate future, and therefore parliament is not being asked to vote any more money on that account. We think that "Day by day, in every way Canada is getting better and better."

Mr. MEIGHEN: The United States is relieving the minister of very much trouble in that regard.

Mr. MURDOCK: Yes, and no other one gentleman in the Dominion of Canada is more responsible for that fact than is my right hon. friend.

Mr. MEIGHEN: For the policy?

Mr. MURDOCK: We find my right hon. friend, the leader of a once great party, who is accepting $14,000 of the people's money, standing on the floor of parliament the other night and making the statement, which Hansard will show, that children are dying, and that many suffered and died during the past winter. The statement is absolutely exaggerated and absolutely unfair to Canada, and it is just such statements as that on the part of my right hon. friend, and others like him, that are giving workmen the belief that this Dominion is not a proper country to live in and driving them out to seek employment elsewhere. My right hon. friend is the best advertising medium that Uncle Sam has today in taking from Canada the good citizens that know and love the country and would like to remain here if they were only given a square deal. No immigration agent that the United States ever sent to Regina—as we heard of the other night—or to any other part of the Dominion has been able to do as effective and splendid work in the nature of disgusting Canadians with their own country and turning them loose to seek their fortunes elsewhere as my right hon. friend has done. He can take the chief credit to himself of being the best immigration officer that Uncle Sam has on this continent at the present time.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I appear to have started something. I must say that these fine orations from the Minister of Labour are rather diverting. My latest crime is that I stated in the House, I think three weeks ago, that because of the position we found ourselves in last winter in respect of the coal needs of the poor there had been deaths of children. That is true.

Mr. MURDOCK: Will my right hon. friend please read the exact language he used.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Read it? Does the minister think I carry the newspapers of the country around with me?

Mr. MURDOCK: Oh no, read Hansard.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh, Hansard? That is what I stated and that is what appears in Hansard, that children had died, and there have been a lot of deaths, because of inability to provide fuel under the conditions which have prevailed during this last hard winter. The minister says that is an awful thing to say, and that it is the cause of the denudation of the cities of this country by our artisan population who have gone to the United States. Well, I do not like to be disrespectful but I think if the consummation of nonsense was ever reached in the world's history it was reached in this last sentence. The men have gone there by the thousands because there is no work. It is unfortunate. I drew attention to it during the debate on the Address, and I stated that I did not attribute the condition wholly to this government, if at all. These things follow in cycles from world conditions and special conditions in the

country, in respect to which the government has only partial control. But I do hold the government responsible for some of the unfortunate circumstances that exist to-day. A government policy can have a substantial effect in curing a situation. No word of pessimism as to this country has ever escaped my lips in this House or in the Dominion.

Mr. MURDOCK: Nonsense.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The leaders of hon. gentlemen opposite in 1921 declared to the world that we were in the throes of bankruptcy, that even our own men were getting frightened, that we owed so much we could not maintain any longer our integrity as a country; and then they wonder that they did not have any immigration in 1922. No prophecies of that kind or of any kind have been made by me. I am not afraid to state conditions as they exist and as I know them.

Mr. MURDOCK: Did the right hon. member not, on various platforms in October and November of 1921, prophesy with loud acclaim that if certain things happened the factories of the various towns and cities of Ontario and Canada would be closed?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Surely.

Mr. MURDOCK: And that the workmen would be out of work?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK: Was it true?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, certainly it was true, but hon. gentlemen took care that these things did not happen, at the expense of their plighted word. Undoubtedly it was true. If we had seventeen classes of articles on the free list to-day there would be scores of factories in this Dominion closed beyond any question, and no one knows it better than the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding). That is what I stated, and hon. gentlemen opposite now point to the factories which are open and say, "Look at them, the prophecies of Mr. Meighen have proved false by the events." No, what proved false was the government. These hon. gentlemen proved false to what they pledged themselves to do in this country, and then they boast of their own duplicity, and point to the condition of the country under the policy now in effect.

Mr. FORKE: This is very entertaining, but we are not getting very far with the estimates.

Mr. LADNER: The question I asked a moment ago was turned into an occasion for a declamation by the minister. Now I seek full information. I am trying to find out from the government if it is their policy to leave the solution of the question of unemployment with the provinces. The minister has told us that it is not anticipated that there will be unemployment. I ask the question purely with a desire to get information, in order that the people in that province who are interested will know, when the crisis arises, where they must go to find employment.

Mr. MURDOCK: On the 22nd day of December last, after very careful consideration by the government, a telegram was sent to the Prime Minister of British Columbia and a similar telegram to the Prime Minister of Manitoba, in answer to representations they had made to this federal government on the question of unemployment, indicating to these Prime Ministers the view that there was no general condition of unemployment in effect comparable in any way to that in effect during the two preceding winters, and no condition of unemployment which, in the judgment of the government, would warrant the participation of the federal government in a joint unemployment relief scheme such as had been in effect during the past two winters, the telegram indicating, as orders in council had previously indicated, that the question of unemployment relief was primarily one of municipal and provincial concern. The government has maintained that position on the general question of unemployment since that time, and, as a matter of fact, we have seen no great reason for changing that position. So far as British Columbia is concerned, I do not at this moment recall any word that we have received from authorities in British Columbia taking exception to that declaration of our position. It is true that in Manitoba we have received from the Mayor of Winnipeg, and various other representative gentlemen in that province, numerous requests indicating their desire that we should participate in assisting to relieve the conditions of unemployment which it was stated were in effect in Winnipeg. We did not however believe that it was advisable or necessary that the federal government should participate in any unemployment relief scheme, with, of course, one exception provided for in Order No. 220 which was laid on the Table of the House some time ago and which provides that where in certain municipalities relief organizations, composed in part of charitable and soldier organizations with representatives of the municipality, were participating in the relief of unemployed returned men, the federal government would, under the conditions recited in the

order in council, pay one-third of the expenditure. Under that order in council we paid out some few thousand dollars, probably not more than ten thousand dollars, since the order in council was passed some weeks ago. Our view is that the conditions which I have just referred to are going to improve rather than get worse, and that there is no necessity at this time, for us to consider such a question as asking for money with which to deal with unemployment, which we do not believe will be general in effect.

The CHAIRMAN: Carried.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I would like to clear up a certain matter. Is the contention of the city of Winnipeg set forth in the following resolution correct?

And whereas at a conference called by the federal government in September, 1922, a resolution was unanimously passed to the effect that should abnormal unemployment exist during the winter the provincial and federal governments should jointly meet the situation in a manner similar to that followed during the winter of 1921-22.

Is that contention correct? Was that resolution unanimously passed?

Mr. MURDOCK: No, that contention is not altogether correct, but it would probably take some few minutes to explain the situation, and I am told the House desires a few minutes before rising. Therefore, I move the committee rise and report progress. I will have that information for my hon. friend next time we meet.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The item under discussion was not carried.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It was carried a few minutes ago.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh, no. The minister suggested that the committee rise.

Progress reported.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES FOR 1922-3.

A message from his Excellency the Governor General, transmitting Supplementary Estimates for the year ending March 31, 1923, was presented by Hon. W. S. Fielding, (Minister of Finance) read by Mr. Speaker to the House, and referred to the Committee of Supply.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES FOR 1923-4

A message from His Excellency the Governor General, transmitting Supplementary Estimates for the year ending March 31, 1924, was presented by Hon. W. S. Fielding (Minister of Finance) read by Mr. Speaker to the House, and referred to the Committee of Supply.

ADJOURNMENT — BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MEIGHEN: What business will be taken up on Monday the 9th April?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: We will continue in Committee of Supply, taking up the estimates of the departments that have already been considered; Trade and Commerce, Public Works, and Labour—one of the three.

At six o'clock the House adjourned, without question being put, pursuant to rule.

Monday, April 9, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

REPORTS PRESENTED

General Rules and Orders of the Supreme Court.—Hon. Mr. Copp.

Eighteenth Annual Report, for the year ended December 31st, 1922, of the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada.—Hon. Mr. Graham.

WRECK OF ALASKAN

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. NEILL: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe) if he can give us any information as to when the report on the investigation into the wreck of the steamer Alaskan is likely to be brought down. The investigation took place more than two months ago, and the report is not likely to be voluminous. I may point out that apart from this investigation, sufficient has been brought out in connection with the wreck of the Alaskan and three other wrecks which have unfortunately occurred since then, two of them with loss of life, to show that the representations made by myself and by many public bodies in the West are well founded, namely, that the life-saving appliances or provisions out there are not adequate. I would like to ask the minister what steps he is taking or contemplates taking to deal with this matter. Time is slipping away; the session will soon be over, and this is a very important matter to the people on the coast of British Columbia.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The report of the Wreck Commissioner who investigated the wreck of the Alaskan has not yet been received. My information is that the stenographer who took the evidence had been ill and was unable to transcribe his notes; then, the commissioner himself has been ill. But we are informed that the report will be submitted in the course of a few days. Meanwhile, this matter has been brought to my attention on several occasions by my hon. friend himself and by various bodies in British Columbia, and I think that something should be done to improve the conditions there. I have decided, in fact, that something should be done this year, first, by establishing small wireless telephone stations in the various lighthouses so that communication may be had at any time with the life saving stations at Bamfield and Tofino. It has also been decided that the department shall have a station at Bamfield during the winter months and a ship suitable for the work which shall be equipped with all the necessary life-saving appliances and be in communication with all the lighthouses. As I have already said, we have in the Fisheries department two or three boats any one of which I think would serve the purpose.

I am glad to congratulate my hon. friend from Battleford (Mr. McConica) on his reappearance in this House.

It is also intended to place notice boards alongside the telegraph lines running along the shore to indicate the nearest place where survivors from a wreck can find food and shelter.

My hon. friend has suggested to me at various times that boats over one hundred tons register should be subject to the same inspection as boats of one hundred and fifty tons and over, and that the Shipping Act be amended accordingly. That matter is engaging the attention of the department.

PRIVILEGE—MR. SUTHERLAND

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. SUTHERLAND: As a member of the special committee to whom was referred Bill No. 15 to readjust the representation of the House of Commons, I take this the first opportunity afforded to refer to some newspaper articles which appeared on March 29 regarding this matter and referring particularly to myself. One of these articles purports to be based on a letter received from the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. Hammell) wherein he states that I am the one man who is responsible for holding up the work of the Redistribution committee. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I should like to read one paragraph from an article in the Bracebridge Gazette of March 29, 1923, dealing with this matter, and which I want to characterize as absolutely false and without any foundation in every particular. This is what purports to have been received by the Bracebridge Gazette from the hon. member for Muskoka:

> As to Donald Sutherland, he is the one man who is now holding up the work of the Redistribution committee. At a former meeting of the sub-committee to work out the salvation of Ontario, Sutherland agreed to nine members for the city of Toronto, which would have meant very few changes in other parts of the province. But, at the meeting of the same sub-committee again to-day, after he had been censored by his Conservative friends, he backs up or swallows himself and now wants fifteen members for Toronto, which if they get them, will most certainly interfere with Muskoka.

As I said before, I wish to characterize that statement as absolutely false in every particular.

IMPRISONMENT OF J. H. ROBERTS

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I should like to ask if the government has received a petition asking for the disallowance of special legislation which led to the imprisonment of Mr. J. H. Roberts, and what is proposed to be done with the case.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I might say to my hon. friend that I understand communications have been received asking that the matter of disallowance to which he refers be looked into, and that at the present time it is receiving the attention of the Minister of Justice.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the Prime Minister say that the statutes have been returned in the regular way to the government from the province of Quebec? I was not aware that they had been. Have the statutes of last session of the province of Quebec as yet been transmitted to the Department of Justice in accordance with the constitutional procedure?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do not think they have. I was answering the question my hon. friend asked as to whether any communications had been received asking that this matter be looked into, and I mentioned that they had.

SINGLE TRANSFERABLE VOTE

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Is it the intention of the government to introduce

legislation this session looking to the establishment of the single transferable vote?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That matter is under consideration at the present time. Any amendment of the character which my hon. friend has just mentioned would be an amendment to the Dominion Elections Act. There will be a number of amendments possibly to that act which the govenment will wish to present to the House for consideration, but whether it would be wise to bring them down at the present session will depend upon the progress we make now and in the next month or two.

PRIVATE BILLS

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING

Bill No. 34, an act respecting the Huron and Erie Mortgage Corporation.—Mr. White.

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 92 (from the Senate), for the relief of Emily Margery Chrimes.—Mr. McQuarrie.

Bill No. 93 (from the Senate), for the relief of Lyle Johnson.—Mr. Church.

Bill No. 94 (from the Senate), for the relief of Annie Belle Wilson.—Mr. Church.

Bill No. 95 (from the Senate), for the relief of Henry John Burden.—Mr. Ryckman.

Bill No. 96 (from the Senate), for the relief of Ethel Olmsted.—Mr. Rankin.

Bill No. 97 (from the Senate), for the relief of Edward Lewis Britton.—Mr. Arthurs.

Bill No. 98 (from the Senate), for the relief of Ruby Minnie Stallworthy.—Mr. Porter.

Bill No. 99 (from the Senate), for the relief of Christopher Campkin.—Mr. Maybee.

Bill No 100 (from the Senate), for the relief of Andrew George Suffel.—Mr. Preston.

Bill No. 101 (from the Senate), for the relief of Joseph Ross Wallace.—Mr. Church.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

MR. W. N. TILLEY, K.C.

Mr. BENOIT:

1. Was Mr. W. N. Tilley, K.C., of Toronto, retained by the government to conduct different cases on behalf of the government, between the years 1911-1921?

2. Is it true that the said Mr. W. N. Tilley has represented the government in the arbitration of the C.N.R. stock?

3. Is it true that the said W. N. Tilley has represented the government in the case of Sir Charles Ross against the government?

4. What amounts of money have been paid by the government to the said W. N. Tilley from the year 1911 to 1921, inclusively?

Hon. Mr. COPP:

Department of Justice—

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. Yes.
4. $1,000.00.

Department of Labour—

1, 2, & 3. No information.

4.

Fiscal year	Services and expenses as member of Conciliation	
1913-14...	Services and expenses as member of Conciliation Board, Canadian Pacific Railway Company and Maintenance of Way Employees..	$100 00
1917-18...	Services and expenses as member of Conciliation Board, Canadian Pacific Railway Company and Railroad Telegraphers..	140 00
1918-19...	Services and expenses as member of Conciliation Board, Canadian Pacific Railway Company and Commercial Telegraphers	284 33
	Total..	$524 33

Department of the Secretary of State—

1. Yes. One case.
2 & 3. No. information.
4. $750.

DOCKAGES ON GRAIN

Hon. Mr. STEVENS:

1. What was the total amount of dockages on all grain received at Port Arthur and Fort William by regular public terminal elevators for calendar year 1922 and for crop year ending August 31st, 1922?

2. What was the weekly average price paid the producer for dockages from public terminal elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur from 1st September to 31st December, 1922?

3. What was the total amount of dockages on all grain received at Fort William by the government elevator for calendar year 1922, and for crop year ending August 31st, 1922?

4. What were the weekly average prices paid the producer for dockages from government elevator, Fort William, from 1st September to 31st December, 1922?

5. What was the total amount of revenue received by the government elevator at Fort William for screenings for crop year 1922?

6. What is the information as applied to public terminal elevators and the government elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur:—(a) Total amount of wheat scalpings shipped from same; (b) Total amount of oats scalpings shipped from same; (c) Total amount of second recleaned scalpings shipped from same; (d) Total amount of elevator scalpings shipped from same; (e) Total amount of elevator

screenings shipped from same; (f) Total amount of second recleaned scalpings received in crop 1922 at regular terminal elevators; (g) Total amount of elevator screenings received in crop 1922 at regular terminal elevators; (h) total amount of oats scalpings received in crop 1922 at regular terminal elevators; (i) Total amount of wheat scalpings received in crop 1922 at regular terminal elevators; (j) Total amount of elevator scalpings received in crop 1922 at regular terminal elevators?

Hon. Mr. ROBB:

1. Crop year 1921-22, 71,861 tons; calendar year 1922, 101,204 tons.

2. The board has no record as to the average price paid to the producer for dockages.

3. Crop year 1921-22, 5,643 tons; calendar year 1922, 7,200 tons.

4. September 1-7, 75 cents; 8-15, 75 cents; 16-23, 65 cents; 24-30, 50 cents. October 1-7, 75 cents; 8-15, 75 cents; 16-23, 75 cents; 24-31, $1.00. November 1-7, $1.00; 8-15 $1.56; 16-23, $2.50; 24-31, $3. December 1-7, $2; 8-15, $2; 16-23, $4; 24-31, $4.

5. Gross revenue, $21,877.50.

6. (a) & (b) The board is unable to furnish the amount of wheat or oat scalpings shipped or received as they are included in the records of the board as elevator scalpings. In consequence no separate record is available showing the composition or quantities of either wheat or oat scalpings handled by terminal elevators.

(c) Shipments of standard recleaned screenings crop year 1921-22.

From public terminal elevators, 3,705 tons; from government elevator, 633 tons.

(d) From public terminal elevators, 7,309 tons; from government elevator, 740 tons.

(e) From public terminal elevators, 44,062 tons; from government elevator, 3,760 tons.

(f) Receipts of standard recleaned screenings from western points in cars as such, crop year 1921-22, 59 tons.

(g) Receipts of elevator screenings, from western points in cars as such, crop year 1921-22, 3,349 tons.

(h) & (i) The board is unable to furnish the amount of wheat or oat scalpings shipped or received as they are included in the records of the board as elevator scalpings.

(j) Receipts of elevator scalpings from western points in cars as such, crop year 1921-22, 2,049 tons.

TRUSTS AND COMBINES

Mr. CHURCH:

How many inquiries or prosecutions were there in Canada from 1905 to 1922 against trusts, and combines and combinations in restraint of trade by the government of Canada and with what results?

[Mr. Copp.]

Hon. Mr. COPP:

(a) Action has been taken in one case, namely, that relating to the United Shoe Machinery Company of Canada. In this case a board of investigation was, on the order of the Honourable Mr. Justice Cannon, a Judge of the Supreme Court of the Province of Quebec, established on February 25, 1911, under the provisions of the Combines Investigation Act. The inquiry took place in due course and the findings of the Board of Investigation were received on October 21, 1912, the findings declaring the United Shoe Machinery Company to be a combine within the meaning of the Combines Investigation Act.

(b) The United Shoe Machinery Company, in a communication addressed to the Honourable T. W. Crothers, then Minister of Labour, under date of August 21, 1913, reported that, to meet the situation created by the findings of the Combines Investigation Board, the company had changed its form of lease, and the evil alleged by the Combines Investigation Board.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—WESTERN TERMINI

Hon. Mr. BAXTER:

1. Was it decided at any meeting of the Board of Directors of the Canadian National Railway that Brockville and Cochrane should be the western termini of the maritime region or division of the Canadian National Railway? If so, when was such meeting held?

2. Did said board at any other time change such western termini to Montreal? If so, when?

3. Did the said board at any other time change such terminus to Rivière du Loup?

4. When were each of said meetings held and who were present and acting at each of such meetings?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM: The reasons for the selection of Rivière du Loup as the western terminus of the maritime division of the Canadian National Railways have already been brought down. It is not considered to be in the interest of the successful management of the National Railways to make public the proceedings of the board.

YUKON TELEGRAPH SYSTEM

Mr. BLACK (Yukon):

1. What was the cost of maintaining Yukon telegraph system within Yukon territory, from and including Whitehorse north to and including Forty Mile, Yukon territory, during the year ending March 31, 1922, including salaries and all expenses but not including the superintendent's office at Vancouver, British Columbia, or any expense in connection therewith, or of any office or part of the line south of Whitehorse, Yukon territory?

2. What was the cost of maintaining Yukon telegraph system, main line only, from Ashcroft, British Columbia, to Whitehorse, Yukon territory, during the same period?

3. What was the cost of maintaining Yukon telegraph system, main line only, from Vancouver, British Columbia, to Ashcroft, British Columbia, including superintendent's office at Vancouver and all expenses on that section during the same period?

4. What was the cost of maintaining each branch line from Yukon telegraph main line, including branch lines from Hazelton to Prince Rupert, British Columbia, Port Simpson and Port Essington, British Columbia, from Quesnel, to Barkerville, British Columbia, from Williams Lake to Quesnel Forks, British Columbia, from Williams Lake to Bella Coola, British Columbia, from the main line in British Columbia to Lillooet, British Columbia, and of each other branch line, if any, included in the system referred to by the government as Yukon system, during the same period?

5. What was the cost of maintaining Yukon telegraph system from the point at which it intersects the telegraph line of Grand Trunk Pacific at or near Fort Fraser, British Columbia, and parallels said Grand Trunk Pacific line to Prince Rupert, British Columbia, during the same period?

6. What was the total cost of maintaining Yukon telegraph system outside the boundaries of Yukon territory, including main line and all branch lines and offices included in that system outside of Yukon territory, during the same period?

7. What is the length in miles of Yukon telegraph system, main line only, from Vancouver, British Columbia, to Forty Mile, Yukon territory?

8. What is the length in miles of Yukon telegraph system, main line, from Whitehorse, Yukon territory, to Forty Mile, Yukon territory?

9. What is the length in miles of each branch line from said main line, naming them?

10. What distance in miles does Yukon telegraph system parallel the Grand Trunk line from at or near Fort Fraser, British Columbia, to Prince Rupert, British Columbia?

Hon. Mr. KING (Kootenay):

1. $40,599.83.
2. $128,027.57.
3. $14,560.23.
4. and 9.

	Miles	Maintenance
Ashcroft-Highland Valley, B.C.	28	
Ashcroft-McKennais, B.C.	13	
Ashcroft-Savona, B.C.	33	89.12
Ashcroft-Lilloet, B.C.	60	2,924.89
Lillooet-Lytton, B.C.	49	430.00
Lillooet-Bridge River, B.C.	72	13.41
Clinton-Gang Ranch, B.C.	57	637.66
100 Mile House-Canim Lake, B.C.	23	
150 Mile House-Bella Coola, B.C.	362	7,366.37
150 Mile House-Quesnel Forks, B.C.	66	251.62
Quesnel-Barkerville, B.C.	59	1,593.55
Vanderhoof, B.C.	12	992.23
Stuart lake, B.C.	41	83.56
Burns Lake-Francois lake-Ootsa, B.C.	57¾	84.62
North Bulkley-Ootsa lake, B.C.	24	50.29
New Hazelton-Skeena Crsn'g, B.C.	19	
New Hazelton-Silver Standard, B.C.	8	
Queen Charlotte line, B.C.	113	9,896.45
Hazelton-Prince Rupert, B.C.	189½	34,770.60
Prince Rupert-Port Simpson, B.C.	30	1,190.29
Prince Rupert-Digby Island, B.C.	4	
Terrace-Stewart, B.C.	171	19,097.10
Tagish-Carcross, Y.T.	25	1,653.19
Hootalinqua-Livingston creek, Y.T.	35	6.71
	1,551¼	$81,131.66

5. $47,135.93.
6. $223,719.46.
7. 1,737 miles from Ashcroft to Forty Mile; The line from Vancouver to Ashcroft is owned by the C.P.R. Telegraphs.
8. 511 miles.
10. 159½ miles.

NEW ELEVATOR, MONTREAL

Mr. BOYS:

1. Are the harbour commissioners of Montreal calling for tenders for a new grain elevator to be erected in the vicinity of Tarte pier, Montreal?

2. If so, will tenders of all companies operating under Dominion or provincial charters receive consideration?

3. Is there any truth in the report that tenders which may be received from companies with headquarters outside of Montreal will not be considered?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE:

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

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—TORONTO OFFICES

Mr. CHURCH:

1. Is there any truth in the announcement made by Director Gough of the Canadian National Railway and by J. E. Dalrymple, vice-president, in Toronto evening papers, Friday, March 23rd, that the Canadian National Railways is to erect the largest skyscraper in the British Empire on the corner of King and Yonge streets, Toronto, for regional headquarters, and have the National Railways under the existing legislation the power to erect such a building without the consent of parliament and by what statute?

2. What will be the cost of said building, how will the money be provided, and will parliament have to pass on the money for this item?

3. Is it intended that the building of this skyscraper shall have priority and take precedence over the contract the city has with the government for the building of the following long delayed essentials and the carrying out of the contracts herein, viz.:—

(a) A post office,
(b) A customs house,
(c) Completion of the new Union Railway Station,
(d) The viaduct,
(e) Harbour improvement?

4. Why are the Canadian National Railways expropriating this property when private ownership was ready to build a similar building on this site, and was not the new Union Station erected for this required accommodation if at present needed at all, and is not the new station the logical site for headquarters?

5. Is the erection of said building not a violation of the station and viaduct agreement, 1913, by which headquarters were to be in the new depot?

6. Who recommended this construction to the government, and why?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. If such a statement were made in Toronto, it was without authority. The property has been expropriated largely for ticket office purposes and to protect the interests of the Canadian National Railways in its uptown location. An amicable arrangement in the matter has been reached with the owners.

2. Plans for the utilization of the property have not yet been decided upon. When they are, whatever requisite authority is required will be obtained.

3. The necessity to protect the railways' interests uptown does not interfere with any other public improvement required at Toronto.

4. The lease of the Grand Trunk for the location in question was expiring, and no other suitable site was available.

5. No violation of said agreement is involved.

6. The Railway Management recommended the expropriation for the purpose already referred to.

DRY DOCK, PRINCE RUPERT

Mr. LADNER:

1. What is the tonnage capacity of the dry dock of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, or the Canadian National Railway, at Prince Rupert, British Columbia, for vessels?

2. What is the total investment in the said dry dock?

3. How many main sections comprise the complete dry dock?

4. How many of such section, or sections, of dry dock are used at present, and what class of vessels, and how many of such vessels, have been repaired in the dry dock during the year 1922, and up to the end of March, 1923?

5. What is the tonnage of the largest vessel repaired in said dry dock between the 1st of June, 1922, and the 28th February, 1923?

6. Would the government, or the Canadian National Railway, be willing to move a portion of such dry dock to Vancouver under reasonable terms and conditions?

7. Is the government, or the Canadian National Railway, or the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, or whoever has the legal authority in that behalf, willing, under reasonable terms, to lease certain sections of said dry dock as are capable of being moved to Vancouver, in order to provide dry dock facilities for the vessels entering and leaving Vancouver?

[Mr. Church.]

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. 20,000 tons.

2. $2.940,000.

3. Three.

4. All sections have been used from time to time and all classes of vessels up to 17,600 tons displacement. During the year 1922, dockings totalled 182, and from beginning of January to end of March, 1923, total dockings 37, mostly small vessels.

5. 8,000 tons D.W.

6 and 7. So far as the government is aware the question of moving any part of the Prince Rupert drydock has not been considered.

UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR PAPERS

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—LIFTING OF STEEL

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton):

For a copy of all papers, letters, telegrams, orders in council, and all other documents, relating to the lifting of the steel on portions of the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Canadian Northern railway between Edmonton and the western boundary of the province of Alberta.

SUPPLY—CIVIL SERVICE BONUS

On the motion of Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King that the House go into Committee of Supply:

Mr. SHAW: Before this motion is put, I wish to say that I have just received a copy of the Supplementary Estimates, indicating that it is proposed to vote a sum of $5,500,000 to cover provisional bonus allowances for the inside and outside Civil Service. I take this opportunity of indicating the difficulties from which many civil servants suffered last year owing to the fact that this bonus was not voted until, I think, the month of June. The civil servants consequently found it necessary to get along without that bonus, which many of them needed, until the vote was passed by parliament. I simply rise to call the attention of the government to the necessity of having this matter disposed of as early as possible in order that there may be no interregnum whatsoever in the payment of the bonus allowance to civil servants this year.

SUPPLY—GRATUITIES TO GRAND TRUNK OFFICIALS

On the motion of Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King that the House go into Committee of Supply:

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: I may as well take this opportunity as any other to call attention to an official statement that I see

in the press, authorized by the government, I believe by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) to the effect that a royal commission has been appointed, presumably under the Inquiries Act, to make inquiry into certain payments made by the former Board of Directors of the Grand Trunk in London, England, by way of gratuities, first of all to themselves, and secondly to others of their officers who still continue in their employment. I wish to ask: Is it the fact that a royal commission is to inquire into this matter? If so, what is there that is dark or misunderstood about it? In a word, what is there that is not known? What is the phase of it that still needs the light? Is it contemplated that this royal commission will proceed to England and have a trip over that portion of the world, and after they get there, how are they to be given such powers as will enable inquiry in England? In short, what is the general purview and what is the specific purpose of this inquiry? Anent this, it would be interesting to know who are in line for these positions, and how many? What is the proposed remuneration, besides the trip?

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Acting Minister of Railways): My right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) has soared into the realm of unknowable details. I am not giving any new information to the House when I say that when the fact became known that certain grants were made by the London Board of Directors to their own members as well as to officials of the Grand Trunk, it caused considerable uneasiness throughout the country as to just how far these grants went, whaat authority there was for making the grants, and if other grants were made the details of which have not yet become known. I want to make it clear that the suggestion of a royal commission, is no reflection on any person, but the conditions surrounding the making of these grants ought to be made quite clear to the public in Canada who now own the property out of which, at least, a proportion of these grants came, as the assets of the Grand Trunk Railway Company were less when they came into the possession of the Dominion of Canada than they would have been had these grants not been made. without casting a reflection on any person, but merely with a desire to get at the real situation, so that the Canadian National Railway may be started on its career from now on without any cloud or suspicion hanging over it in regard to any of these transactions, the government thought it advisable to ask some independent body or person to act as a royal commission, to get the facts as briefly and succinctly as could be done, so that they might be given to the public.

A letter was written if I remember correctly—and I am speaking from memory now—in October, 1919, by a legal representative of the government of that date in reference to a proposed agreement for taking over the Grand Trunk Railway. That agreement, although its provisions I believe were outlined in this letter, was not executed and did not become operative till the following March. There was one clause in that agreement, if I am correctly informed, which stated that after the execution of the agreement the Grand Trunk could not dispose of any of its assets without the consent of the government of Canada. In December, 1919, midway between the letter of October and the bringing into operation of the agreement, the board of directors met and passed a resolution giving gratuities to certain officers.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): May I ask, was the resolution made public at that time?

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not think so. It was made public a few days ago, as far as I know. In addition to that, that money was taken out of the fund set aside for fire insurance purposes. True, that fire insurance fund belonged to the Grand Trunk Railway Company, but it never was set aside for the purpose of giving gratuities, and the public would like to have cleared up the details surrounding the decision in regard, not so much to the giving of the gratuities, as to taking them out of the fire insurance fund which had been set apart for other purposes; because to the extent that these gratuities were taken out of the fire insurance fund, that fund was reduced when the Grand Trunk system came to the Dominion of Canada.

Then a resolution was passed by the board of directors, giving themselves a gratuity of five years' salary on account of the disappearance of the Grand Trunk and, consequently, the disappearance of the board of directors. I might say, in justice to the board of directors, first, that I believe that, under the Railway Act of Great Britain, gratuities of that kind are given to directors under similar conditions, and that, while the company may not have been chartered under that act, yet they were living in the shadow of it, and this resolution would be passed under conditions similar to those existing in Great Britain.

But in addition to that, it is said in the resolution that these funds payable to the directors came out of another fund, contributed by the holders of the guaranteed se-

curities, debentures and stock of the Grand Trunk. The holders of these securities are the men who have value, or to put the matter plainly, who do not lose by the transference of the Grand Trunk to the Dominion of Canada or to the Canadian National Railways. Just why a resolution of the board of directors ought to be necessary to dispose of privately contributed funds is a question that ought to be cleared up. I want to be fair to every person, and this might be the situation As I understand the matter, the holders of these securities contributed certain funds for the purpose of protecting their interests or the interests of the shareholders before the board of arbitration, and this fund may have been so contributed that the board of directors had the power to use it even for the purpose of giving themselves the five-year gratuities. Everything that has taken place may be perfectly explainable; but there are surrounding the payments of these gratuities to officers in Canada, conditions which, to my mind, make it essential, in order that the people of this country who now own these properties may have the utmost confidence in them, that this should be cleared up.

One thing which has come to my attention is this. These funds were paid out of the fire insurance fund; but when the officials signed the receipts for their gratuities, they found that those receipts stated distinctly that the contributions were gifts from the shareholders to them for long and contiued service. There are as regards the vouchers which were originally presented, details which, I think, require a good deal of investigation, and it would be in the interest of the public that some independent body—the government suggests a royal commission—should be named to make this investigation and to give to the people of Canada who own this property, a clean slate as to what has occurred, so that we shall all know through what vicissitudes our property has come before it has reached us. I think this is fair to the officials, fair to the British board as well as fair to the various Canadian boards.

I need not go into details. My right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) has asked me who was in line for the position of commissioner. If we take the men who are able, the line would be long; but up to the present time the personnel of the commission has been a secondary matter. Our sole purpose is to clear the air of whatever clouds may surround the transference of the Grand Trunk to the Dominion of Canada, and we believe it is in the public interest that this should be done. It may be necessary to have one commissioner; it may be necessary to have more. The government has not even discussed the question of the personnel of the commission. My right hon. friend has asked: Shall he or they have power to go to England? If it be found in the early stages of the investigation in Canada that it is in the interest of the public that the commissioner or commissioners should go to England, he or they should have the power to do so in order that the people of Canada may have the fullest information as regards this the greatest undertaking which the Canadian people have ever had on their hands.

The government had first thought of a Parliamentary committee; but they are unanimously of opinion that owing to the lateness of the session and the peculiar conditions surrounding this tranfer, the interests of the public would be better and more speedily served by having a royal commission.

Mr. JOHNSTON: Can the minister tell us why this matter has been covered up, so to speak, since 1919, over three years? Is it that it was left to a member of the Farmers' party to bring this thing to light? I am sure it would be appreciated by the members of this party and the people of the country if the minister could give us some light on that point.

Mr. GRAHAM: If I might be permitted, I am not sure that the Farmers' party has brought much light to the subject. The light was forced upon it. The question that was asked was whether the gratuities were given in perfect order to Mr. Hanna and Mr. Mitchell; but having just received other information, I thought it was wise that parliament should have that also. I am glad my hon. friend brought this matter up. As regards Mr. Hanna, it is well known that it is the custom of large railway corporations to give gratuities or superannuations to old and tried employees. The House will pardon me if I point out that the situation in Mr. Hanna's case was delicate, and that Mr. Hanna coincided and fell in line with what was done as explained to him by the late Minister of Railways. Let me say this on behalf of Mr. Hanna. Mr. Hanna was not retired because he is not an able man. The government thought—and I am free to confess that as the days and weeks and months have gone on that the judgment was sound—that it would be next to impossible, for reasons that I need not explain, to amalgamate these two great systems with the head of either one at the head of the amalgamated system. I can assure the House that the difficulties that have arisen day by bay in welding together

these two systems with the official staff of each, have convinced me that it would have been practically impossible to have done this with the head of either one of the separate systems at the head of the amalgamated system. Mr. Hanna, understanding the situation, sent in his resignation.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have not the right to speak again, so I shall have to put this in the form of a question.

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not know that I have the right either.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the minister wish to intimate to the House that Mr. Hanna acquiesced in the resignation; that it was not a virtual dismissal of Mr. Hanna? If so, will the minister undertake to bring down the correspondence in connection with Mr. Hanna's resignation?

Mr. GRAHAM: Any correspondence that is public, parliament has a right to have at any time it wants it. I do not know whether there was any correspondence.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, there was.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am speaking only from what I know. If the leader of the Opposition has other information, he can give it to the House.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have none that the minister has not.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am speaking from the facts as I understand them. Mr. Hanna resigned, and Mr. Hanna, from that day to this, has acted in connection with the Canadian National Railways, as a man who is interested in the success of that system. There was no superannuation in the old Canadian Northern. Had Mr. Hanna and Mr. Mitchell retired without some consideration, they would therefore have had no benefit of any superannuation. For the benefit, however, of the railway men, something of that kind will be established before very long. It will be remembered that the late Minister or Railways himself, in speaking in this House last year, informed the members of parliament and the country that when any of these old and tried officials were retired, they would have the benefit of superannuation. I imagine he had in mind at that time, not exactly superannuation, but that they would be treated generously. There is nothing secret about the gratuities handed to Mr. Hanna and Mr. Mitchell. This was done publicly, wide open. The late board of directors did not act in any underhand way in connection with this matter. When they decided to do this, I knew they were going to do it, and I informed the government. So the circumstances are altogether different, and I am prepared to say that the gratuities given to Mr. Hanna and Mr. Mitchell, under all the circumstances, were not more than those to which they were entitled. The country from a practical standpoint is the gainer instead of the loser by the generous treatment accorded these two officials, as any hon. gentleman would admit had he been in the Railway department or been associated with the railway amalgamation during the last six months.

As regards the question asked by my hon friend, as to why the matter of the other gratituties was kept hidden, I do not know that there has been any effort to conceal it. The facts are in the minutes of the old Grand Trunk Company, although as a matter of fact they did not come to the notice of the department until a few weeks ago. They are, however, recorded in the minutes of the old Grand Trunk Company in London, and it may be that the board of arbitration took recognizance of these gratuities and other expenditures when making the award. That being the case, it is all the more necessary that we should have an independent commissioner or body of commissioners to place all the facts before us so that the air may be cleared and we may start the new year knowing just where we are at.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Will the reference which will be made to the commission include the letter published a day or two ago by certain officials who did receive gratuities of this kind from the Grand Trunk and who are now in the service of the National Railways?

Mr. CHAPLIN: Certain gratuities were given by the Grand Trunk directors to employees who are still in the service of the Canadian National Railways. Are these men going to be allowed to keep these gratuities, or will there be a refund of the amounts paid to them? Will they be told whether it is right or wrong for them to keep the money seeing that they have not lost their positions? What is going to be done in the matter?

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend has not seen the morning papers.

Mr. CHAPLIN: We do not always believe what is in the morning papers.

Mr. GRAHAM: That may be wise.

Mr. CHAPLIN: We would sooner have a statement from the minister.

Mr. GRAHAM: Those gentlemen who were given these gratuities under the impression that they were a gift from the shareholders for services they had rendered, when they discovered the peculiar conditions under which the money was given and the source from which the funds had come, informed the president of the Canadian National Railways that they would refund every cent they had received. That is a brief answer but I think it is a complete statement of the case.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): I wanted to know whether the letter written a few days ago would be referred to the commission.

Mr. GRAHAM: Everything in connection with the gratuities will be placed before the commission.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have allowed these various questions, on the assumption that there was no objection on the part of the House, because the matter is one of considerable importance. But I must remind hon. members that this free discussion is irregular as the House is not yet in committee. There is a motion before the Chair, and hon. members will have an opportunity to discuss the subject fully when the House is in Committee of Supply.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I submit, Mr. Speaker, that everything has been regular until this moment, for I admit that my rising now is out of order. I would ask that no objection be raised to my speaking on the subject at this stage; otherwise I should not have the right to proceed. I have only one word to say. My own view of the action of the board I have already made public. I consider the action of the old Grand Trunk board as wholly indefensible from every standpoint. It was the taking advantage of an interregnum, which could not be avoided, between the date as of which the valuation was to be made and the date of the government's possession, and that advantage was taken for the benefit of themselves and of those of their staff to whom they wished to proffer favour, and at the ultimate expense of the people of this country, for whom they were not trustees. While it may be that some thought was given to the fact of the gratuity by the board of arbitration, I am of the opinion that, as the date as of which the value was to be fixed was prior to the grant, the board was not legally competent to take into account the facts of the grant. That makes all the more reprehensible the conduct of the board of directors. But that done, I do not see what there is to inquire into beyond possibly some legal phase which the Justice department is amply competent to deal with. I do not myself know whether the government can have any doubts as to the legality of the grants, but if it has such doubts the Justice department can deal with the matter. There is nothing in the world mysterious about it. The facts are all in the government's possession. The company is in the government's possession, and the records, the minutes and everything else are all there. There is nothing in the way of fact that remains disputed or that would remain disputed if looked into by an officer of the Justice department, without any powers under the Inquiries Act at all. So much for that. Now, if the government is doubtful as to whether or not someone else got money that is not yet revealed, that will all appear from the auditor's report which is in the government's possession. For the life of me, therefore, I see no reason for a royal commission, except the reason that is only too often in evidence, namely, for the benefit of the royal commission rather than of the country.

4 p.m.

Motion agreed to and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

SUPPLY

DEPARTMENT OF LABOUR

Labour—salaries, contingencies, $277,235.

Mr. MEIGHEN: From what I can glean from the estimates, the Minister of Labour has been called upon to so contract, if not to demolish his department, as to make up for the extravagance of many of the others. In the process, though, it appears he is going to remove—according to report—his deputy minister, and put him in the position of King's Printer, a position for which I suppose he knows as little as any living man and in respect of which he has had no experience at all. He has had, I should say from memory, about fifteen years' experience as Deputy Minister of Labour. He is to go in, as I understand it—if I am wrong I hope the minister will correct me—over the present Director of Printing, who is by trade and by experience, a qualified printing man, making two directors of printing at salaries of about $6,000 and about $5,000 respectively. I presume the minister contemplates then bringing someone else in as Deputy Minister of Labour. Is that information correct, and if not, what is the minister's intention as to changing the personnel of his department and of the Printing bureau?

Hon. JAMES MURDOCK (Minister of Labour): The Deputy Minister of Labour for some years past, having been appointed as such by the late government, has been King's Printer.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Deputy Minister of Labour was appointed by the Laurier government not by the late government. Recently the duties of King's Printer were added to his duties.

Mr. MURDOCK: My right hon. friend misunderstood me. I will repeat: The Deputy Minister of Labour has been for some time the King's Printer. He was appointed by the late government as King's Printer, and he has since been nominally filling the position, so far as the statute requires.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister knows that the position is only nominal; in fact he himself used the word "nominal." The real head of the Printing bureau has been Mr. Draper.

Mr. MURDOCK: The word "nominal" applies more specifically to the question of salary. Mr. Acland has received no salary as King's Printer. There is now a proposal before the committee in the civil government estimates of the Printing bureau to have the King's Printer paid a salary. As to who is to be deputy minister and who is to be King's Printer, that matter has not been decided. What my right hon. friend has seen in the press is largely, if not entirely, supposition.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But something must be intended, because heretofore the organization has been this: The late government abolished the separate position of King's Printer and the separate salary for it, but as the statute provided for a King's Printer, the Deputy Minister of Labour was nominated as such. He had, of course, only the one salary, $6,000. Mr. Acland has been Deputy Minister of Labour since some time in the regime of the Laurier administration. Mr. Draper was the active head of the Printing bureau, with the title of Director of Printing. Now the minister proposes to give a salary to the King's Printer. He certainly does not intend that the present Deputy Minister of Labour shall draw two salaries. Is he going to make somebody else King's Printer, and if so how does he justify providing an additional salary of $6,000 when the work is being satisfactorily done under the present arrangement? If he intends to have that as the salary of Mr. Acland, then he should tell us, so that we may know what he purposes doing. Does he intend to bring in some new man to take the post of Deputy Minister of Labour?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I ask my right hon. friend why, if Mr. Draper was the head of the department, his government did not make him King's Printer? Why did they make Mr. Acland King's Printer?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Well, we saved some money by it, and I think that should be quite sufficient. We would have had to give him $6,000 if we made him King's Printer.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Was that the reason?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am not aware that there was any other. Senator Roberston was Minister of Labour; he would know. Anyway, the work has been done all right under that arrangement. It is now proposed to add another $6,000 to the expenditure. What is the reason and what is the intention to justify that?

Mr. MURDOCK: As to the saving suggested by my right hon. friend, he will admit that there was an additional expenditure of something like $8,400 or $9,000 a year for an editorial committee, the functions of which should normally and consistently be carried out by the King's Printer. I was sorry indeed to hear my right hon. friend suggest a lack of experience on the part of the Deputy Minister of Labour. Does my right hon. friend not know that the Deputy Minister of Labour has had an experience of thirty years as a printer, as well as in editorial and publishing work? Does he not know that the deputy minister came to the department a number of years ago with a splendid experience in these capacities?

Mr MEIGHEN: As a printer?

Mr. MURDOCK: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is the minister sure of that?

Mr. MURDOCK: Yes. I am quite sure of it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He has been an editor; I never knew he was a printer.

Mr. MURDOCK: I am quite sure of it. As a matter of fact, the law provides that he could not be considered as King's Printer unless he were. But the question as to what arrangement is to be made, I can truthfully tell my right hon. friend, has not been decided.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But it is intended to put Mr. Acland in as King's Printer?.

Mr. MURDOCK: Mr. Acland, as I have said, was appointed by my right hon. friend's government as King's Printer. Whether that arrangement will be changed I cannot say.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But the minister is asking for $6,000 more.

Mr. MURDOCK: For a King's Printer.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Then if he puts Mr. Acland there he intends to pay him $6,000 extra; that is, he intends to pay him $12,000?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No.

Mr. MURDOCK: Would my right hon. friend object if Mr. Acland continued as Deputy Minister of Labour, a position he has so ably filled for a number of years?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not at all.

Mr. MURDOCK: Well, is there anything in these civil government estimates to indicate that that is not going to be the case?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly there is. An extra $6,000 is asked for.

Mr. MURDOCK: For a King's Printer.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister cannot get away from it; he must tell us what his intention is. He may not have decided upon the names, but he must tell us whether he intends to have a King's Printer and a separate Deputy Minister of Labour.

Mr. MURDOCK: I thought I had stated that on several occasions. Most certainly that is the proposal that is before the committee.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But he does not know whether or not he will put Mr. Acland in as King's Printer?

Mr. MURDOCK: That will be a matter for consideration.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the minister tell us how the department has suffered by the saving of this $6,000.

Mr. MURDOCK: I would not be before the committee for a moment with a proposal for increased expenditure. On the contrary, I think it can be shown that a decreased expenditure is proposed. Hon. members will note that there is no provision in the estimates this year to continue the Editorial Committee. It is believed that the business-like arrangement of maintaining timely supervision over government publications could be very well co-ordinated and regarded as part of the duties of the King's Printer, and that the King's Printer, if properly qualified to perform the functions of King's Printer as defined in the law, could do the work in a supervisory way, or a large portion of it, that is now performed by the Editorial Committee. So in the final analysis, and having regard to the Editorial Committee, which I hope my hon. friends will bear in mind, there is no increase contemplated whatever in this particular item. There appears to be a slight increase when you come to create an entirely new position, but my right hon. friend I am sure will take into consideration the various rearrangements that have been made, as a result of which a considerable number of positions have been eliminated entirely

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister's long explanation amounts really to this: He purposes that the new King's Printer, whoever he may be, will do the work of the Editorial Committee.

Mr. MURDOCK: Partly.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is the only thing he said in the course of his long sentence round. Well now, that is to be examined into. Is the King's Printer really going to do the work of the Editorial Committee? The Editorial Committee was appointed about four years ago, I think. It was a committee representative of the different classes of departments and of men intimately associated with all the printing work of each. Because it was representative of the various departments and of officers of them, and particularly of the experienced men in that line, it carried an authority with it toward which all bowed, and as a consequence that Editorial Committee succeeded in reducing the printing liabilities of the country by very many hundreds of thousands of dollars. I think I would have been safe in saying millions of dollars, but undoubtedly I would be safe in saying over one million dollars.

The minister shakes his head. Has the minister the report of the committee there? I think he has likely heard of the work of the committee through some poisoned channel. Of the work of that committee I have some knowledge myself. I had to do with its appointment. If there has been one source of waste in the administration of this country more prolific and more persistent than another, it has been the constant printing at the behest of ambitious officers of various departments who want everything in which they are interested and everything they do scattered to the length and breadth of the world so long as it is at the country's expense.

Mr VIEN: Is the hon. member aware that most of the saving came from the elimination of the French publications?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am not aware of that, and I am quite confident it is not the fact. I have no doubt there would be saving there, and I have no doubt there would be equal saving and far more, in the English publica-

tions. I never saw it divided, and I never took the slightest interest in the division. The question was whether the country was getting any return for the printing, and if the country was not, the instructions of the committee were to eliminate, to cut it down, not so that there would be any curtailment of printing in anything so long as there was appreciation of it, so long as there were those who were going to read it, but to prevent the piling and stacking in heaps in all corners of these buildings of blue books and government publications which no one looked at from one year's end to another or from one decade to another. The Editorial Committee set to work at that. At first it was under cabinet supervision, I think. I am not quite certain of that, but I know that it did report to the cabinet. Its work was thoroughly reviewed, any objections made were taken into account, and very great savings were made to the country as a result of that committee's work.

Now if that can be done by a deputy minister known as the King's Printer, all well and good; but in my judgment it cannot, and I will say why. We have had a King's Printer ever since we have had a country, or since very shortly afterward, and that was the duty of the King's Printer, but that duty he never performed. He never had sufficient authority to perform it. He had not that authority spreading over the other departments that a representative committee would have, and as a consequence we had the waste going on year after year. We never had the curtailment. The minister will find just the same result if he reverts to the old system. It depends, of course, in some degree who the King's Printer is; that is true, but get the best King's Printer he will, and that King's Printer will be stampeded and the old waste will be revived. I think he should have a representative committee, and he should have that committee in such association with the cabinet that its decisions will carry weight, or he is simply going to go back down the hill that we have been travelling up for these last few years.

Mr. GOOD: I understand the late editor of the Labour Gazette is going to be dismissed. May I ask who is going to take over his duties?

Mr. MURDOCK: The Deputy Minister of Labour is editor of the Labour Gazette. He has an assistant deputy minister, who is also associated with the deputy in the editorship of the Labour Gazette. While there was a gentleman classified as editor, it was thought that the duties could be properly performed by the Deputy Minister of Labour and his assistant deputy, and in that way save the salary of a special individual acting as editor.

Mr. GOOD: May I ask if the person mentioned here as deputy minister drawing this $6,000 is to be paid henceforth out of the money appropriated for the Printing bureau?

Mr. MURDOCK: No. There are civil government estimates for the Labour department, and separate estimates for the Printing bureau. If my hon. friend will look at page 84 of the estimates, he will find the Department of Labour civil government estimates above, and below that the estimates for the Printing and Stationery branch.

Mr. BOYS: I notice that in last year's list there was a total of 124 employees. That number has been reduced to 97, a reduction of 27. Would the minister tell us whether the services of these men have been dispensed with, or have they merely been transferred from this department to some other?

Mr. MURDOCK: Ten statistical clerks were transferred from this department to the Bureau of Statistics several months ago. They had been carried on the Labour department payroll and paid out of the Labour appropriation, but having regard to the discussion in the House last year, and particularly to the remarks of the then leader of the Progressive party, arrangements were made to transfer these ten clerks to the Bureau of Statistics. In many cases the positions were not required. There were seven rather important positions in that class. Then there have been other rearrangements, and as a result of all these changes it has been possible to reduce the permanent staff from 124 to 97, as my hon. friend says.

Mr. BOYS: The minister says that seven are not required. Not required by this department, for which reason they have been relieved entirely of their duties?

Mr. MURDOCK: Yes.

Mr. BOYS: And not transferred to any other department?

Mr. MURDOCK: No.

Mr. BOYS: Then the actual change in employees so far as the government is concerned is seven?

Mr. MURDOCK: Oh, no.

Mr. BOYS: So far as the government is concerned, I say, not the department.

Mr. MURDOCK: All of the 27 except the ten who were transferred would be out of the service of the government.

Mr. BOYS: I thought the minister said they were transferred.

Mr. MURDOCK: Ten were transferred, and the services of the others were dispensed with.

Mr. BOYS: Is it correct then to say that seventeen have been relieved of office and are not in the service of the government in any department?

Mr. MURDOCK: Some of those seventeen may have found positions elsewhere; if not it is a great misfortune. A number of them are very valuable employees; but it is unfortunate that in the government service it is not always open to us to transfer a known and capable employee from one department to another excepting under certain restrictions.

Mr. BOYS: I am not criticizing the minister at all; I merely want to get the facts. I cannot say that I am at all sure of them yet. The minister says that some of these employees may have secured other positions. All may have done so as far as that is concerned. I was trying to find out if the minister can tell me—if he cannot I will have to be satisfied—whether any of these seventeen employees have found positions elsewhere.

Mr. MURDOCK: There is no desire on my part to be in any way evasive. We are trying to do all we can to assist in having some of these employees transferred to other departments. A number of these cases are under consideration in the hope that that can properly be done, but so far as the Labour department are concerned these men are through there and are under retiring allowance, whatever it may amount to.

Mr. BOYS: Were any of these seventeen permanent employees?

Mr. MURDOCK: They were all permanent. In addition there were a great number of temporaries whose services have also been discontinued.

Mr. CHAPLIN: If the minister will refer to page 35 of the reprinted civil government estimates he will find that the number of employees last year is represented as 124. Now, I have under my hand last year's estimates and the total number of employees given there is 117. Will the minister be kind enough to explain how the discrepancy occurs?

Mr. MURDOCK: I am glad my hon. friend asked that question. Last year when these estimates were before the House the Annuities branch was not in the Labour department. A little later that branch, having a total of thirteen employees—one of whom resigned—was transferred to the department under my control. The estimates presented this year make provision for the employees of the Labour department and the Annuities branch, and the reduced figure of 97 shows the number of employees in the two branches as consolidated.

Mr. CHAPLIN: The explanation of the minister means that last year, under the appropriation granted by the House, he was entitled to employ 117 persons but actually employed 124. I think it would only have been fair for him to have so stated in his estimates for this year. Instead of taking credit for a reduction from 124, the reduction should be from 117 to the lower figure. I might also point out to the minister that under last year's estimates he was granted $195,000 and he spent in the department something like $202,000.

Mr. MURDOCK: I am not altogether clear as to what information my hon. friend wants; I do not know what particular thing I am being criticized for just now. I will be glad indeed to give my hon. friends any information possible if they will only let me know precisely what they want.

Mr. IRVINE: Would the minister explain how he has been able to reduce the staff by twenty-seven?

Mr. MURDOCK: First of all there were ten employees transferred to the Statistical department. It was contended, I think, last year by the leader of the Progressive party, and by a number of other hon. gentlemen that the Statistical department should, as far as possible, have charge of the compilation of all government statistics. That arrangement was carried out and ten employees were transferred from the Labour department to the Bureau of Statistics. Then during the year the director of the employment service of Canada resigned rather hurriedly and left for another and better paying position. At that time we had two superintendents of the federal employment service. We believed that one superintendent was amply sufficient and that for the future the director of employment service could discharge the duties of one of these superintendents. There were a number of other positions which we thought could very well be eliminated. For instance, we had five fair wage investigators and we found that with the adoption of a very definite fair wage policy—which was agreed to by all the departments of the government as the proper thing to carry out—it was unnecessary to have as many as five fair wage investigators looking into these matters, that three such officers would answer for the next fiscal year. Accordingly the services of two fair wage investi-

gators were dispensed with. Then we had what is known as an employment specialist. A very capable individual filled this position, and he was also known as the juvenile employment specialist. Our opinion was that if the federal government's activities were properly regulated no need existed for an employment specialist, and so it was decided to discontinue the position. At a former sitting I explained to the committee what happened in the matter of the editor of the Labour Gazette; we concluded that the duties of this office could very well be handled by the deputy minister and the assistant deputy minister. Furthermore, in the case of two clearance officers in connection with our employment service—one at Ottawa and one at Halifax—it was thought that these two positions could very well be discontinued and the work formerly attaching to them handled by the director of employment service, the superintendent and the remaining staff of the employment service. Again, we had a publicity agent. Some hon. gentlemen asked me last year what the publicity agent was for. I did not know then and I do not know yet. We decided that we could get along without a publicity agent. And so I might go on in the case of a number of other positions of minor importance. In all these changes in the staff an effort has been made to see that no part of the work, or the functions, of the Labour department, would suffer in any way. We have taken the stand that an employee not very busy in a particular position for the time being, might properly be called upon to help out in some other office, and in pursuance of that policy the reductions in the staff have been made as I have indicated.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I want to go back to the question I asked the minister a few minutes ago. He did not give a very clear answer to my question. There were last year, when the estimates were passed, 117 employees in this branch, with an expenditure of $195,000. I find, on referring to the second column of the present estimates, the figures now read 124, and the amount for the service is $203,000. I would like to know how the employees came to be added.

Mr. MURDOCK: I have before me a memo in which the matter is very clearly outlined, and which I shall read:

> Two points must be specially borne in mind in considering the civil government estimates for 1923-24 and comparing them with those for 1922-23: (1) the reduction by $15,000 made by parliament in the estimates as submitted, and (2) the addition to the department from the beginning of the fiscal year 1922-23 of the Annuities branch, though the figures for this branch were not included in the printed estimates for the Department of Labour for 1922-23. The civil government figures for 1922-23 as submitted by the minister provided for 117 positions at a cost of $195,040. In addition an estimate for the Annuities branch, at that time associated with the Post Office Department, provided for 13 positions at a cost of $22,320 a total of $217,360. The estimates of the department were reduced by $15,000 and the total voted for the department including the Annuities branch, thus became $202,360. Similarly as to numbers of positions, the positions in the Department of Labour estimate numbered 117, and those in the Annuities branch estimate numbered 13, a total of 130. Owing, however, to the $15,000 reduction in the estimates it became necessary to abandon 6 positions intended for purposes of adjustment, etc., and the salaries for which totalled somewhat less than the figure named, thus leaving at 124 the number of positions actually provided for in the estimates of 1922-23.

Does that answer the hon. member's question?

Mr. CHAPLIN: Yes.

Mr. IRVINE: The minister explained by a process of elimination how he got rid of seven employees. If he would continue that process of elimination I wonder if he could successfully do away with the Labour department entirely, and have these matters dealt with by some other department of the government, and thereby save the country a considerable sum of money. For instance, one official who has been eliminated is the employment specialist who is, perhaps, one of the most important officials of the Labour department. It might be wise to re-establish that one particular individual and do away with all the other departments of the Labour administration.

Mr. MURDOCK: In answer to my hon. friend I would say no, I do not think we can do away with the Labour department entirely. I would oppose any movement of that kind just as strongly as my hon. friend would. Referring to the employment specialist, I would be very glad indeed to have my hon. friend from Calgary come to the Labour department some time and show me wherein we could properly, under any existing regulations, utilize the services of such a valued employee. The chief functions of this employment specialist, as I understood, were to secure the names of various individuals graduating from the different colleges of Canada, with a view to placing them in positions of responsibility and proper remuneration after they had graduated. I do not know whether it is intended that we should pay out the money voted by parliament for employment service purposes in that way, and there did not appear to be any opportunity for us to utilize, in accordance with what we understood to be the requirements of parliament,

or of continuing to utilize, the services of this very valuable and capable employee. There was simply no work of importance, as my hon. friend can ascertain if he cares to do so, being accomplished by him so far as I know, in that particular branch.

Mr. IRVINE: The minister has just told us of 27 men that were let out from the Labour department. Would it not have been wise to have used this employment specialist first of all to find employment for those 27 men, and then engage him to find work for all the rest of the unemployed now in Canada?

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry): Will the minister tell the committee just what services the employment officers have been rendering to the country, and how he is decreasing that service, and why?

Mr. MURDOCK: My hon. friend will understand that employment service in the various provinces is under the direction and control of the provincial governments. They open the offices and appoint the employees. They are in charge, but they enter into an agreement with the federal government whereby we pay not more than 50 per cent of the cost of handling those employment offices in the various provinces, and in that work it is necessary for the Labour department to maintain a supervisory federal body, composed of a director of the employment service, in touch with all the provincial superintendents and officers to some extent, some 70 or more in Canada, and a superintendent of employment service, who is located at Winnipeg, and certain other officers and staff in different parts of Canada. But the employment service generally, as I think my hon. friend understands, is under the direction of the provincial government and we simply co-operate or maintain, shall I say, supervision over what is being done under certain regulations clearly set out and defined by order in council.

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry): Any decrease, therefore, in that service is wholly done by the provincial administration?

Mr. MURDOCK: We have not a thing to do with the increases that the provincial governments might want to make in those offices. For example one hon. gentleman came to me the other day and wanted to know whether an office could not be opened in a certain specified town, and I said that was a matter we would have to take up with the provincial government. If they found an office was necessary, they would no doubt proceed to put one there, and if they did we would assume 50 per cent—not more than 50 per cent—of the cost of maintenance, they appointing those in charge of the particular office.

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry): I notice the minister has here an item for purchasing agent. Are the purchases for the department being made through the Purchasing Commission?

Mr. MURDOCK: That is for the Printing bureau, and it comes a little further on. That is not in the Labour department.

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry): Then are those purchases for the Printing bureau being made through the Purchasing Commission?

Mr. MURDOCK: That question was asked as to all departments of government, and I think an answer was laid on the Table today. I would prefer if my hon. friend would get the information from that answer, so that there would be no misunderstanding.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I notice there is in the estimates an account for a director of technical education. In view of the fact that the provincial governments are taking charge of technical education, why do we need this expenditure?

Mr. MURDOCK: For the reason, as my hon. friend, I am sure, will appreciate, that the federal government authorizes by statute the expenditure of $1,100,000 for the present fiscal year, and will do so for each fiscal year until 1929. The money is to be expended under certain regulations defined in the Technical Education Act, and we want to have somebody here who, on behalf of the federal government, will see that the various provinces are receiving their proportion of the money as a result of spending it in a proper way and in accordance with the act.

Mr. IRVINE: I should like to say a word or two with regard to this estimate before it is passed. I do not think the Labour department is a labour department. The term is a misnomer; it should be called the Capitalistic department of the federal government. I gather that from the nature of the work it does and from the attitude of the minister himself. I would, of course, be the last to speak against a real labour department, if it undertook work in the interest of the labouring classes of this country, made an attempt to solve some of the economic problems and to meet some of the practical difficulties with which the labouring people are confronted. But as I understand the matter, I do not think there is any part of the work coming under this department that could not

very well be put under some other department, and we could do away with this, at least under the name of a labour department. If we are going to continue it, it should be called the Capitalistic department of the government. If we are not going to continue it, it would be a good thing if we could expend the amount, nearly $1,500,000, in relief of unemployment or the colonization of some unemployed people on the land. That would be of far greater value to the labouring people of this country than the continuation of this department.

Mr. GOOD: I am not quite clear yet as to the duties of the deputy minister. I understand Mr. Acland is deputy minister at the present time, and it is proposed that he and the assistant deputy shall perform what duties they have performed in the past and also the editorial duties in connection with the Labour Gazette. I understand also that Mr. Acland is to assume some real responsibilities in the position of King's Printer which he has had nominally in the past. It would appear, therefore, that in respect to both the King's Printer's work and the Labour Gazette, these two gentlemen, the deputy minister and the assistant deputy, are to do very much more in the future than they have done in the past. Is that correct?

Mr. MURDOCK: There will, possibly, be slightly more to do, only to the extent, though, of the additional work, whatever that may amount to, that the editing of the Labour Gazette will place upon them. As a matter of fact, as the executive head and the assistant executive head of the department, they were required heretofore to be responsible for that work; they had to go over it; O.K, it, see that it was in proper form. It is thought that without any great additional hardship, that work can still be performed by the deputy minister and the assistant deputy minister.

Mr. GOOD: The deputy minister is also to assume real duties in connection with the position of King's Printer. Is that right?

Mr. MURDOCK: No. We are asking parliament to provide for a King's Printer in fact, under salary, to devote his time to the work of King's Printer in a supervisory capacity as provided for in the law and as it may be necessary to provide for by order in council defining his duties, as I think was suggested by my right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) a little while ago. It is not intended that the one person shall handle the two positions.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister mentioned, a moment ago, that he was saving money by abolishing the Editorial Committee. I do not know what money he refers to. The Editorial Committee was composed of officers of different departments. Mr. Lynch, of the Natural Resources branch, Interior department, Mr. Cook and Mr. Taché were the committee when I had to do with them directly. Mr. Taché having gone into the Library, somebody would take his place. They received no extra salary at all over what they were drawing in their respective positions. Any other expense—and I do not think there was a great deal—would be incidental to the work, no matter by whom it was done. Therefore, I do not see where the saving will come in, and this House will be confronted, year after year, with increased expenditures in this connection if the minister takes this view.

Mr. MURDOCK: My right hon. friend will remember that the Editorial Committee had a separate office in a separate building, with a staff, and I think an expenditure of $8,400 was provided for last year. I do not want to be understood as saying that there is going to be an actual reduction. I do not know just how the proposed increased expenditure of $6,000 for a King's Printer will work out with the expenditure for rent, additional office space and staff that there has been in the past; but it is thought in the final analysis, there will be a real saving and a better business arrangement.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There will be a saving only by neglecting the work. If the staff is necessary to the Editorial Committee, it will be necessary to the King's Printer for the same work. So, the only way in which money can be saved will be by neglecting the work—unless the staff is unnecessary. Thus, as far as any specific information goes, there is no saving at all; this is just an extra $6,000.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think my right hon. friend agrees; in fact I have heard him say at different times, that it was not advisable to have members in one position in the Civil Service giving time to other work. This invariably results in these officers expecting extra remuneration for the services they give apart from their regular positions. As regards the Editorial Committee, the gentlemen who have been serving on it have made representations to the government that they should receive something in the way of additional remuneration for the services they have been rendering. It is unfair to expect any member

of the Civil Service to devote all his regular time to the work of the department to which he has been appointed, and then to give extra time to the country without additional remuneration. It he has enough time to do other work than that for which he is regularly appointed, there is something wrong in the way in which government business is being carried on. We have been trying, in an effort to effect economies, to do away with this system of having officers of one department doing part of the work of another department. More than that, we have been trying to fix responsibility in a way that will, we trust, ensure more accurate and careful supervision. No better illustration could be taken than this very matter of the King's Printer. This is a most important branch of the public service. As my right hon. friend has said, ever since we have had a government service it has been thought necessary to have a King's Printer. Well, if that position has been required all along it stands to reason that the man who was to be held responsible as King's Printer should give his entire time to that work, it should not be left to the Deputy Minister of the Department of Labour or the Deputy Minister of Trade and Commerce or of any other department. A person who is filling any one of these positions is doing more than he can attend to properly if he gives his whole time to it. While my hon. friend was in office, for some reason best known to himself, it was decided to do away with a permanent deputy head as King's Printer who would be held responsible for the position, with all the duties that naturally go with the office of a deputy head, and with the salary attached to it. But the responsibility was left to an officer of another department who has ever since been responsible for the position of King's Printer. I think we ought to make it a separate position, where we can fix the responsibility and do away with this overlapping of different departments; and that is what the government has in view in the matter.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I cannot be expected to acquiesce when it is said that I have always been against an officer of one department having anything to do beyond the immediate duties assigned to him in that department. I am, however, opposed to officers getting extra remuneration under different designations for work done, whether within or outside of their particular departments. The salary an officer gets is paid to him for all his time to the country, and he ought to be prepared for that salary to do anything which the government feels he is fitted to do. There is some advantage to an officer in getting the opportunity of service such as comes to a man who goes on the Editorial Committee. It is first of all an indication that he is a man of special capacity. For example, Mr. Lynch was head of the Natural Resources branch of the Interior department. He was chosen by myself as the one officer of the whole Interior department most likely to render efficent service on the Editorial Committee. I knew something of his ability and the character of his work, and his designation gave him at least that additional status, so that in the event of promotion in the future his services there would be of great value to him. Mr. Lynch may have joined with the others in a request for more salary; most men are ready to do that. If he did so when I was there I opposed it, as I opposed the request, so far as all the rest were concerned. There are certain tasks that can be performed by representative committees better than by any single officer, no matter of what department, and these are tasks that appertain generally throughout the whole service and that affect the moneys spent in all. The fact is established, if by nothing else than the work of the Editorial Committee, that we have always had a King's Printer. But the work was never done. He never had the authority to carry it out, and only one minister was affected. When we appointed the Editorial Committee, gathered from the various departments, and brought that committee in direct contact with Council, we succeeded in getting the work done and saving the country hundreds of thousands of dollars. The minister thinks that the work is better done the other way, but I do not think he will save anything. He only takes a chance of its being done better, but I think the probabilities are that it will be done a lot worse. Rather, I should say, it will cease to be done at all.

Mr. MURDOCK: My right hon. friend will understand that the government has given the matter a great deal of consideration and has decided that this will be the best plan. It is not just the personal position of the minister.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That adds rather to my argument.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): What are the duties of the director of employment service, and why is the salary for this office reduced?

Mr. MURDOCK: The following is the definition of this position as given by the Civil Service Commission's reclassification:

Under direction to have charge of employment service of the Department of Labour, to supervise operations of the provincial labour clearing houses and pro-

vincial employment offices, to co-operate with provincial employment services, to supervise expenditure of moneys voted by the Dominion government, and to perform other related work as required.

The salary is $320, $335, $355, per month graduated up. As I said some time ago, and as my hon. friend will recall, the director of employment service resigned on July 7th last, his resignation to be effective from the first day of August, and it was necessary to have another director appointed. The Civil Service Commission appointed one of the superintendents located at Winnipeg and brought him to Ottawa as director, and he receives the minimum salary for the first year. He will, of course, work up to the maximum.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Do the duties of this position necessitate general travelling throughout the country?

Mr. MURDOCK: They do, considerably. Quite frequently this officer is required to take a trip to the West to inspect the office at Winnipeg and to get in touch with the superintendent of provincial employment service in each of the provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan and British Columbia; and he also is required to visit the East. He makes these trips about once a year when he meets all the superintendents.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): How much was paid out last year in addition to salary in connection with this position?

Mr. MURDOCK: I cannot give that information at the moment but I can get it for my hon. friend.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): It would be just as well if we had that information, but we can pass this point for the moment. What are the duties of the superintendent of Dominion government annuities?

Mr. MURDOCK: I was going to quote the classification, but I find it is not here. The superintendent is in general charge of the handling of the Dominion Government Annuities branch. He maintains supervision over the office staff and determines under the regulations the functions of the branch. Briefly, without reference to the specific classification, those are his duties.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The increase is statutory?

Mr. MURDOCK: Yes. I may add that the salary was slightly increased within the last few months by the Civil Service Commission who considered the responsibilities of the office as entitling him to that increase.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Inasmuch as we have a Statistical branch, what is the need for a statistician in the minister's department? What is the need also for an annuities actuary and an actuarial assistant? It seems
5 p.m. as though the minister were running a big business, and I think he might take a leaf out of last year's book and reduce these estimates by another $15,000 or $20,000.

Mr. MURDOCK: The minister will give careful consideration to that suggestion, although I am sure that my hon. friend must have noted, from another quarter of the chamber, the view that I was cutting down to such an extent as to render the Labour department useless. I am not sure that my hon. friend is not right and that there can be further reductions without impeding the progress of the Labour department in any way whatever.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I certainly did not construe the remarks of the member for Calgary (Mr. Irvine) as the minister has construed them.

Mr. STEWART (Humboldt): Was the work of the Dominion Government Annuities branch efficiently performed last year?

Mr. MURDOCK: Yes. I may say that several hon. members asked for information the other day respecting the Annuities branch which I could not answer at the time. I have the information now and I shall be glad to place it on record if the committee so desires.

Mr. STEWART (Humboldt): The minister has stated that the staff of the Annuities branch has been reduced by practically fifty per cent, and that the work is nevertheless efficiently done. That would bear out the contention that has been made that the minister might well make staff reductions—or the committee might force him to make them, as it did last year—in certain other branches.

Mr. MURDOCK: There is only one less employee in the Annuities branch, due to one employee having left voluntarily.

Mr. STEWART (Humboldt): Then I will have to ask the minister to explain all over again the answer that he gave to that question why the figure showing 124 for last year is not 130.

Mr. MURDOCK: The civil government estimates for 1922-23 provided for 117 positions in the Labour department at a cost of $195,040. In addition, the estimate for the Annuities branch, at that time associated with the Post Office Department, provided for 13 positions at a cost of $22,320, a total of $217,-

360. The estimates of the department were reduced by $15,000 in the committee, and the total voted, including the appropriation voted for the Annuities branch, thus became $202,-360. As to the number of positions, there were 117 in the Department of Labour and 13 in the Annuities branch, a total of 130. Owing, however, to the $15,000 reduction in the estimates it became necessary to abandon six positions in the Labour department—not in the Annuities branch—leaving the number at 124.

Mr. CHAPLIN: How many are employed in the Annuities branch now?

Mr. MURDOCK: Twelve.

Mr. CHAPLIN: On the fifth line of the details we have provision for "Superintendent, Dominion Government Annuities." A little further down we have "Annuities Actuary," and still further down we have an "Actuarial Assistant." It seems to me that there are three men doing practically the same work, and the minister, as he himself has suggested, might effect a saving there. Then we have a "Senior Wage Investigator;" two lines below there is provision for another wage investigator, and six lines down we have a "Junior Wage Investigator." It looks to me as if the minister might cut out one or two of these and save some money.

Mr. MURDOCK: I have already pointed out that last year we had five wage investigators; we have eliminated two, leaving three. My hon. friend may be right; we may be able next year to get along with two.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Are these men fully employed?

Mr. MURDOCK: Yes, the three are pretty well employed. The five were not altogether as fully employed as I thought they might be.

Mr. LADNER: This vote is quite a large one, and the point arises whether there is any correlation of activities between the Dominion Labour department and provincial departments of labour. I have specific reference to cases in British Columbia, particularly in South Vancouver, which would indicate that there was not always the degree of co-operation between the two that would seem to be possible.

Mr. MURDOCK: Our desire is to have as much co-operation as possible between provincial departments of labour and the federal government. The Progressive government in Alberta the other day decided upon the adoption of the fair wage provisions of the federal government as defined by our fair wage investigators; that is an indication of co-operation. Of course we cannot suggest to a provincial department that it do this or do that, but there is undoubtedly a certain amount of co-operation between federal and provincial labour departments.

Mr. LADNER: That is not exactly the information that I wanted. Is there any considered plan whereby the officials of the provincial labour departments meet in consultation with the officials of the federal Labour department so that they do not cover the same spheres of activity, and thereby the public, which after all bears the expense whether it is paid out of the federal or provincial treasuries, will get the maximum advantage with the minimum of expense?

Mr. MURDOCK: There have been various conferences held. For instance, we had a conference on the uniformity of labour legislation. Another conference was held here in Ottawa in September last. There is another conference proposed which I think will be held within the next couple of months. Then the director of the employment service of Canada meets with the superintendents of the provincial employment services and discusses ways and means for co-operating to the best advantage and for uniformity in carrying on the work of the employment service, So my hon. friend will see that there is consultation whenever there is any possibility for co-operation. Within the next day or two I might mention that two officers of the federal Labour department are going to a certain province for the purpose of discussing with the deputy minister and his assistant deputy and other officers certain matters of joint interest. That is the plan that is followed all the time so far as is possible.

Mr. IRVINE: Arising out of the explanation given by the minister I would like to ask if it has yet been decided whether the municipal, the provincial or Dominion authorities are responsible for the unemployment situation?

Mr. MURDOCK: There has been no change in that respect from the position taken by the federal government as outlined in the following telegram dated December 22, 1922, which was sent to the Premier of Manitoba. A similar telegram was sent on or about the same date to the Premier of British Columbia, and the same information was conveyed to the mayors of a number of western cities. The telegram reads in part:

With regard to the question of federal assistance to municipalities on the same basis as assistance was

granted during the winter of last year or otherwise, it is necessary to state that neither the present federal administration nor, so far as can be gathered from the records on fyle, the late administration had at any time contemplated that the action taken during the last two years by way of relief to municipalities and in some cases to provincial governments on account of unorganized districts should be regarded as a precedent for federal participation in the responsibilities of municipal and provincial authorities, save under conditions comparable to those existing during the winters of nineteen twenty, twenty-one, and nineteen twenty-one, twenty-two, when, over the larger part of the Dominion, unemployment existed on a wholly unprecedented scale. Information reaching the federal government does not lead to the view that any situation exists at the present time which is at all comparable to that prevailing during the two last preceding winters, but is on the contrary to the effect that industrial conditions generally show great improvement and large sections of Canada are reaping the benefit of a harvest of unprecedented bounty. The situation, therefore, as it appears to the federal authorities, is not one which justifies action on their part in assuming at present any portion of the obligations falling customarily to the municipal and provincial authorities, and the conditions you indicate as existing in certain municipalities of your province cannot be regarded as ground for departing from this principle.

That was the position taken by this government on the 22nd of December last, and we have seen no reason whatever to change the view as then expressed.

Mr. IRVINE: If the government continues with its immigration policy as announced by the Minister of Immigration and the result next year is that we have increased unemployment because of it, will the present government now promise to assume responsibility for all such unemployed?

Mr. MURDOCK: I am sure that the present government will next winter take carefully into consideration the conditions which then exist, and certainly will not indicate by a promise now what it would do in advance.

Mr. IRVINE: I have another question. Is it the intention of the department to grant to the relief board at Calgary one-third of the amount, as the statute calls for, of the money expended on unemployed returned soldiers?

Mr. MURDOCK: My understanding is that there is no body composed in Calgary properly qualified under the provisions of P.C. 220 to receive from the federal government any assistance in the relief which they may have expended during the present winter. That is my understanding of the situation in regard to Calgary.

Mr. LADNER: With reference to the telegram which the minister read, this is rather an important matter to the people of the various provinces, because they do not seem to be clear as to where the primary or constitutional responsibility rests with reference to the unemployment question. I would ask the minister if I state the policy of the government correctly when I say that they now take the position that primarily the handling of the unemployment question is a provincial matter and that until the situation gets of a nation-wide character the federal government, as a matter of policy, does not propose to deal with the problem. Is that a short statement of the position? The telegram is rather lengthy and not quite so specific.

Mr. MURDOCK: The position that was taken by the previous government and the position that has been taken by this government is that responsibility primarily rests with the municipalities and the provinces. There has been no variation from that position. In the telegram which I read a few moments ago it was indicated that during the two winters previous to this one there were abnormal conditions with unemployment general throughout the country, and under such conditions it was thought desirable and consistent that the federal government should come in a certain degree to the assistance of the municipalities and the provinces.

Mr. LADNER: That was a war problem, was it not? Detaching the question from the war, how would the minister regard it then?

Mr. MURDOCK: Detaching it from the conditions that existed during the two preceding winters, no matter what the condition was, no matter whether it was a post-war condition or brought about by some other cause, we can leave all that to one side. The position taken is that dealing with unemployment is primarily a matter of municipal and provincial concern, but during the last two winters unemployment reached such an acute stage, and was so generally prevalent all over the Dominion that it became absolutely necessary for the federal government, without committing itself to any such policy for the future, to come to the assistance of the municipalities and the provinces.

Mr. IRVINE: What court decided that the responsibility for dealing with unemployment fell upon the municipal and provincial authorities?

Mr. MURDOCK: The previous government so decided and enunciated the policy in order in council which it issued. This government did likewise on that particular point.

Mr. IRVINE: I am very sorry that the present government should have followed the previous administration in this or any other regard.

Mr. MURDOCK: We were more liberal. Owing to the abnormal conditions of unemployment which prevailed we were more generous in some of our allowances.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: In answer to my hon. friend for Calgary East (Mr. Irvine) I may say that the rights of the federal government and the provinces, as respects many important subjects, are determined by the British North America Act. The matter of property and civil rights, according to that act, is assigned to the provinces. The provinces have all along claimed, and I think rightly, that under that provision factory legislation, matters of employment, questions relating to master and servant and the like, come within their jurisdiction and not within the jurisdiction of the federal government. Such, in my opinion, is a sound and proper interpretation of that section of the act. If dealing with employment is part of the duty of the provinces, action regarding unemployment would also seem to fall within the same category. The view this government has taken has been that any such relief granted by it in the past has been by reason of a national emergency arising out of the war. Such aid was not given because of an obligation imposed upon the federal government by the British North America Act; it was to meet an emergency national in its character. Now the time has come when it is necessary to draw the line. I want to point out to my hon. friend—and I think it is well worth pointing out to hon. gentlemen as a whole—that during the period of the war the debt of the federal government was increased enormously; some two billions of dollars were added to the national debt, and this government has now to ask parliament for an appropriation of $140,000,000 to meet the interest on that debt alone. On the other hand the provinces, during the period of the war, added virtually nothing to their public debt as a consequence of that great struggle; the whole burden fell on the federal treasury which is now having difficulty in raising the money needed for the purposes of the nation. Moreover the provinces, or some of them at least, are beginning to have surpluses instead of deficits, and we feel, and I think the House will agree, that if this government is to be expected to carry out the obligations that clearly fall upon it we ought to tell the provinces that where they can reasonably find the means of dealing with those matters that come within their particular jurisdiction they should make an effort to do so.

[Mr. Irvine.]

Mr. LADNER: The Prime Minister has furnished the information which I sought to get in my questions to the minister, namely, that the question of unemployment is primarily one that rests upon the provincial governments and that it is only under unusual conditions, such, for example, as those which arise out of war, that the federal government has any responsibility. So that we may assume from the statements of the Prime Minister and the minister that henceforth the attitude of the federal government on the question of unemployment will be a negative one excepting in cases of national emergency arising out of war—

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: National emergency of any kind.

Mr. LADNER: I cannot conceive that there would be any other national emergency except such as stated, and therefore action on the part of the federal parliament would be confined to what I might call a war emergency. I get letters all the time from people saying, "Why don't you get after the government, they are not doing anything for unemployment?" I frankly confess that I agree with the attitude assumed by the government —that this is a provincial problem, not a federal problem; and the sooner the public learn where they stand the quicker they will be able to seek and enforce a remedy. I am therefore glad the Prime Minister has made this statement because it tends to make clear something which has been shrouded in mystery in the past. I presume that henceforth—excepting as regards situations growing out of war—we may conclude that the federal government has finished with the question of unemployment.

Mr. IRVINE: I appreciate the position of the federal government with regard to unemployment, and I am certainly glad that the Prime Minister has given us this explanation. We shall now, as provinces and municipalities, know that there is very little hope of expecting anything in the way of relief from the Dominion government except in extreme cases. However, I would like just to add this: While the Prime Minister has no doubt given us the proper interpretation of the act, nevertheless I would submit it is not a satisfactory one. If the act has been correctly interpreted by the Prime Minister I think it will have to be changed. For surely it is not fair that the Dominion government—possessing the power by its fiscal policy pretty well to regulate the industrial life of the country, and the power also by its immigration policies to flood this

country with labour that cannot be employed —should pass on the unemployment burden to the provincial and municipal authorities. I would suggest that if this course is going to be continued the provinces be granted the right to map out their own tariff and immigration policies so as to be able to meet the emergency confronting them.

Mr. SHAW: I want to ask the minister a question in connection with a statement he made in answer to the hon. member for Calgary East (Mr. Irvine) about the refusal of his department, if such it be, to pay to the city of Calgary the sum of approximately $1,800 because, as he suggests, no proper body has been constituted in accordance with the provisions of Privy Council Order No. 220. I do not know what the terms of this order in council are, but I do know that the city of Calgary has a regularly constituted and responsible organization to deal with the matter of unemployment, and that there is a responsible official in charge of the office. Returned soldiers have received relief during the past winter to the amount of something over $5,000, and acting and relying on the previous attitude of the government, and the former governments, the city of Calgary had a right to expect that approximately $1,800 of that amount would be borne by the federal government. If a mere technicality stands in the way surely the minister is not going to take advantage of it in order to deprive the city of Calgary of this not inconsiderable amount which has been expended for the relief of returned soldiers. I would therefore like to know from the minister what limitations stand in the way of carrying out my suggestion and if the department proposes to rely upon those limitations or whether, regardless of non-compliance with the terms of the order in council referred to, an adequate amount will be placed in the Supplementary Estimates to cover this item.

Mr. MURDOCK: I will read Privy Council Order No. 220 to the committee, and then ask my hon. friend to suggest whether, in his judgment, the Minister of Labour—who is subject to criticism when he does not do things according to instructions—is permitted to recognize any bills of the kind presented by the city of Calgary.

Mr. SHAW: Is there any dispute as to whether or not the city of Calgary has properly expended this sum for unemployment?

Mr. MURDOCK: No, none whatever. The city of Calgary, in an orderly way and in due course, as it was necessary, and as the bills were presented, paid the amount without any federal grant, and thereby obviated the necessity of the Dominion government in any way, under order in council 220, coming to their assistance. This order No. 220 was not issued for the purpose of coming to the assistance of any municipality that accepted, dealt with and paid bills of the kind, but I still would like to read the order in council to my hon. friend as the point has been raised, and then ask him for his own version of it. The order in council reads:

> The committee of the Privy Council have had before them a report, dated 30th January, 1923, from the Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment, submitting that, while employment conditions generally have improved since the winter of 1921-22, unemployment still exists, particularly in the larger centres of population, to an extent necessitating the provision of relief by municipalities and charitable organizations.
>
> The minister states that representations have been received indicating that certain of those reduced to a condition of distress in consequence of unemployment are former members of the Forces, including some suffering from disabilities which, although not attributable to war service, and therefore not pensionable, place the men concerned in most cases under a handicap in competing in the general labour market; such men not being, however, eligible to receive assistance extended by the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment to men whose disabilities are attributable to their services with the Forces during the war.
>
> Previous federal regulations with respect to federal co-operation with local authorities in the relief of unployment have properly emphasized the principle that the matter of caring for unemployed persons is fundamentally a responsibility of the local authorities, and that the federal authorities are justified in undertaking any share of the obligation arising only under abnormal conditions. It is, however, submitted that the situation above indicated is one which justified and requires federal action by way of co-operation in the relief of unemployed ex-service men of the class described.
>
> Information received shows that in certain municipalities central bodies, composed of representatives of the municipality and of the various charitable and veteran organizations, have been formed for the administration of relief to ex-service men unable to procure work and in necessitous circumstances, and such organizations are regarded as serving excellent purpose.
>
> The minister accordingly recommends that where any organization composed as above, has, since January 1st, 1923, made disbursements in relief of the necessities of ex-service men of the class indicated in paragraph 2 as above, the federal authorities will reimburse such relief bodies to the extent of one-third of such disbursements incurred since that date; provided that no grant shall be payable by the federal authorities save when the accounts submitted for payment have been approved by the Minister of Labour and Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment; the grants in question to be paid, the Minister of Labour concurring, from the appropriation for the relief of unemployment for the present fiscal year and administered under the authority of the Minister of Labour.

And it is duly signed. Therefore I call the attention of my hon. friend from Calgary to the fact that the $1,800 that he is interested in securing for the city of Calgary was paid by the municipality through its

relief department alone, and without any consideration or recognition of this order in council, and it is only proper to say that I do not think that, by any stretch of imagination, sympathetic or otherwise, I could indicate that under this order in council the city of Calgary qualifies to be reimbursed the $1,800.

Mr. SHAW: The minister must certainly realize that, while the letter of the law has not perhaps been complied with the spirit of the law has been. Is it not possible for him, under those circumstances, to put in the supplementary estimates an amount sufficient to cover this particular item?

Mr. MURDOCK: Would my hon. friend be surprised to know that if I said yes, which I have no right to do, it would mean the presentation of bills very much greater in amount from various places from which we have not heard one word so far. Where it means $1,800 in the case of Calgary, I do not think I am exaggerating when I say that, in different parts of Canada, several thousand dollars would be claimed in the same way, although the money had been paid out in the ordinary course of business, and had been regarded having been properly paid by the relief departments of the various municipalities.

Mr. IRVINE: I would like to point out that there is a slight difference between the case of Calgary and that of any other supposed case to which the minister has alluded. For instance, I inquired from the Minister of Soldiers Civil Re-establishment for his interpretation of this particular order in council which the Minister of Labour has just read, and according to the interpretation given me by the minister of the Department of Soldiers Civil Re-establishment, the federal government was liable for one-third of the amount of money expended by the relief board of Calgary. I communicated this information to Mr. H. B. Adshead, who is the administrator of the department of municipal service in Calgary. That statement was published in the public press and the people of Calgary had been relying on the government to recoup them that amount of money. So that there is a slight difference between this case and any supposed case that might come before the minister. Therefore I would urge the Minister of Labour to consider the appeal of Calgary in this regard, set aside what, after all, is only a technicality and grant this request.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Some time ago I asked the minister a question relative to the statistics of the department. I find, besides the names that I have mentioned, that there are 20 clerks in this department interested in the compilation of statistics. It seems to me that the minister can use the pooling method to great advantage there.

Mr. MURDOCK: Although a number of statistical clerks were transferred to the regular statistical department, it is still necessary, and has been held so, even by the chief of the Bureau of Statistics to have in the Labour department a considerable number of employees especially qualified to look after the compilation of labour statistics. It is for that purpose that a Statistical branch is still being maintained in the Labour department, and in that branch there are sixteen employees altogether.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I can count twenty. If the minister will look down the list, he will find one chief statistician, one head statistical clerk, three principal statistical clerks, a little further down he will find six senior statistical clerks. A little further down, eight statistical clerks, and still further down, one junior statistical clerk, making in all twenty.

Mr. MURDOCK: My hon. friend is quite right. There is the Statistical branch for the purpose of compiling labour organization figures and matters in connection with that. Then there is the Employment Service branch which has also certain statistical clerk employees, and which deals with the compilation of figures that we receive from the various provinces. Thus, there are two branches of the Labour department, a Statistical branch and an Employment Service branch, in which there are a number of statistical clerks, compiling and handling figures that we could not get, I understand, through the regular statistical department of the government under the Department of Trade and Commerce.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: What are the special matters referring to labour for which these statistics are being compiled?

Mr. MURDOCK: Hours of employment, wage rates, cost of living in its various classifications, rentals which have an important bearing on the cost of living and all such items as that. These are all matters that it has been regarded as necessary to maintain as reasonably as possible accurate figures on.

Mr. BOYS: Possibly this question would come more appropriately at this moment. What I was going to ask was about the Annuities branch information that the minister was kind enough to offer about half an hour ago and which was asked for before the Easter recess.

Mr. MURDOCK: I have just got the information that I think was asked for from several sections of the House the other night.

From the 1st September, 1908, the date of the inception of the Annuities branch, up to and inclusive of the 31st March, 1923, the total number of annuity contracts issued was 5,643. Of the purchasers of these contracts, 513 have been removed by death, leaving in force on the 31st March ultimo, 5,130 contracts. The total amount of purchase money received during the same period was $6,688,760.19. The following statement gives the details:

Sept. 1,—March 31,	Number of Annuitants	Purchase money
1908 to 1909..	66	$ 50,391 32
March 31,—March 31,		
1909 to 1910..	566	434,490 89
1910 to 1911..	1,069	393,441 40
1911 to 1912..	1,032	441,600 60
1912 to 1913..	373	417,136 10
1913 to 1914..	318	390,886 71
1914 to 1915..	264	314,459 29
1915 to 1916..	325	441,696 09
1916 to 1917..	285	432,272 40
1917 to 1918..	187	332,792 01
1918 to 1919..	147	322,154 23
1919 to 1920..	204	408,718 78
1920 to 1921..	195	531,800 45
1921 to 1922..	277	748,159 73
1922 to 1923..	335	1,028,760 19
Total..	5,643	$6,688,760 19

For a portion of the years 1909, 1910, 1911 and prior to 31st March, 1912, twelve lecturers or outside representatives, six in Ontario, three in Quebec, two in New Brunswick and one in Nova Scotia, were employed.

Mr. BOYS: Could the minister say what proportion of that money was received upon a 3 per cent basis, what proportion upon a 4 per cent basis, and what the disbursements were for the same periods?

Mr. MURDOCK: I am afraid I could not give my hon. friend that information. I could get it, of course, but I do not have it here.

Mr. BOYS: Can the minister give the total receipts and total disbursements irrespective of the variation in the 3 and 4 per cent calculations?

Mr. MURDOCK: I have the occupations of the various annuitants, covering 176 occupations, and then certain other information in answer to questions asked the other night, but I have not the information for which my hon. friend now asks. My recollection is that the 4 per cent basis was adopted about 1911. Prior to that time the basis, I think from recollection, was 3 per cent. It started off at 3 per cent.

Mr. BOYS: The minister will appreciate why I want the information. As I understand the matter, when this venture was started, there was no thought of making money, and after the experiment for, perhaps, three years on a 3 per cent basis, the calculation was then made on a 4 per cent basis. I was rather anxious to find out what the experience of the department had been on the 4 per cent basis, whether or not considerable money had been made, and if so, whether or not we might in the near future, perhaps, get on a 5 per cent basis, which, I understood, when we were considering the matter before the Easter recess, the minister said was under consideration. I should think the manifest way of reaching a conclusion would be to see what the receipts and the disbursements were, now that the scheme has been in operation for a sufficient length of time, in order to get down to a working basis.

Mr. MURDOCK: I will get that information for my hon. friend. He will have noticed that in 1910 there were only 566 contracts, the number in 1911 being 1,069, in the following year 1,032 and in 1913, 373.

Mr. BOYS: The decline was due to lack of publicity.

Mr. MURDOCK: Lack of publicity and information.

Mr. BOYS: I do not desire to delay the item. I do not know whether the House generally wants the information but I should like to have it myself, and if the minister can promise to let me have it I do not care whether I get it privately or in the House.

Mr. MURDOCK: I will get that information. I appreciate the interest my hon. friend has shown in the matter, because I think it is worth boosting.

Mr. SHAW: I did not gather from the minister whether or not he has given a definite refusal to the claim of the city of Calgary, or whether he is prepared to reconsider the position already taken.

Mr. MURDOCK: My recollection is that a letter was forwarded to Calgary stating that they were not within the law. Of course, that being the case, I would not have the authority as Minister of Labour to reverse the decision, although I would not for a moment suggest that there could be no possibility of reversing it. The decision was based on the circumstances, and the money was expended by the city of Calgary without any drawback from the federal government under any regulations in effect. They were so informed, and that is the situation.

Mr. SHAW: I take it then that the minister definitely refuses, either under order in council or by way of supplementary estimates, to make provision for that amount.

Mr. MURDOCK: I am sure my hon. friend would not want to put me in the position of definitely refusing to determine what the government shall do. If he so desires, I shall be glad to bring to the attention of the government his specific claim on behalf of Calgary, which in effect is just the same as might be made by many other municipalities throughout Canada. If he wants me to do so I will promise to ask the government to say whether the claim on behalf of the city of Calgary for $1,800 shall be reconsidered.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: The minister says that one feature of the statistics that are being compiled relates to the cost of living. I would infer from the discussion that took place a few nights ago that a good deal of the information is sent in from those who are paid a very small sum in outlying districts. During the war, I believe, it was required of those handling meat and produce of all kinds to file a monthly statement with the department regarding the prices at which these commodities were being sold. Is this practice still in vogue, or has this matter been turned over to the Bureau of Statistics?

Mr. MURDOCK: The duties of the statistical branch relate, first, to prices and the cost of living; secondly, to wages and hours of labour, including industrial agreements; and thirdly, to strikes and lockouts. With regard to the first, there is published, monthly, information concerning retail and wholesale prices in Canada and other countries; and so far as wages and hours of labour are concerned, there appears monthly in the Labour Gazette a summary analysis of recent industrial agreements, schedules of wages, and so forth; and information is also given as to strikes and lockouts.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I want information with regard to the cost of food products. Does this matter still come within the scope of the Department of Labour? I have a list of articles which those who handle these commodities are asked to fill in monthly, along with a solemn declaration as to the correctness of the report. I am raising this matter because a lot of the questions which have to be answered are absurd. There are 24 articles mentioned in the list devoted to fish of various kinds, 5 to butter, 8 to pork, and so on. One of the questions refers to beef roast from the fore quarter. A statement is required in regard to this matter and I have often wondered why it was called for. The price must be stated of roast from the fore quarter of veal but from no other part of the animal; and the same thing applies to mutton leg roast from the hind quarter. There must be a report as to the prices of these parts of the animals. What is the object in singling out these two particular parts for the purposes of the report? With regard to beef also there are five different qualities dealt with, and you can understand how absolutely impossible it would be for a retail merchant, a butcher or any one else to make a statement that would be in any degree accurate. It might have been necessary at one stage of the war to require these things, but I do not believe that the people who drafted these questions had any fair idea of just what they were trying to get at. No matter how many clerks you may have in this branch, it is absolutely impossible to make a report that would be of any value considering the nature of the 61 questions which are contained in this list.

Mr. MURDOCK: Is that a Labour department form that my hon. friend is referring to?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: It is from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics.

Mr. MURDOCK: That has nothing to do with my department, although I believe that some information of the kind goes to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. I do not think that information is collected by the Department of Labour, but we probably get from the Bureau of Statistics an analysis of the results that may be secured through this questionnaire.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: The information sent out through the Labour Gazette is compiled from the statistics arrived at in this way.

Mr. MURDOCK: The department maintains also some 60 or more correspondents to check up on the figures obtained in the various towns.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I see by the statistics which the Professor of Economics of McMaster University has been compiling for some years, that the cost of living has been rising for several months now. Is that the same verdict as the officers of the department find?

Mr. MURDOCK: The figures of the Labour department are in evidence for my right hon. friend to see. I do not recall what they show.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister is not so interested on this subject as he was a year and a half ago.

Mr. MURDOCK: He is yet quite as interested.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He does not know what the results of his own department are as to the cost of living. I was asking whether the department's figures agreed in tendency with those of the Professor of Economics of McMaster University showing an increase in the cost of living.

Mr. MURDOCK: The figures did show a slight seasonal rise as we have found in all winters in Canada in the past.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is the minister going to do to bring the cost down? He has been failing in all his pledges in that regard.

Mr. MURDOCK: We are working nicely in that direction if you will keep out of the road.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister is working all right, but the results are exactly the opposite of what he is working for.

Mr. MURDOCK: We are doing nicely, thank you.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I know that the minister is drawing his salary, but the cost of living keeps going up. The minister made terrible strictures on the late government, and promised to devote his tremendous abilities to the reduction of the cost of living. That was to be his ambition in public life. That was what he set his heart upon; he was going to relieve the poor.

Mr. MURDOCK: Some job.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Some job! Yes, now that my hon. friend is in the department he finds that it is "some job." The cost of living, which went down 24 points in the official scale in 1921 from what it was 12 months before, is now higher than it was when the minister took office. It is going the wrong way. Does the minister not think it is time for him to give place to somebody else?

Mr. MURDOCK: I suggest that my right hon. friend read Babson instead of the pessimists that he has been reading.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am not criticizing Babson at all—I have been reading the hon. minister. He should judge his conduct by his own standard. I am asking him in what state of mind is he now, having not only failed to carry on the good work instituted by the previous government that he criticized, but having reversed the process altogether.

Mr. MURDOCK: We are doing very nicely, thank you.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Individually he is doing very nicely, I admit that, but those for whom he is trustee are doing very badly.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Before the Easter recess the minister said he would be able to give us some statistics with regard to the value of the time lost on account of unemployment. There are statistics with regard to the amount lost through strikes and that kind of thing, and I think the minister said he could get us information from the point of view of unemployment.

Mr. MURDOCK: That was held in abeyance under vote No. 263. I am anxious to go on with the discussion on that vote when hon. gentlemen on the other side are ready to proceed with it. In the meantime, however, we are dealing with another matter.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Before this item carries I would like to have some definite assurance from the minister that the list which I hold in my hand is not the list upon which the opinions of the department with regard to the cost of living are based.

Mr. MURDOCK: I assure my hon. friend that they are not entirely based on that list. The analysis is made on the basis of the figures thus secured as well as of other information.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: The minister says, "the figures thus secured."

Mr. MURDOCK: Consideration is given to those figures, I understand, in compiling the analysis.

Progress reported.

ADJOURNMENT—ADDRESS OF LORD ROBERT CECIL

Mr. MACKENZIE KING moved the adjournment of the House.

He said: It had been the hope of the government and of hon. members generally that there might be an opportunity to hear Lord Robert Cecil during his stay in Ottawa, possibly in the Railway committee room of the House of Commons. We have learned, however, that that will not be possible, and tonight will be the only opportunity that members of the House will have to hear his address on the League of Nations. Under the circumstances the suggestion has come from a number of sources that it might be advisable to ad-

journ the House this evening so as to afford hon. members the privilege of hearing Lord Robert at the Collegiate Institute. I have spoken with my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition and I think he shares with me the view that the circumstances would warrant the adjournment of the House for that purpose.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 6.10 p.m.

Tuesday, April 10, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

REPORTS AND PAPERS

Mr. DUFF presented the second report of the select standing committee on Marine and Fisheries, as follows:

Your committee have had under consideration the new regulation regarding the time each year that trout fishing by anglers is permitted, and recommend that the regulation at present in force be repealed and that the time be as formerly, that is from the 1st of April of each year until the 1st of May each year.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

Mr. GRAHAM: It is permitted for the same length of time as formerly, but the date is changed?

Mr. DUFF: Yes.

IMPERIAL CONFERENCE

On the Orders of the Day:

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, in the morning press there is an announcement that this year there is to be an Imperial Conference of the nature of that in 1921 to be held simultaneously with an Imperial Economic Conference, and that to the former all prime ministers are invited and all are going save the Prime Minister of New Zealand, who presumably along with the others is to attend the latter. May I ask if this conference has been decided upon if it is to be attended by the Prime Minister or by others of the government, and if so, what is the agenda that has been agreed upon or submitted to the government as subjects for consideration at the economic conference and also at the conference of the character of that of 1921?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I might say to my right hon. friend that the report as it appears in the press this morning is correct. An Imperial Conference similar to the one held in 1921 is to be held in London in October simultaneously with an Imperial Economic Conference. It is hoped that when October comes the expressed wish of the British Prime Minister that the prime ministers of the different dominions should attend the conference may be complied with so far as Canada is concerned.

As to the agenda, I think I might promise my right hon. friend that I will be in a position to place on the Table such papers as we have already received in that connection. Broadly, as to the agenda of the conference of prime ministers, it is similar to the agenda of the conference which my right hon. friend himself attended. The agenda in complete form is not available as yet. It is open to the different governments concerned to make suggestions as to matters to be taken up between now and the time of the conference.

As to the Imperial Economic Conference, The agenda I think is set forth in completer form, and I shall have pleasure in placing on the table of the House the data the government has.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Can that data be placed on the Table to-morrow or this week?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING In this, as in all matters between the Home government and our own, I wish to follow the customary practice of communicating with the British government before I take any action. I shall ask for permission to bring the papers down at an early date.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There can be no possible exception taken that would be acceptable to this House, no possible reason for secrecy in regard to the agenda of either conference.

HUDSON BAY RAILWAY

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. MEIGHEN: I call attention to another despatch in the press this morning indicating that the government has altered its attitude with respect to the Hudson Bay railway. The despatch is dated April 5, and states that the Hon. W. R. Motherwell in the contest now being decided in Moose Jaw has undertaken on behalf of the government the completion and the establishment of service upon this railway before Christmas. This is one of several commitments made. May I ask if this is the policy of the government? If so, is it permanent or is it only made for Mr. Knowles to get in on?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The policy of the government remains what it was, as announced by the Acting Minister of Railways

and Canals (Mr. Graham) when this matter was referred to in the House.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That policy would be consistent with completion before Christmas. Is the government purposing to do that? Does the government purpose to have it completed this year, or does the government not?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I cannot give my right hon. friend an answer as to time.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the Prime Minister say that he cannot say whether it is the intention to complete the Hudson Bay railway before this Christmas or not?

Mr. GRAHAM: I think that must have been a misprint.

GRATUITIES TO GRAND TRUNK OFFICIALS

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. WARD: I should like somewhat out of curiosity to draw attention to a statement made by the Acting Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) yesterday in reply to a question by the hon. member for Last Mountain (Mr. Johnston) regarding a question I had put on the order paper some time ago. The minister had this to say:

> If I might be permitted, I am not sure that the Farmers' party has brought much light to the subject. The light was forced upon it.

I would like to tell the hon. minister—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. This refers to a debate which took place yesterday and cannot form the subject of a discussion at the present time.

Mr. WARD: What I would like to ask the minister is what ground he had for making that statement.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. GRAHAM: Pure fact.

SUPPLY—DISMISSAL OF JOHN J. HAYES FROM POSTAL SERVICE

On the motion of Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King that the House go into Committee of Supply:

Mr. WILLIAM IRVINE (Calgary East): Before the motion is put, there is a matter of great urgency which I should like to bring to the attention of the House. It deals with one Mr. John J. Hayes of Calgary. I want first briefly to state this man's position.

Mr. Hayes has been a postal employee of the Dominion of Canada for thirty-three years. Not only has he served in that capacity for that length of time, but he also served overseas for some years. After returning he was moved from the Toronto post office to the post office of the city of Calgary. He was moved there immediately after the postal strike in Calgary. He was considered to be of such efficiency that he was placed in the position of supervisor of the letter carriers there at that time. Now for some reason unknown to me, the postmaster at Calgary seemed to take an aversion to Mr. Hayes, and recently they set a trap to catch him. There had been some petty thieving going on in the post office, and a trap was set by a policeman and an official of the post office expressly to catch Mr. Hayes. These gentlemen were in the office watching for Mr. Hayes to put his foot into the trap. They sprang the trap when they were ready but they did not catch Mr. Hayes in it; the money they had planted was found elsewhere. Nevertheless Mr. Hayes was arrested. He was not accorded trial by a jury but was brought before Hon. Mr. Justice McCarthy, and was found guilty. His case then came before the Appeal Court and was heard by Hon. Mr. Justice Beck, Hon. Mr. Justice Hyndman, and Hon. Mr. Justice Clarke, the result being that the conviction was quashed. I would refer those who are interested in the case to the report of the proceedings to be found in Canadian Criminal Cases, volume 38, page 348. Mr. Hayes then found himself a free man. The case was thrown out by the Appeal Court because the evidence against him was insufficient. Subsequently Mr. Hayes applied for reinstatement in the post office but was told by the postmaster that he would have to wait for some time. After repeated attempts to be reinstated he was informed that an order in council had been passed by the present government discharging him from the service, the letter from the Deputy Postmaster General stating that they were taking this action in the light of the judgment as summed up by the dissenting judge of the Appeal Court. I would like to know by what authority the Deputy Postmaster General sets himself above the Appeal Court in this case or, for that matter, by what authority the cabinet even judges a man over the head of the courts.

I want next to show what these proceedings mean to Mr. Hayes himself. As already pointed out he has seen thirty-three years' service. I think his service overseas counted for something more than the regular time, which would give him about thirty-five years' service under the postal department. Now,

by his discharge Mr. Hayes loses the pension which rightfully belongs to him as an employee of the department. In this regard I want to point out that on the morning of his arrest the postmaster at Calgary offered Mr. Hayes the privilege of resigning. Had he resigned at that time he would have obtained his pension, but he would not resign because to do so would have been an admission, inferentially at least, that he was guilty of the charge laid against him. Mr. Hayes would not take that opportunity of getting out, but went to the court with his case. However, although he won out in the courts he was summarily dismissed by an order in council. By that dismissal the fruit of his labours of thirty-three to thirty-five years was lost and he himself, as long as the attitude of the department is what it is, is even regarded by his friends with suspicion. I saw Mr. Hayes when I was at Calgary a few days ago and he is undoubtedly in dire financial straits, and his family, at the present time, are dependent upon the precarious charity of friends. Owing to this charge against him, and to the attitude of the department, Mr. Hayes is unable to get work and is on the very verge of starvation. Now, I submit that a grave injustice has been done to this man. I do not mean to say that the government would knowingly pass an order in council calculated to inflict injustice upon anybody. At the same time, I want to say, that in my opinion, the attitude of the Deputy Postmaster General is contemptible; I cannot find words with which to express my contempt for his attitude in the matter. I imagine that the government reached the decision which it did under the influence of communications received from the postmaster of Calgary, and has not been guided in its decision in this matter by the judgment of the courts. I therefore think this injustice should be remedied. The thirty-three years of creditable service by Mr. Hayes should not be forgotten. The government's attitude not only robs Mr. Hayes of the pension which he has earned, but it also robs him of his character, for it was on the charge of theft that he was discharged, the judgment of the courts notwithstanding. I would therefore urge remedial action on the part of the government immediately. I contend that Mr. Hayes should be paid his wages from the moment he was arrested until he is reinstated, or else, if the department does not want to reinstate him he should be granted his pension. The least the government can possibly do, in recognition of his service overseas, and of his long term in the service of the department, is to give him his pension.

[Mr. Irvine.]

Mr. GRAHAM: May I ask my hon. friend to what pension he refers—this man's pension as an employee of the government or his pension for service as a soldier overseas?

Mr. IRVINE: I refer to the pension which Mr. Hayes has earned under the regulations governing postal employees. The man is innocent in the opinion of the court; he has been discharged as innocent of the crime of which he was accused. Therefore, I submit, he ought to receive his pension. He is an honest man in the opinion of the courts, consequently I do not see why anyone should desire to treat him as a criminal. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Shaw):

That all the words after the word "that" to the end of the question be struck out and the following words be inserted instead thereof:

That this House desires to record its opinion that the dismissal of John J. Hayes, formerly employed as a civil servant by the Post Office department, Calgary, Alberta, is wholly unjustifiable, and that immediate steps be taken to redress the injury done to the said John J. Hayes.

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Acting Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, this amendment came into my hands just as I was entering the House, and you can readily understand that I have not had time to digest the details of this case. I might point out, however, that if the mail matter, either social or business, is not safe in the hands of public servants, then the business of Canada, as well as our social relations, goes to pieces. Any man who cannot be trusted to handle the mail matter in a post office, while he may have the sympathy, cannot have the confidence, of the people of this country. I do not want to say anything to hurt Mr. Hayes' feelings, and I think bringing up this resolution, while it is in order, is not doing Mr. Hayes a kindness. It would have been better, I think, for my hon. friend to have discussed it with me, to see if there was not some other way of reaching a conclusion. However, I am not responsible for that.

In reference to the charge against Mr. Hayes I may say that he was arrested on September 14th, 1922, charged, first, with stealing a post letter containing $2, a test letter prepared by the investigating officer, contrary to section 364 of the Criminal Code, and stealing a post letter addressed to Mrs. C. I. McFarlane, Calgary, contrary to section 364 of the Criminal Code. One can readily understand that the officials of the post office, particularly the postmaster who is responsible would be in a very embarrassing position, having discovered that at different times, on sundry occasions, letters mailed and contain-

ing money had gone astray, and he set out to find who was responsible for this loss of money, and who was guilty of malfeasance in office. He came to the conclusion, with the other officers of the department and officials who were there, that they should investigate the matter. Mr. Hayes was under suspicion at least. This case was tried before Mr. Justice McCarthy. Practically every man in this House knows Mr. Justice McCarthy, who was formerly a member of this House. He heard all the evidence, saw the demeanour of the witnesses, was in a position to take into account all the local conditions and he found Mr. Hayes guilty and sentenced him to three years' imprisonment on each of the two counts, sentences to run concurrently. An appeal was taken. That appeal was heard before three judges; two of them upheld the appeal, one dissenting, Mr. Justice Clarke.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Did Mr. Justice Clarke dissent?

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes. I must not comment on the judgment—but perhaps I might as well. I will be very delicate about it. Mr. Justice Clarke was at one time a member of this House, and one of the ablest lawyers in the Dominion of Canada, and one of the ablest men that ever sat in this House.

Mr. MEIGHEN: And appointed by the late government.

Mr. DUFF: An exception which proves the rule.

Mr. GRAHAM: That may have been a lapse of memory. But we are all unanimous in the opinion that Mr. Justice Clarke is a very able man. An appeal was taken. There were two questions at issue; first, the right of trial by jury, which had been refused at the time of the trial by the presiding judge. My hon. friend for Calgary (Mr. Irvine) referred to that. As a matter of fact, the law provides for the trial, as it took place, without a jury. The second point was insufficient evidence. Two of the judges held that the evidence was not conclusive. Without criticizing the judgment at all, and I am not doing that, I would say that in order to come to a conclusion some other theory must be adopted, or some other explanation must be accepted as to the method by which Mr. Hayes got the letters and money into his possession. One of these was purely presumptive. The first suggestion was that the test letter had been stolen by a letter carrier who had later turned the money in to Hayes when buying stamps. Some letter carrier other than Hayes must have stolen this letter, brought it back and turned it in to Hayes for stamps—a roundabout proceeding. The second point was that Mr. Tingle substituted this money while he was taking the requisition handed in by Hayes to the clerk from whom he obtained the stamps.

Now certainly the evidence may not have been conclusive, but to my mind the reasoning of the other judges was far from conclusive. I want to point out what Mr. Justice Clarke said in his dissenting judgment. Referring to these two contentions, or suggestions as to the method by which Hayes might have got these letters and this money, Mr. Justice Clarke first deals with the opportunity a letter carrier would have to steal this letter and shows that while it would not have been impossible for a letter carrier to have done it, it was highly improbable. He pointed out that Mr. Hayes's desk was only a few feet from the case in which the letters, including the stolen letters, were placed for his attention. Hayes personally took the letters from the pigeon hole, containing the "removed" letters, and put them on his desk to check them over as usual and turn them over to Clerk Black, the supervisor of city sortation. When examined by Black one of the test letters was there, and the other one was missing. The accused left the room for about 15 or 20 minutes—this was about 8.50 a.m.—immediately after he had turned the letter over to Black. About 9.30 a.m. he sent his assistant, Tingle, with the requisition for postage due stamped to the amount of $3.75, to the stamp vendor on the mezzanine floor. The marked money contained in the missing test letter was found among the moneys sent by Mr. Hayes for stamps. Hayes alleged he got this money from the letter carriers. I am not going to refer further to this judgment, but Mr. Justice Clarke dissented very strongly, giving, to my mind, real reasons for every point of his dissent. We begin with this again: Letters and moneys were found in the possession of Hayes illegally. Mr. Justice McCarthy, who heard all the evidence, sentenced Hayes to three years' imprisonment on each count.

Mr. IRVINE: The minister said that the money and the letters which did not belong to Mr. Hayes, were found in his possession. I think the minister is in error as to that. I do not think any money was found in Mr. Hayes' possession.

Mr. GRAHAM: The memorandum which I have here says that Hayes was charged with:

1. Stealing a post letter containing two dollars (test letter prepared by investigating officer) contrary to section 364 (c) of the Criminal Code, and

2. Stealing a post letter addressed to Mrs. C. I. McFarlane, Calgary; contrary to section 364 (b) of the Criminal Code.

Hayes appeared before Judge McCarthy and was found guilty and sentenced to three years' imprisonment on each of the two counts.

Mr. IRVINE: That is the charge, but that does not prove that money that did not belong to Mr. Hayes was found in his pockets by the trap-springers.

Mr. GRAHAM: Let me read again a synopsis of what Mr. Justice Clarke says:

The carrier would have had to pick out this particular letter from the thirty or more letters in the pigeon hole, which he would have no knowledge of, abstract the money—two dollars, and then turn in the money in two instalments to Hayes in purchasing a few cents worth of stamps, all before 8.50.

From that I take it for granted that the money was found in the possession of Mr. Hayes. But let me get back. I am not going to take the place of the court. Hayes was charged with stealing money and mail matter; Mr. Justice McCarthy, who heard all the evidence, found him guilty and sentenced him to two terms of three years' imprisonment, the terms to run concurrently. The case was taken in appeal on two points: First, refusal of trial by jury. That has been cleared up by Mr. Justice Clarke, who pointed out that the law provides for such trials without a jury. The second was that the evidence was not sufficient. The judges rather took the ground "not conclusive". What I have read from the synopsis of the judgment of Mr. Justice Clarke would lead me to believe there was a wide divergence of opinion in that regard. Leaving all that aside, however, this is a man who is under suspicion sufficiently strong to make him a man not worthy to handle the mail of the people of Canada. Would any man in this House trust a public servant who had been tried and found guilty by Mr. Justice McCarthy and who, although he won on appeal, had applied to the case the remarks of Mr. Justice Clarke which I have read? I cannot but oppose this motion. I am willing to discuss this matter in the Post Office Department with my hon. friend; but I can assure him and assure Mr. Hayes that the object of the Post Office Department of the Dominion of Canada is not to persecute anybody; its chief object is to have the people of this country served, not only efficiently, but honestly.

Mr. JOS. T. SHAW (Calgary West): Mr. Speaker, I must confess that I am amazed by the attitude assumed by the Acting Postmaster General (Mr. Graham) in connection with this matter. He spent a good deal of time reviewing the judgments of the court and explaining why the view expressed by Mr. Justice Clarke must be upheld. Then, in the next breath, he tells us that he does not want to go into the matter as regards the courts. There can be no question of this fact —John J. Hayes is innocent of the charge which was laid against him.

Mr. CARROLL: Who told the hon. member?

Mr. SHAW: There can be no question about that. The courts have decreed that the charges which were laid against Hayes were unfounded, and he stands to-day before the people of Canada and in the eyes of the law an innocent man.

May I say at the outset, that of the questions which were considered by the Court of Appeal in this matter, one was a legal question as to the right of an accused person charged under the section dealing with post office offences, of securing a jury. On that point, the court did not come to any conclusion, because in view of the facts they deemed it unnecessary to consider that question. There were I believe, at least, three questions reserved. The second was: Was the finding against the weight of evidence? That is the question submitted by Mr. Justice McCarthy to the Appellate Court. I think we should have in mind that well-established principle that no man shall be convicted if there is any reasonable doubt as to his guilt. The second question concerned itself with the question of whether or not Mr. Justice McCarthy, in trying the case, had, so to speak, misdirected himself. The third question is:

Did I err in finding the appellant guilty of the charge of stealing from the post office at Calgary a post letter addressed to Mrs. C. I. McFarlane, in that the appellant alleges no guilty intent was established.

Next,

Did I err in failing to direct that no evidence was produced to prove the value of the letter forming the substance of the first charge?

Next,

Did I err in failing to direct that no evidence was produced to prove the value of the letter forming the substance of the second charge?

These questions were placed for consideration before the appellate division, and I want to read some extracts from the judgments of Mr. Justice Beck and Mr. Justice Hyndman, dealing with this matter.

Mr. CARROLL: Would the hon. member tell us briefly the decision of the Appellate Court on the second question.

Mr. SHAW: I am going to read some extracts taken from the judgments of these Appeal Court judges. The judgments themselves are rather long. Mr. Justice Beck

states, and his statement will be found at page 349, Canadian Criminal Cases, volume 38:

As I am of opinion that the conviction must be set aside and the accused discharged upon a proper view of the evidence and the judge's reasons for his decision, I refrain from a consideration of the question whether or not the accused was entitled to be tried by a jury.

Further on at page 354, he continues:

There is absolutely no direct evidence of the guilt of the accused. The evidence against him, such as it is, is wholly inferential. The evidence makes it quite clear to me that, without discrediting in the slightest degree the evidence of Black, Hale, or the constable—

And these, by the way, may I mention, are the gentlemen who framed up the scheme on this particular man:

—(I emphasize this for reasons which will appear later,) there is room for more than one reasonable hypothesis to account for the two marked one-dollar bills being found in the way described in the hands of Hazleton. I set forth these hypotheses, of course, without wishing to suggest guilt on any particular individual.

In other words, Mr. Justice Beck found, under the circumstances, that any one of a number of individuals might have committed the offence. At page 357 Mr. Justice Beck again says:

Applying these principles to the evidence I am convinced not only that had I been trying the case I should not have convicted the accused, but that, in view of the several hypotheses consistent with his innocence, there is no evidence on which he could be properly convicted. Apart from this it seems quite clear to me that the judge misdirected himself. He gave reasons for convicting the accused as follows in which I insert comments indicating which I think are objectionable features.

To my mind it is impossible, in view of the law as I have indicated it, to say that this statement by the trial judge does not indicate that he very seriously misdirected himself. This being so, in my opinion, the conviction cannot stand. If this were the only ground for quashing the conviction, of course the court would have to consider whether or not a new trial should be directed,—

And I direct the attention of the Acting Postmaster General to this:

—but in view of what I have said with reference to the evidence, I would, even if it is thought that the evidence would on a strict application of legal principles justify a conviction, I would refuse to direct a new trial.

In other words, the court is satisfied that if a new trial were directed in this particular case this man must necessarily be found innocent of the charge. Mr. Justice Hyndman also deals with the matter.

Mr. HANSON: The result of the appeal was, then, that the conviction was set aside and a new trial refused.

Mr. SHAW: Yes. I may remark, for the information of hon. members, that the court might have taken three different actions in connection with this conviction. It might have confirmed the conviction; it might have decided that there was some error in law and therefore ordered a new trial; or on the other hand it might have done, what in fact it did in this case, namely, hold that there was no evidence to justify a conviction and decide that the conviction must be quashed.

Now, that is the position in which this man finds himself, and the Postmaster General's department in regarding him as guilty of the charge is simply arrogating to itself the functions of a court of appeal from the appellate division of the Supreme Court of Alberta. The lawyer representing this accused man has been in communication with the Postmaster General's department; I do not think he has been able to get any direct word from the Postmaster General. A letter appears to have been sent under the signature of "T. P. Murphy, private secretary," and I want to direct the attention of the House to portions of it. This letter is dated the 2nd day of February and is addressed to Mr. Hayes' lawyer. It says:

I note you state that the case was appealed and the matter came before the Appeal Court. Mr. Hayes was completely exonerated by two of the judges, the third dissenting. I am given to understand that the quashing of the verdict of the lower court, on appeal being taken, was by reason of the fact that there was considerable doubt of the guilt of Mr. Hayes in connection with the theft of the letter containing the marked money, but that the judgment did not "completely exonerate" him, as you state. In other words, the appeal was quashed because there was insufficient evidence, and not because it was clearly shown that Mr. Hayes did not commit the theft.

I would ask Mr. Murphy how a court could more fully exonerate an individual than this court did. I must confess that I have never known a case in which a court has held that a person is, to use the language of this letter, completely exonerated. Any exoneration is a complete exoneration, and that is the fact in this case. This private secretary indicates that he is placing his reliance on the judgment of Mr. Justice Clarke, which in substance is the same as the argument used by the Acting Postmaster General, and then he goes on to state:

The circumstances brought out in the evidence show that Mr. Hayes was the only person who would have opportunity, without being observed by others, to steal the test letter containing the marked money, which was subsequently sent by him to the stamp clerk.

Mr. Murphy evidently sets himself up as a judge of the facts and declares that this man is the only one who could have stolen the money, notwithstanding that the Court of Appeal has held that there were numerous individuals who might have been guilty of the offence. I quote further:

Leaving aside technicalities which necessarily enter into a legal trial, the fact remains that Mr. Hayes

violated a positive rule of the service in having this letter secreted on his person, and there is strong presumptive evidence that he tampered with it.

Mr. Murphy talks about "technicalities" after the court has found that there was not sufficient evidence to justify the charge against this man. In my opinion Mr. Murphy is guilty of an unwarranted assumption of appellate court functions. He concludes:

In view of the facts above stated, this department cannot, in the public interest, accede to any request that Mr. Hayes be reinstated in the service. The necessity for preserving the safety of the mails entrusted to the care of Post Office employees, makes it impossible, after a careful consideration of all the circumstances in this case, to retain Mr. Hayes in the postal service where he would have access to the mails.

It appears therefore that Mr. Murphy accuses this man of the very crime of which he has been acquitted by the court; and I think that this is a most outrageous letter for an official to send to the lawyer representing an accused person. The government should be the last body to adopt an attitude of this kind towards a humble citizen of this country; and I urge, Mr. Speaker, that ample reparation be made this man. He has been declared innocent; in the eyes of the law he is innocent. If our law is worth anything at all he must therefore be given the benefit of that finding, and in my humble judgment he should be reinstated in his position if he desires to resume it, and should have restored to him the pension privileges of which he has been deprived. I do not think he should be eternally damned in this way and made to suffer for a crime which he never committed and of which the courts in this country have freed him.

Mr. CARROLL: Was there any finding as to the question of the denial of jury?

Mr. SHAW: I might elucidate that point which is merely a legal one. Under our Northwest Territories Act a person who is accused of the crime of theft where the value of the property is under the sum of $200 is not entitled to a jury. That is a provision of the Northwest Territories Act which has not been repealed, and consequently when Mr. Hayes found himself charged with the crime of stealing two dollars he was not entitled to a jury. In addition to that he was liable to a minimum penalty of three years in gaol. The Postmaster General mentioned the fact of his having been sentenced to three years as indicative of the enormity of the offence. Now, no one deprecates these offences more than I do, for we do require honesty in the public service; it is absolutely essential. But I want to direct the Postmaster General's attention to the fact that the minimum sentence which the court could impose for the offence was three years in gaol; and the man was under our law denied the right of a jury. He was convicted, but that conviction was set aside, and the moment that the conviction was quashed he was innocent in the eyes of the law. With the setting aside of the conviction the law regarded him as having been innocent at the time the charge was laid. I think it is only fair, Mr. Speaker, that the government, above all organizations, should assume a proper attitude in matters of this kind and not set itself in judgment above the courts of the country; and above all, this man having been found innocent, the government should make ample amends for the injustice which has been done him.

Mr. CARROLL: Did the majority of the court find that there was not sufficient evidence to convict the accused?

Mr. SHAW: They must have so found; the majority of the court must have found that there was not sufficient evidence to warrant a conviction. As a matter of fact I am sure that was the finding. Mr. Justice Hyndman in his judgment declares, that all the facts having been apparently before the trial court, that it would be useless to have a new trial since acquittal would necessarily result; and I have already read extracts also from the decision of Mr. Justice Beck indicating his view of that matter. If there had been only a legal technicality, or if there had been some doubt as to the value or the significance of the evidence, I doubt not that the Court of Appeal instead of ordering an acquittal would have ordered a new trial. That was not done, and that is the best proof that such evidence as there was was not sufficient to justify the conviction of this man.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the first information I have received of this case is that presented by the hon. members for Calgary (Mr. Irvine and Mr. Shaw). I must say that I find some difficulty in coming to a conclusion on the very brief statement of facts that has been made by the minister as well as by the hon. members to my left. So far as I have been able to gather, one Hayes, an employee of the post office at Calgary, was accused of stealing mail, was brought to trial before Mr. Justice McCarthy, and was by him convicted without a jury, the trial being in every way legal and proper. An appeal was taken to the Appellate Court of Alberta and was heard before Mr. Justice Beck, Mr.

Justice Hyndman and Mr. Justice Clarke. The appeal was on several grounds, but summing up briefly, it resulted in the quashing of the conviction on the ground of insufficiency of evidence, two of the judges being in favour of the quashing and Mr. Justice Clarke dissenting and supporting the conviction by the trial judge. It appears as well that in the judgment of the majority, given by Mr. Justice Beck and supported by Mr. Justice Hyndman, it was found that there were several explanations consistent with the innocence of the accused for the disappearance of the money in queston. The dissenting judge appears to have taken the view that the possibility of the money having been stolen by any other person was so remote that it could not be taken into account as overpowering the judgment of facts found by the trial judge.

The Post Office Department, as its conduct is defended by the minister, (Mr. Graham) takes the view that whatever the final judgment, the circumstances affecting the entire case are such that suspicion attaches to the accused, so much so that in the opinion of the department the confidence of the public could not be longer retained in him. The hon. member who has spoken last (Mr. Shaw) urges that the finding of the appellate court must be taken as establishing beyond suspicion the innocence of the accused. While as far as I can gather the facts from the debate, there does seem to be room enough for doubt to justify an acquittal, I would not like to subscribe to the proposition that the government of the country must in its decision of the fitness of an employee for office who has been charged with crime be absolutely bound by the judgment of a court. I feel that a department must be left in a position corresponding with that of the private employer. The private employer would have the right, and in justice to the shareholders of the buisness—if there were such—would be bound to exercise the right, of reviewing all the facts himself and deciding as to the qualifications and fitness of the man for a continuance of trust based upon those facts as they appeared to him.

Now, I have not been convinced that the case is so overwhelmingly in favour of the innocence of Hayes that the department is not justified in exercising its prerogative and saying that "The circumstances are at least so suspicious that we do not think he should be continued in office." It may be that on further argument the case in his favour could be made stronger, but it seems to me that a vote for the amendment is merely a vote that in all cases the judgment of a court must be final as to the retention of the

4. p.m. employee. It certainly is final in so far as it establishes that no proof has been made out of the guilt of the accused. and it is to that extent incumbent on the department, if it feels that his dismissal must take place, to effect it in such a way as to entail as little hardship on him as possible.

It does seem to me strange that Hayes must necessarily be deprived of his pension. I do not know that I got the facts in this special connection right. I understand that he was asked to resign, and declined. I do not think Hayes could have been expected to resign. He appears to have felt himself innocent, he was found innocent by the court, and resignation on his own part upon request by the department would imply something of an admission of guilt. Therefore his refusal to resign should not of itself deprive him of his pension. Though the department may be justified in regarding his case as so surrounded with suspicion that he must not be continued in a post of public trust, the department is bound to put him in a position consistent with his public service. Although for the reasons I have given I purpose voting against the amendment, I would hope that some way could be found of bringing to this man the pension of which I think he should not be deprived because of the final decision of the Court of Appeal.

Mr. ROBERT FORKE (Brandon): Mr. Speaker, I feel that we are being placed in a very awkward position. I agree very largely with the statements made by the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen): I think the government were justified under the circumstances in dispensing with Mr. Hayes' services in the Post Office Department. On the other hand, there is a doubt as to whether he was guilty or not, and I really hope that some way can be found to take care of him so that he may not suffer the loss of his pension. We cannot afford to have in the public service, more especially in the Post Office Department, a man upon whom there is the least shadow of doubt as to his character. It is all very well to say that he has been found innocent by the Court of Appeal. We know the facts of the case. There is some room for doubt, and under the circumstances I would not care to vote for the amendment. On the other hand, I would feel very guilty if by reason of the course we take now this man suffers for the remainder of his days and should after all prove to be an innocent person. I really hope the government will find some way of taking care of him.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do not think there was in the mind of any member of the government the least desire to have other than the fullest justice done by Mr. Hayes. I should like to draw the attention of the House to the manner in which this particular amendment has been introduced. Had my hon. friend who has moved the amendment seen well to go to the office of the Postmaster General and have a word with the Acting Postmaster General, I am sure he would have found no one more anxious and willing to take up this case and look carefully into it.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. IRVINE: I would just like to point out that I did what I was advised to do by those in charge of this case .I understood from them that they had done the very best they possibly could to secure remedy for this man's case and had failed. I apologise if I have not done what is the ordinary thing in cases of this kind.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend has been badly advised. If he had followed his own judgment it would I think have been better than acting upon the advice he has apparently followed. The amendment he has introduced really asks the House to record its opinion on two matters: The first is to the effect that the Post Office Department was wholly unjustified in dismissing Mr. Hayes. I would rather submit to my hon. friend that if all the circumstances which have been narrated by himself and by the seconder of his motion had come to the attention of the Post Office Department, they would not have been justified in retaining Mr. Hayes.

Mr. IRVINE: I would point out that I did not suggest that the government had overstepped its right in discharging Mr. Hayes, but I suggested that they had gone much too far when they had deprived him of his pension upon discharge after thirty-three years' service.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am glad to hear my hon. friend say that, because under those circumstances he will probably withdraw his amendment. The amendment reads:

> That the dismissal of John J. Hayes. . . . is wholly unjustifiable.

Now, my contention is that the Post Office Department, being the guardian of the public interest, and above all having to establish confidence in the handling of the mail, would have really been remiss in its duty if its officers had not under these circumstances intimated to Mr. Hayes that they could not retain him longer in the service of the department. Now as to that part of my hon. friend's resolution, I think hon. members of the House will agree practically without exception, even my hon. friend himself, that the Post Office Department were right in that particular.

Mr. IRVINE: I am sorry to have to interrupt again, but I would point out that the dismissal of this employee is inseparable from his pension rights. If he is dismissed his pension is gone. If you will fix that up, I will fix the amendment.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: As to the second part of the amendment, "and that immediate steps be taken to redress the injury done to the said John J. Hayes," if my hon. friend heard the Acting Postmaster General when he was replying to him, he will have observed that he said that if my hon. friend would come to his office and discuss this matter with him he would be very pleased to look into this case himself with a view to seeing that no injustice was inflicted on Mr. Hayes. I think that with that assurance from the Acting Postmaster General and having regard to the manner in which the amendment is drawn, my hon. friend will perhaps see his way to withdrawing the amendment and not pressing it to a division.

Mr. IRVINE: After the explanation of the Prime Minister, with the consent of the seconder and of the House I withdraw my motion.

Amendment withdrawn.

Main motion agreed to and the House went into Committee of Supply.—Mr. Gordon in the chair.

SUPPLY

DEPARTMENT OF LABOUR

Labour—salaries, $231,735; contingencies, $45,500.

Mr. BOYS: Perhaps the minister could now supply the information regarding annuities that he promised just before we rose last night.

Hon. JAMES MURDOCK (Minister of Labour): The question was asked yesterday, what proportion of the amount given in the statement that had been made was received for annuities on a three per cent basis, and what proportion on a four per cent basis, and what would be the disbursements for the same periods. The answer should have been that a four per cent interest rate has obtained since 1908, when the act came into force. Where an annuitant dies before the annuity becomes payable and the contract provides

for the return of the payments made, interest thereon at the rate of four per cent is also allowed, this rate having been raised under an amendment to the act in 1920, from three to four per cent.

The question was also asked, what were the total receipts and disbursements on annuities account since the organization of the branch. These are as follows to the 31st of March, 1922. The interest on account for the year 1922-1923 and payments to annuitants for the same period are not yet completed. I have here a statement under the caption "Dominion government annuities, progress of fund from year to year."

Mr. BOYS: Perhaps other members want that information, but as far as my question was concerned I was not anxious for that. I wanted to know the total receipts and total disbursements. I am aware that there would still be outstanding liabilities in connection with some annuities.

Mr. MURDOCK: The total receipts since the act came into force are $5,660,000. The interest amounts to $1,529,951.14, or a total of receipts and interest of $7,189,951.14. The payments to annuitants for the entire period amount to $2,184,526.72, leaving a balance as of date of $5,005,424.42.

Mr. BOYS: There are certain obligations which belong to the department, I presume, in connection with annuities which were placed, the annuitants having died but the annuities being payable to others, for a period of five, six or seven years, the balance of a ten or twenty year period as the case may be.

Mr. MURDOCK: I am not sure—

Mr. BOYS: Perhaps I can make myself plainer. As I understand it, there is a system by which an annuity may be purchased and if the annuitant dies within ten years the annuity is still payable to persons named for the balance of the period whatever it may be —generally ten years, I imagine. To that extent there would be outstanding obligations against this surplus of nearly $5,000,000. To ascertain whether or not the branch is paying one would have to know something of these outstanding obligations. If they are not very extensive one would be forced to the conclusion that the time, perhaps, is ripe now when these annuities should be placed on a five per cent basis—which the minister has in contemplation—rather than on a four per cent. That is, if it is not the intention of the department to try and make money out of this particular branch of the service—and I understand such is not the intention of the department.

Mr. MURDOCK: I think I have here the information that is desired by the hon. gentleman: An annuitant might have in hand a few hundred dollars which he would like to apply on account of the purchase so as to reduce the annual payments thereafter to be made; or he might wish to pay a specific sum, say $100 or $200 a year, to secure at a stated age the annuity which such payments would give him; or, if he is a young married man, the class of annuity which should interest him most would be a deferred last survivor annuity on the lives of himself and wife jointly, to be purchased by monthly payments, with a return to their heirs of the purchase money and interest if both should die before the annuity became payable; or the annuity desired might be an immediate annuity purchasable for cash on the lives of two persons payable so long as both lived, with a certain amount to the survivor; or it might be the kind of annuity in regard to which the hon. member for Simcoe said he had interviewed the superintendent, namely, an immediate annuity on the lives of two persons, the annuity to be paid to the purchaser so long as he lived, with the full amount to the survivor so long as he or she lived; the rates for all of which are not printed for distribution, and have to be calculated by the actuarial staff as required. It would be the work of years to prepare the tables which would be required to meet all such cases.

Annuities are not being sold for gain, and it was never intended that they should be. Whether the government might or might not lose a few thousand dollars by such a proposition would seem to me to be a matter of secondary importance to that of encouraging our people to be thrifty and saving, and of furnishing them with the facilities for investing their money with absolute security. The rate of interest on which annuity values are calculated is, as I have previously stated, 4 per cent. That was the rate fixed in the regulations of 1908, and the rate has obtained ever since. Where an annuitant dies before the annuity becomes payable, and the contract provides for the return of the payments made, interest thereon at the rate of 4 per cent is also allowed, the rate having been raised under an amendment to the act in 1920 from 3 to 4 per cent; but in order to secure this additional interest the premium rate had also to be increased. Does this give the information desired by my hon. friend?

Mr. BOYS: The minister has given me most of the information but I think one point still remains to be cleared up. There appears to be to the credit of this branch a surplus, which has accrued during the fourteen-year period, of $5,005,425. Now, that would be profit with the one exception that you must deduct from it the obligations connected with the two plans that the minister has just referred to. Is it not possible to find out to what extent money should be retained to take care of those obligations—the difference between the five millions and that being really what this department has profited during the fourteen years—and if it is anything like the sum of $5,000,000, I think it would be an easy matter to come to the conclusion that the department has now reached the point when the rate of interest should be five per cent. I believe myself there is a great field for this security and the government requires money. It might as well get the money this way and if the people of Canada can be given a reasonable return for their money I should think they would take advantage of it. Four per cent is certainly not a satisfactory or productive return. But the government can make it productive. Let us have a little publicity, let all the postmasters throughout the country have this information for the benefit of those who seek it, and I believe that instead of reaching one million dollars—and I am glad to know that last year the receipts of this branch amounted to that sum—if the return to the people be raised the government will get a very considerable sum of money and this will prove an excellent and safe investment as against old age.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I believe that the real difficulty we are all in is that we do not know what we can do. I do not know that the minister can tell us where we are and therefore what we could do in moving towards a more liberal policy having regard to annuities. Before we get to that it is, of course, necessary to know what we have been doing. As I understand it—I was not here when the figures were last discussed—we now have a credit of some $5,000,000. Of course, that credit of five millions may mean a lot of money or may mean nothing at all; it may mean a very large profit or it may mean an absolute loss. But the minister has his tables worked out on the regular actuarial expectation of life, on a four and on a five per cent basis, and those tables will tell him just what reductions have to be made in connection with that sum of money. The House ought to know whether we are making or whether we are losing; and if we are making money, why we might not in future make a little less in order to earn a great deal more in ease of the Department of Finance. It is not a matter of guesswork, it is a matter of actuarial computation. The minister must have computations in the department. Perhaps he can tell us now just what actuarial reserve out of that five millions is necessary to meet the claims, based on the usual expectation of life, from the two classes.

Mr. MURDOCK: I am very sorry but I do not think that the information requested by the hon. gentlemen has ever been compiled in connection with the Annuities branch of the service. My hon. friend (Sir Henry Drayton) refers to what the Department of Finance might do in regard to this matter. I may say that the matter of increasing the allowance from a four to a five per cent basis has been under discussion for some time. Those authorized to consider and deal with these matters in the Department of Finance have indicated the belief that it might not be altogether safe to adopt the 5 per cent basis because of the possible loss that might accrue. During the last year I understand that, on the 4 per cent basis, the Annuities branch broke a little better than even, with, I think, $2,800 to the good, but I do not think the matter has been gone into by anyone to determine just what the profit or loss has been. I think the statement that was made a little while ago that it should not be considered altogether on that basis is a sound one. Personally, I agree with the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Boys) who suggested that if the rate of interest were made sufficiently attractive we would enlarge the scope of the department, would not lose any great amount of money, even on that basis, and would have the use of a great deal of money invested by the citizens of Canada.

Mr. BOYS: I have not yet got what I want. Perhaps the minister cannot give it to me. Has he under advisement the question of whether the rate should be raised to 5 per cent or not, and what information is it he is considering? He finds that at this period he actually has a surplus of $5,000,000 odd. That is profit, with the one exception that he must take a sufficient sum of money to take care of the outstanding obligations to which he has referred. If we could only find out from the actuary what sum of money would be required, we would go a long way towards finding out whether or not this annuity system could be placed on the 5 per cent basis.

I wish to refer to another matter. We have in Ontario a savings bank carried on by the government of Ontario.

Mr. FIELDING: Not a bank.

Mr. BOYS: I forgot really what name I have seen on the outside of the various offices. It is a provincial savings bank.

Mr. FIELDING: The name "bank" cannot be used for the Ontario business.

Mr. BOYS: I appreciate that, and I am in error in using the word "bank," but as far as the public are concerned, they view it in that way. It is a provincial savings institution. There is one not very far from the Parliament Buildings. We have them in Toronto and elsewhere in the province. We can take our money and place it in one of these institutions. With regard to the annuity of $1,000 which has been mentioned, the cash payment asked by this branch for that annuity was $15,000, which was estimated on a 4 per cent basis. How can the branch expect to do much business, when the same individual who might want an annuity could deposit his $15,000 in this provincial institution, get 4 per cent as long as he wanted it, and at the end of the period get his $15,000 back whereas by the system now in vogue in the Annuities branch. he would get $1,000 a year for his expectation of life, as long as he lived, and if his wife survived she would get it afterwards, for a period at the outside of 15 years. At the end of that time the $15,000 would be gone. If a man has $15,000, is he going to hesitate as to whether he should place it on deposit at 4 per cent, having the province of Ontario behind him, knowing he can get that rate of interest upon his money, and have the $15,000 at the end of the period, or purchase an annuity? I submit he would not hesitate very long. If annuities were placed on a 5 per cent basis, they would be attractive, and he would accept it; the government would get the benefit of the money, and the annuitant would be protected in his old age.

I want to ascertain how much of that $5,000,000 cash on hand should be retained to take care of outstanding obligations. I understand there is a plan whereby an annuity may be purchased on a ten-year basis. It will be payable to the annuitant for his or her life, but if he or she dies before the expiration of the ten-year period it will still be paid to whomever may be designated for the balance of the term. It stands to reason that a sum of money must be held to guard against these payments. There is also the other feature that annuities are purchased by laying aside certain annual payments to take care of them, and that money is on hand and must be kept on hand to take care of that situation. So far as I know, outside of these two features, this entire $5,000,000 balance—a large sum, in view of the business that is done, is on hand. If the minister has not the information, I wish he would get it so that we may be able to form our own opinion as to whether the time is not ripe and overdue when annuities should be placed on a 5 per cent basis.

Mr. MURDOCK: In considering the $5,000,000 surplus, you must take into consideration that there are 5,643 annuitants who stand to benefit proportionately from that, and, therefore, it cannot be regarded as a $5,000,000 surplus.

Mr. BOYS: I quite appreciate that. A great many of these annuitants have reached the expectation of life or very nearly so. Some of these annuities, of course, have recently been purchased, and the payments will have to go on. I want to find out how much money would have to be held to take care of them; the balance would be profit.

Mr. MURDOCK: Of course, that information could be procured, but I might state that there has never been any opportunity given to the department to find out anything of this kind—

Mr. BOYS: Why?

Mr. MURDOCK: —to the general extent that I think it should have been.

Mr. BOYS: The department has an actuary?

Mr. MURDOCK: Yes.

Mr. BOYS: What is he there for?

Mr. MURDOCK: There has never been as much interest, I think, in Dominion government annuities as on this occasion, for which I am personally thankful, and I hope the hon. member from Simcoe will have his wishes realized and a 5 per cent interest payment guaranteed for Dominion government annuities. I think it will do just exactly what he believes it will do—largely increase the sale of Dominion government annuities.

Mr. HOCKEN: Does the Superintendent of Insurance exercise any supervision over this fund?

Mr. MURDOCK: Not directly. But this department, of course, asks his advice as to the consistency and safety of changing a 4 per cent rate to a 5 per cent rate.

Mr. HOCKEN: This, of course, is an insurance fund handled by the government, and having the government behind it, but I think it ought to come under the same supervision

as any other insurance fund, and it strikes me that if this Annuity branch went about its work with the energy that ought to be applied to it, it should be possible to get all the business of that kind that is done in the country. You ought to be able to get better results at lower rates than any other insurance company. The government has no dividends to pay. The cost of management ought to be cut down to a minimum, an annuity ought to be purchasable from this fund at a lower rate than from any company, and if the people of Canada were properly approached and made familiar with the scheme in any way the department might discover to be effective, I believe there would be a very large increase in the number of those who would purchase such annuities. It is an old age pension operating, in my judgment, under the very best conditions that could be adopted, because it is a man's own thrift that secures for him the necessities of his old age. There is no element of party in it or anything of that kind. This is one feature of government policy that might be developed more thoroughly and energetically than it has been, with good results to both the annuitant and the country.

Mr. FIELDING: I have not had this matter before me for some time, and I did not have the good fortune to hear what was said on the matter before. I am not clear as to the meaning of this $5,000,000 surplus, if it be a surplus. I know the whole purpose of the organization has been, not to make money, but to afford an excellent opportunity of exercising thrift with the security of the country behind it. The 4 per cent rate was established in the belief that that was a fair value for the money. Then, in addition to that, there was the cost of operation. I think it was well understood from the beginning that the government would have to bear the cost of management, and the people investing their money in annuities would get the full benefit of the 4 per cent. Some months ago, I think, the Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock), raised the question whether we could not afford to raise the basis to 5 per cent. I had the matter referred to one of the officials of the department, and he advised that this would not be profitable; that it would not help the financial situation and would be a burden to the country. There is, however, no finality in that. Rates of interest vary, and I am not prepared to say that we could not under any circumstances allow 5 per cent. I think the information asked for by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Boys) can be secured, and I am sure the Minister of Labour will be glad to procure it, if possible, and to bring it down at a later date.

If we can give the facilities of this institution to the people without incurring any very considerable increase of expense, that should be done. I quite agree with what has been said by hon. gentlemen opposite as to the character of the business. In the early days, when this organization was established, we appointed lecturers for the purpose of making the people understand the matter. It is unfortunate, perhaps, under circumstances into which I need not enter now, that the services of these lecturers were dispensed with. We were told that the business was to be handled by the post offices. Soon after that policy was adopted, down in a distant portion of my province, I thought I would go and see what the postmaster knew about it. When I asked him about the matter, he asked me three or four questions as to what I was driving at. When I explained matters to him, he said that he did not know anything about it. I said: "I am told that literature has been forwarded to you." He said: "Has it?" He said that he did not know; that he would look for it, and at last acounts he had not found it. I am not complaining of any particular postmaster in this regard. This matter is like insurance. How many of us would have taken out insurance policies if some energetic agents had not canvassed us and pointed out the virtues of the system? While this is an excellent system, it does not reach the people; by merely placing literature in the hands of postmasters, you cannot bring the matter before the public properly. I am glad to have this attention given to the subject, and I think we might look into it again and see, before the session is over, whether we cannot afford to adopt the 5 per cent basis. The government are not going to approach this matter in any niggardly spirit. We are not going to be on easy street as regards money; but we can always get money, and I am not disposed to resort to this merely as a means of getting money. If we can get money at fair rates and at the same time establish this as a means of encouraging thrift, by all means we ought to do so.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I know the situation is much as has been stated by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding). We might, perhaps, make a little headway if we were to apply the ordinary actuarial methods and find out where we are. My impression is that we can do much better than we have been doing. In this instance, we ought to be able

to do business much more cheaply than insurance companies, although as a matter of fact, we are selling annuities generally more expensively than they are. I may be wrong, but I believe I am absolutely correct in that statement. What I mean is that you can get better rates from an insurance company paying a dividend than you can from the government which pays no dividend. We should be able to do better than they, because we are under no cost of investment for this scheme. The money all goes into the fund without paying any percentages or commissions or anything else to anybody. We have the money, and there is no expense whatever in connection with the administration of the fund as such. Therefore, again we should be able to do business a little more reasonably and profitably to the people of Canada than insurance companies could.

I appreciate what my hon. friend says as to the difficulty of raising rates. When the four per cent annuity was first started, we had the government borrowing at something like 3½ per cent, sometimes 3¼ per cent, and the idea of the annuity rate was a rate which would yield the annuitant a higher rate than government borrowing would. Ordinarily, that would be the case. Lately, however, we have been in the anomalous position—and I am to blame for it too; I am not criticizing my hon. friend for it at all; we should have taken up this matter before—that we have been actually paying more interest on a thirty-year debenture, at the end of which time the whole capital comes back, than we calculate our annuities at for a much less period. That, of course, is all out of joint; it is all wrong. You cannot expect to do very much with annuities on that basis. I think my hon. friend is right when he says that we are going to have cheaper money. If we get out a number of annuities at a higher rate, we are bound to lose money. While the government ought not to make money in this connection, it ought not to lose money, and therefore we should be careful. While that is quite true as regards long-term annuities, this annuity business can be looked upon as a liquid business, something similar to loans, and a higher rate can be properly applied to short-term annuities. One always pays more for a short-term annuity, and it is money which is just as useful as any other kind of annuity. We know, however, we are going to be paying a high rate of interest for some time ahead, and I would suggest to my hon. friend that he consider an extension of the rate, at least, as regards short-term annuities.

Mr. BOYS: I understood from the Minister of Labour that the raising of the rate was under consideration, whereas I understand from the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) that he had the matter looked into, but that the actuaries considered—

Mr. FIELDING: Not lately. Some time ago.

Mr. BOYS: Perhaps the Minister of Labour has taken the matter up again. When he reflects that on $15,000 at 6 per cent, which rate for ordinary investment purposes cannot be considered high, because hardly any investments pay less than 6 per cent except government securities—you get $900 return, and purchasing an annuity you get only $100 more on the basis now existing, surely he must realize that that is not attractive to any investor. One would sooner put his money out on a mortgage or some other absolutely safe security at 6 or 6½ per cent. There is no difficulty in getting 6½ per cent on absolutely safe investments to-day, and that would produce just about as much as the annuity does. In the one case, the money is gone and in the other, you have it. I hope the minister will take this matter up seriously and see if it cannot be placed on a 5 per cent basis. It is not surprising that the minister is not able at the moment to give these figures, because I understand this branch of the government service has recently come into his hands. It would, indeed, be somewhat remarkable if he could give these figures, although I thought he might, because we were discussing this matter some days ago and the officials knew what was wanted. These figures, however, are not available now, and I will content myself with the observation that I hope before many months we shall find this on a 5 per cent basis. I feel certain if we do that, a considerable amount of money will come into the treasury of Canada.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Coming back to the question of the number of employees in the minister's department, last evening the minister told us that it caused him a great deal of pain when he was forced to discharge an employee. We know that the minister has a very kindly disposition, and last year, possibly with that fact in view, the House helped him a good deal by asking him to reduce his estimates, thus taking upon itself the burden of the responsibility for the reduction accomplished in the number of employees. I would suggest now that if the minister, in his goodness of heart, does not want to take the initiative the House might again come to his assistance by formally requesting him to reduce his estimates

another $10,000. No doubt he would come through this year, as he did last year, with flying colours and again thank the House for being instrumental in making the reduction.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I would draw my hon. friend's attention to some figures in connection with the cost of living and ask him to inform the committee what particular items are chiefly responsible for the unfortunate condition they reveal. I am referring to Michell's figures. These figures are printed in the Labour Gazette, so that the minister will know all about them. Michell shows that the cost of living in January, 1922, was 165.2 and in February last 176.3. The minister might tell us the different items that are working in the wrong direction.

Mr. MURDOCK: If my hon. friend looks a little further down he will see that Michell's figures reflect trade conditions and do not deal with the cost of living as it is dealt with in the Labour department. His figures have reference to general trade conditions rather than to the actual cost of living.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Perhaps the minister might inform us how Michell's figures are arrived at.

Mr, MURDOCK: I do not think I could begin to determine just how Michell prepares his figures.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: They are published in the Labour Gazette and I suppose they are understood by the Labour department. If they were not worth something they would not be in the Gazette. However, they may be used as padding.

Mr. MURDOCK: They are there as indicating the Michell view of trade conditions, and not as determining the upward or downward changes in the cost of living.

Mr. BOYS: As a matter of fact, is not the cost of living rising? The figure quoted the other evening, which was not contradicted at all by the minister, was 22 points. I am not quite familiar with the figures, but I think the quotation was some twenty odd points.

Mr. MURDOCK: Twenty-two points from what period?

Mr. BOYS: From last year.

Mr. MURDOCK: Nothing of the kind.

Mr. BOYS: Then perhaps the minister will give us the figures.

Mr. MURDOCK: We have here a chart which was prepared by the Labour department at the request of the right hon. the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) during the Lanark election, and which has now been brought up to date as at the end of March. This chart indicates that for December, 1921, when the present government took office, all the cost of living figures, that is to say, of the chief items such as foods, fuel, rent, clothing and such sundries, were 62 points above the 1913 cost of living figures. In April, 1922, the figure was 52 points, or a drop of 10 points. In July, 1922, it was also 52 points or 10 points below the December, 1921, figure.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is my hon. friend quite right there? I think it was 55. In April it was 52, but the budget came and it went up 3 points.

Mr. MURDOCK: In July, 1922, the figure shown is 52.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am taking the minister's chart, by which I see that the figure is still climbing up. It is up to 60 now.

Mr. MURDOCK: In September, 1922, it was still 52, while in December of that year it had risen one point, or 53. For January, 1923, we find that it has risen another point, being at that time 54, while in February it remains the same. In March it was 55, or an increase of one point.

Mr. HANSON: So that it is going up.

Mr. MURDOCK: It shows a slight advance, as hon. gentlmen know there has always been in Canada for many years in the winter. With the increased cost of fuel and other winter necessities there has always been a slight increase.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think that if the minister looks at his own chart closely he will not tell us that there is always an increase. His own chart shows that in 1920 there was a toboggan slide until you get to 1922. From 1920 it is going down all the time, winter included. There is practically a toboggan slide until my hon. friend gets fairly into the saddle. When the government gets the new mechanism to work the figures begin to climb up, and we desire to know the reason for their going up instead of down.

Mr. MURDOCK: There has been no exceptional change during the winter season. My hon. friend refers—

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: To your own chart.

Mr. MURDOCK: —with heroic declamation to the year 1920 and to the upward trend since that time. He declares that the figures have gone away up.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Off the paper.

Mr. MURDOCK: No one knows better than my hon. friend that the increase prior to the great decline was due to the abnormal post-war increases of wages all over the United States and Canada. He knows also that immediately after July, 1920, everything started on the toboggan slide towards normal. In 1920 we had the 200 mark increase recorded on the chart, and it went above that. Subsequently it came down until we find it in 1922 at 156, or 56 points above the 1913 normal figures.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I would ask my hon. friend to check me while I go over his chart, which I cannot read as well as he can. Take the year 1921. The drop in the cost of living in that year was some 38 points. Am I right?

Mr. MURDOCK: Right.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: And that since the time my friend was referring to in December 1921, when he took office, the drop in the cost of living as recorded by his department on his own chart is just two points.

Mr. MURDOCK: No, my hon. friend is in error. There was a ten point drop.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am not going through all the ups and downs of his curve. Is not the difference between now and then two points?

Mr. MURDOCK: Up to the 31st day of March last there is a seven-point drop as compared with the figures for December 1921.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then will my hon. friend please tell me how he gets seven on his chart for that year, because he will see that for the end of 1921 it shows 157 and for March 31st of this year, where his chart stops, it shows 155?

Mr. MURDOCK: Evidently the hon. gentleman is looking at something entirely different to what I am dealing with.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: This is the chart of the department referred to by my friend.

Mr. MURDOCK: But it does not contain all the facts. Evidently the hon. gentleman has not got his chart brought up to date. The one I have before me is brought up to March 1923.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: So is this. I regret very much, Mr. Chairman, if the department is giving us incorrect information It may be that the minister is all right, and his statisticians are all wrong. I am going to send this map over to the minister and ask him to correct it so we can get at the facts.

Mr. MURDOCK: There does not appear to be any difference between these two.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not think so. I again put the question to the minister: Am I not right when I say, looking at his map, that the index number at the end of 1921 was 157, and at the end of March this year was 155?

Mr. MURDOCK: Yes. I am told there are some typographical errors in the printing, December and September having been transposed, and that the index figure did show 156 at the conclusion of 1921.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: 156; and to-day it is 155?

Mr. MURDOCK: 155 as of March 31.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: So the net result for a little more than a year—fifteen months—is one degree.

Mr. MURDOCK: My hon. friend realizes that it fell from 156 to 152 and has gradually risen to 155 since December last.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Quite so. I was sympathizing with the minister, Mr. Chairman. He used to make tremendous speeches against the sales tax and that sort of thing, pointing out what a burden it was. We got the cost of living travelling down nicely until April of that year, and then in came the new budget and the figure went up again. My friend is doing his best to straddle it, but it is lifting him.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I did not draw an answer from the minister in respect to the number of employees in his department. He very kindly listened to what I had to say and then smiled as if he probably would take advantage of the suggestion I made; but he did not tell us anything. Last night I pointed out that he had twenty statistical clerks in 5 p.m. his office. He has a department which is spending about a million and a half dollars. Let us suppose a business house doing a business of, say, a million and a half dollars, and then let us consider the overhead such a business would be carrying if it employed 97 clerks and 27 statistical clerks. Could such a business be considered at any time as properly managed if so over-staffed? I think the minister had better take advantage of the way the matter was handled last year. Why not adopt our suggestion of a reduction of $10,000 in these estimates and let some of

these men go to work? We are getting back to better times this summer, probably, and these men had better be engaged in some productive work.

Item agreed to.

Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, $35,000.

Mr. MURDOCK: This amount has been voted for a number of years.

Mr. ARTHURS: Why?

Mr. MURDOCK: To pay those who, in connection with boards of investigation, inquire into industrial disputes. The amount for this particular fiscal year is overdrawn $4,000, and there is before the committee in the Supplementary Estimates a request for $4,000. In other words, the expenditures for the past fiscal year have been $39,000. We believe though that we can get along with $35,000 for the present fiscal year.

Mr. MANION: How many industrial disputes were there in Canada this year as compared with last year and the year before?

Mr. MURDOCK: Disputes or strikes?

Mr. MANION: I really meant strikes.

Mr. MURDOCK: Of course, there are many disputes where no strikes result. There were eighty-five strikes in existence in Canada in the calendar year 1922, which was fifteen less than in 1921. In 1922, however, the total number of employees affected, and consequently the time loss, was greater than in the previous year. When we come to analyse the figures however we see that the increase in the number of employees affected and the time loss is attributable largely to fifteen strikes which commenced in the previous year, in the month of May, I think, and which had their genesis in the movement which started in the Untied States for the forty-four hour week. I am referring particularly to a number of strikes in the printing trades which started in May, 1921, and which, as a matter of fact are nominally, and so far as the records of our department are concerned, still in effect in various printing establishments throughout Canada, but what damage as a strike they are doing, I could not say without investigation of each individual case. There were also the two large coal strikes which it might be said were wings of the main army of coal strikes which commenced in the central competitive coal fields of the United States last year.

Mr. MANION: That is in Alberta and Cape Breton?

[Mr. Chaplin.]

Mr. MURDOCK: Alberta and Nova Scotia. The number of employees affected and the time loss resulting from these disputes if deducted for the last year would give us a time loss of 169,185 working days lower than in any year except 1902 and 1915. In 1922 there were only seventeen strikes in the building trades, affecting 1,396 employees and involving a time loss of 28,247 days. Of these only three caused a time loss of more than 5,000 days. Six of the seventeen lasted less than seven days, and only five continued thirty days or more. In 1921 there were thirty-six strikes in the building trades, affecting 4,004 employees and involving a time loss of 153,-372 days.

Mr. MANION: Could the minister tell the committee how many threatened strikes were prevented from culminating in a strike by the conciliation method under the old Lemieux Act? I want just the figures for last year and the year before.

Mr. MURDOCK: In 1919-1920 there were 72 applications for boards of investigation and 46 boards were granted. In three cases in which the dispute was submitted to a board of investigation a strike was not averted; in other words, three strikes resulted. In 1920-1921 the number of applications for boards of investigation was 63, and the number of boards granted was 37 with six strikes resulting. In 1921-1922, the number of applications for boards of investigation was 49 and the number of boards granted was 31. In one case where the dispute was submitted to a board of investigation a strike resulted. For the past year there were 39 applications for boards of investigation, and 27 boards were granted. In two cases strikes were not averted.

Mr. ARTHURS: Are those two included in the applications granted?

Mr. MURDOCK: Yes. Those were two cases where a strike resulted after a board had been granted, and had sat and filed an award. It is only proper to say, however, in connection with the one big strike where the time loss was most in evidence, that is the strike in District No. 18, involving the coal mines of Alberta and British Columbia, the board was only granted and finally got to the point of functioning on the 31st day of March, and the strike had been ordered to commence on the 1st day of April, or the very next day; so there was no possibility under the circumstances of preventing that strike in what was just one little wing of the general coal miners' strike in the United States. It was finally settled on the same basis as the general coal miners' strike in the United States.

Mr. MANION: In what lines of industry are these requests granted, and secondly, outside of these regular lines in which requests for boards are granted, does the department ever take part in bringing about a conciliation board?

Mr. MURDOCK: Oh, yes. Very frequently there are cases where municipal employees, for instance, ask for a board of investigation. We have two or three such pending now. In these cases the department is not free under the law to say arbitrarily that a board shall be appointed, but we at once accept an application for a board whether it comes from the employees or the employer, and it is the employees as a rule, and in such a case we ask the municipality if they are willing to become party to a board of investigation of the dispute which has been referred to us. If they indicate their desire to participate in such an investigation, we ask them to name a representative on the board, which presumably the employees have already done, and then ask the two to choose a chairman, and so on. In other words, we help in every way possible to bring about the formation of a board, to delay a strike and bring about an investigation of the differences involved to see if a satisfactory settlement cannot be arrived at. That must be our attitude on all disputes, excepting those which affect public utilities or coal mines. We have under the act, as hon. gentlemen know, no jurisdiction over very many of the disputes that occur from time to time. For instance, in the case of disputes in the building trades or in the steel works at Sydney, Nova Scotia, we have no authority, under the law, to arbitrarily say "You shall do this or you shall do the other thing." The Industrial Disputes Investigation Act does not apply in the case of the Dominion Iron and Steel Company, but the department has always stood ready and anxious to use its friendly offices and to suggest any possible means of bringing the parties together and getting a thorough discussion of the questions in dispute.

Mr. MANION: Just to finish the subject, will the minister enumerate in a few words the different lines of industry which have the right, under the act, to get conciliation boards?

Mr. MURDOCK: The railroads and coal mines.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I should like to ask if the government cannot find it possible to extend the application of the Industrial Disputes Act so as to cover cases that are not at present covered? For example, there is the case of public utilities. As the principle of public control extends, and municipal enterprises grow a larger and larger number of workmen come under public utilities but apparently these have not the same opportunities as if they were in the employ of private concerns. Only the other day my attention was drawn to a telegram that was sent to the Minister of Labour from the Canadian Electrical Workers Union to the following effect:

> I am instructed to ask if Toronto Transportation Commission comes within provision of Industrial Disputes Act. Reasons for question is possible dispute with Toronto Transportation Commission and if they come under act strike would in all probability be averted. Have not yet broken off negotiations with commission but fear that attitude of commission will not be satisfactory to electrical workers employed. Please reply by return.
>
> JAMES T. GUNN,
> 4 Alexander street,
> Toronto, Ont.

I believe the reply received from the Deputy Minister of Labour was to the effect that the Industrial Disputes Act did not apply in this case. I now ask, would it not be possible to introduce legislation this session which would bring these industries, publicly owned, under this act and thus prevent strikes of this character?

Mr. MURDOCK: First of all, I should give my hon. friend from Fort William and Rainy River (Mr. Manion) a little further explanation. I told him a little while ago that railroads and coal mines, under the act, have the right to be granted investigation boards. I should have included also certain public utilities, such as gas plants or waterworks supplying a city. It has been held—I do not know whether it is right or not; I do not know whether the contention would be upheld—that only those classes can insist, under the law, on a board of investigation.

In answer to my hon. friend from Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth) I can say that nothing I know of would please me better than to even suggest that it might be possible to do what I understand he contemplates. The Labour department is criticized for very many acts of omission or commission. I do hope, however, that no hon. gentleman, or any other citizen of Canada, is going to criticize the department because the British North America Act, many years ago, gave the provinces exclusive jurisdiction over property and civil rights within provincial limits. At this particular time I am told—not being a legal man I cannot say with any certainty—that law prevents the possibility of extending the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act so as to include the undertakings to which my hon. friend referred a moment ago. It might also be of interest to my hon.

friend and to the committee if I stated that in the case of the first three or four, possibly more, proposed investigations that came to the Labour department after I took office it was questioned whether any right whatsoever existed under the act, excepting in the case of a railroad, to compel the appointment and meeting of a board of investigation, under the provisions of the act. In other words, my hon. friend will be interested in knowing that it has been seriously questioned whether the act is not ultra vires—I think that is the legal term—of the Dominion authority entirely. My answer to that position in every case was: We at least know what the spirit and intent of the act is. The spirit and intent of the act is that opportunity shall be afforded of meeting and discussing matters of difference; presenting them before presumably an unbiassed tribunal, or a tribunal of which it is hoped at least one member is unbiassed; and after a full and frank discussion of all the points of difference, seeing if we cannot arrive at some common basis of settlement. That is the underlying spirit of the act, and I am glad indeed to say that the majority of the employers throughout the length and breadth of Canada accept the act in that spirit. I may say concretely and in answer to my hon. friend's question, I do not think it is possible to extend—but this is only my own personal opinion—the provisions of the act so as to compulsorily make it applicable to all disputes that may occur in the various municipalities throughout the Dominion.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I have one other question, and that is as to whether it is not possible to do something at the present time in connection with what threatens to be a serious condition down in Cape Breton. It has been my responsibility on several occasions in this House to call attention to the difficulties there, and it would seem as if very strained relations now exist between the employers—the British Empire Steel Corporation—and their employees—the steel workers and the coal miners. I am not particularly concerned as to who has jurisdiction in this dispute. It may be quite true that the British North America Act makes it difficult for this House, or the department, to act in certain provincial matters; but it does seem to me that the Department of Labour ought to be held responsible for initiating such legislation, or for bringing before the people such measures, as will prevent possible outbreaks in that Nova Scotia district. I think that a great many people have clearly recognized that the conditions there are now rather unique—a huge corporation controlling practically the whole of the industries of that part of the country, there being apparently a small population there and no large body of what has often been termed "neutral opinion". Under these circumstances, the employees are being forced to direct action. A letter was forwarded only a few days ago to the Prime Minister which I should like to read, for the information of this committee:

> We desire to call your attention to the following facts. Some three weeks ago, Mr. Roy Wolvin, president of the British Empire Steel Corporation, addressed a closed meeting of the Sydney board of trade. His address was of such a character in his own estimation, that although reporters of the local newspapers were present, it was suppressed as being unfit for publication at his request.
>
> However, we have been reliably informed that he stated to the members of the board of trade, that it was up to them to drive the radicals out of Cape Breton, or he would withdraw his capital from this island and allow the grass to grow on the streets of Sydney.
>
> As a direct result of this suppressed speech a second meeting of the board of trade was held in Sydney this present week, an account of which you may find in the Sydney Record of March 28th. The heading of the article reads: "Citizens call for drive to wipe out Bolshevism in Cape Breton". The particular brand of "Bolshevism" which the board of trade is going to stamp out is described as "Cape Breton Bolshevism". The whole resolution breathes the spirit of Mussolini without having the open courage of Mussolini behind it.
>
> "Cape Breton Bolshevism" consists in the working class of Cape Breton employed in the steel works and the coal mines exercising the right handed down to them by their British forefathers to walk off the steel plant to the last man employed and to walk out of the coal mines and leave the directors of the British Empire Steel Corporation to care for these plants as best they may. This right is being exercised in Cape Breton because of the fierce exploitation of labour carried on by the British Empire Steel Corporation.
>
> We are writing this to inform you and your government that ten thousand working men in Cape Breton are accepting the challenge of the Sydney board of trade and are inviting them to start in now and drive out the humblest "Bolshevic" in our ranks. We also demand that a thorough investigation by your government be made into the speech delivered by Wolvin before the Sydney board of trade, which was suppressed.
>
> Copies of this letter are being forwarded to the Hon. E. H. Armstrong, and C. C. Curtis, president of the Sydney Board of Trade.
>
> Yours truly,
>
> PAUL MCNEIL, Secretary,
> Steel Workers Union.
>
> J. B. MCLACHLAN, Secretary,
> Dis. No. 26 U.M.W. of A.

Mr. SHAW: Could my hon. friend inform the House as to whether or not the Roy Wolvin referred to is the Roy Wolvin, an employee of the Standard Shipping Company, whose operations in fixing rates on the Great Lakes have been the subject of investigation by a special commission?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I have understood so. I have nothing more to add, Mr. Chairman, except that it seems to me to be a serious situation, and that the government of Canada, whether it has the protection of the right of property in the provinces or not, has the protection of the citizens of this country in its charge, and that something ought to be done to prevent this matter developing further.

Mr. MURDOCK: The hon. member for Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth) and I are surely going to agree on one thing, and that is that this is a serious situation which should be dealt with in some way, and it has been a serious situation for a number of years. But I hope the hon. member will admit the limitations of the federal Department of Labour to deal with the questions involved. The British Empire Steel Corporations is operating, as I understand, under a Nova Scotia charter; the mines, the steel works and the other properties of that company are in the province of Nova Scotia. The disputes that have occurred from time to time have occurred in Nova Scotia, and on every occasion, that the Labour department has had an opportunity to do so, it has indicated a readiness to do, within the law, everything possible to bring about, by investigation or otherwise, a settlement of the controversies. As I said a few days ago, one of the first official acts I was called upon to perform, about the 1st of January, 1922, was to appoint a chairman for a board of investigation in regard to the coal mine situation in Nova Scotia, which board had been authorized and established and was waiting the appointment of a chairman when this government took office. It is not necessary to go into a discussion of what developed out of that investigation. Some members might very truthfully say to me—and I would not dispute it if they did—that worse than nothing came out of the investigation held in the early part of 1922. But is that to be charged to the Labour department? Is that to be charged to this government? Is there any coercive right vested in the Labour department or in this government that gives us authority to say "Thou shalt" or "Thou shalt not" to either employer or employee? If there is I know nothing of it. But still it is very easy, in fact it is customary, when any dispute develops in any part of the country, in any walk of life, to turn to the federal Labour department, which may not have, under the law, anything to do with it, and to criticize that department for its omissions or its commissions in the matter. I am sure my hon. friends will recognize the fact that we have in Canada nine provinces, most of which have Labour departments with certain duties, functions and rights, that the Labour department of the federal government has only the rights conceded to it under the law and, that it is ready and willing to do anything it can to bring about thorough investigation with a view to the settlement of the disputes.

In regard to the particular situation that my hon. friend speaks of in Nova Scotia, what do we find at the present moment? What might be termed a club is held over the heads of the people of Nova Scotia, by labour, it is said. In other words, it has been indicated that a strike is going to occur on the 1st day of April unless 30 per cent increased compensation be granted, unless an eight-hour day be conceded and unless a check-off system be recognized by the employing company. As the Labour department of the federal government we might be interested in that, but I would like any hon. member to indicate to me how, in any particular, we can interfere and say "Thou shalt" or "Thou shalt not" to either employer or employee concerned. In other words, we have absolute limitations that I hope my hon. friends will appreciate before holding, as people are sometimes too ready to do, the Labour department responsible for all the disputes that are inevitable.

In the case of the Nova Scotia situation, as soon as the Labour department heard the proposal that a strike was likely to occur on the 1st day of April, one of the most capable and experienced officers of the department was sent down to Sydney, to suggest that the friendly offices of the department, through an investigation or in any other consistent way under the law, were available for the use of the workmen concerned, and we were given to understand that the men and committees were amply sufficient by themselves to deal with the matter. That is the situation that we find ourselves in as regards certain industrial disputes that we have no jurisdiction over.

Mr. SPENCER: Has the province of Nova Scotia a Labour department?

Mr. MURDOCK: Not a separate department or minister. In fact, a number of the provinces have not a separate Labour department. I think there are only two or three provinces that have what might be called a separate Labour department.

Mr. SPENCER: Where a province has not a separate Labour department, the minister's

department would feel freer to act in the discussion.

Mr. MURDOCK: No, rather more hesitant to act, because if there were a separate Labour department, as there are in certain provinces, we would feel freer as individuals with a common aim and ambition in mind, to get into touch with that Labour department and to say: "Is there any way in which we can help and co-operate with you as regards this particular dispute"? Where there was not a separate Labour department, we might find ourselves approaching someone not so sympathetic to the question of a Labour department, and possibly more taken up with the operation of some other particular department.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Is it within the power of the Dominion government, according to the Minister of Labour, to make a thorough investigation of conditions which prevail in Cape Breton, to go thoroughly into the question of the British Empire Steel Corporation, its finances, the hold it has on the country, its connections with steel companies south of the line, the control exerted over its policies by the United States companies? Is it possible that an investigation of this kind could be had? If so, would it not do a great deal to eliminate the causes of unrest?

Mr. MURDOCK: Someone has said:"All things are possible;" but in this particular case, as I said a little while ago, this concern is working under a provincial charter in a province that, according to my understanding. has exclusive jurisdiction over property and civil rights. I am not a lawyer, but I think I am stating the position correctly. That being the case, I do not know just how much latitude there is for one person or one government or one province to butt into the affairs of another. I realize that a good deal of this is indulged in; but I do not believe it would be regarded as altogether the proper thing when all of the provinces have jurisdiction and authority over such matters as those to which the hon. members refers. As to the necessity and propriety of the investigation that he speaks of, that is another matter, and one on which possibly I should not at the moment express my personal view.

Mr. BOYS: I understood the minister to say that the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act had application to coal mines, railways and certain public utilities. I confess at once that I am not as familiar with the act as I would like to be. I come from a very peaceful part of Ontario, and we are not troubled very much with strikes. We have had only one in the history of my experience in Simcoe. I was wondering where the minister gets the authority for that statement.

Mr. MURDOCK: I might give a concrete example. Right at the present moment we have in course of formation a board of conciliation for a gas works in a certain city in the Dominion of Canada. The department has, I understand, for some time prior to the date I took office, regarded it as its absolute right to assume jurisdiction in a matter of this kind, as being a public utility that could reasonably be regarded as being within the law.

Mr. BOYS: It may be that there is some amendment that I am not familiar with, but section 5 of the act reads:

> Wherever any dispute exists between an employer and any of his employees, and the parties thereto are unable to adjust it, either of the parties to the dispute may make application to the minister for the appointment of a board of conciliation and investigation, to which board the dispute may be referred under the provisions of this act.

It is true there is in that section a proviso which specifically deals with railway companies, but I do not think that would warrant the statement of the minister. I am not saying he is wrong; I do not know. If he is right, it might be proper to consider an extension of the act. If again the reason that the act is not extended is because of property and civil rights, how then can there be any jurisdiction regarding a coal mine which is located in one province? I imagine in most cases the operations of a coal mine in a province are pursuant to a charter issued by that province. If the objection is that property and civil rights belong exclusively to the province, I do not see why a coal mine would come within the provisions of the act. At all events there are the two propositions. That is one, and the other is: What limitation is there to the wide-open provisions of section 5 of the act?

Mr. MURDOCK: To deal with the point that is now before us, we should turn to section 2 of the act and read the definition of employer:

> "Employer" means any person, company or corporation employing ten or more persons and owing or operating any mining property, agency of transportation or communication, or public service utility, including, except as hereinafter provided, railways, whether operated by steam, electricity or other motive power, steamships, telegraph and telephone lines, gas, electric light, water and power works, or any number of such persons, companies or corporations acting together, or who in the opinion of the minister have interest in common.

Mr. IRVINE: What can the Department of Labour do in case of an industrial dispute? What is its power?

Mr. MURDOCK: That is a very large order from my hon. friend. If both employer and employees adopt the same attitude in a controversy—that is certain individuals presuming to speak for employers at times and certain individuals presuming to speak for employees at times—the Labour department can do absolutely nothing; they are powerless under any legal rights that at present a Labour department would have. The Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, as I think has been very aptly suggested, is only for the purpose of bringing the parties together to reason, thresh out and determine as between each other their mutual differences with a view of arriving, if possible, at a mutually satisfactory understanding. It might be very aptly described as an intended league of industry and labour. But if either industry or labour or both bow their necks and go around with a chip on their shoulders and are ready to fight first, last and all the time, then this league of nations in a modified form would be absolutely useless. In a few cases in the past where this disposition has been shown by certain individuals this league has proved absolutely useless in preventing discord and strikes as a result of disputes.

Mr. IRVINE: Do I understand the reasoning of the minister in this regard to be that if employees are firm in their demand and if employees through their representatives are equally firm in theirs, so that there is a deadlock, then the department can do nothing? Is not that the only case in which the department would be required to do anything? If there is a disposition on the part of the contending parties to come to an agreement they do not need government assistance. But if the minister is correct in the statement that when there is a real fight the department is hopeless and helpless, why spend $35,000 in carrying it on?

Mr. MURDOCK: If my hon. friend only had a little experience in connection with the aims, ambitions and contentions of labour he would not make any such statement as we have just heard. Unfortunately he was not in the House a few moments ago when I gave some figures in regard to the accomplishments of this particular act which he now tries to hold up as useless except when both sides bow their necks. We find that since 1907 there have been 597 applications made for boards of investigation, not by individuals, either employers or employees, who were ready, as my hon. friend suggests, to bow their necks and not do anything, but by citizens of Canada who were presumably desirous of reaching common ground with those opposed to them in the particular disputes. As I say, 597 applications were made, and 428 boards have been granted under the law during the period I have mentioned. As a result of the appointment of these 428 boards during the time the law has been in force, a settlement was reached by negotiation, in accordance with the underlying intent of the act, in all but 36 cases. In 36 cases it was impossible, by negotiation, by compromise, or by discussion among the parties, to bring about a settlement of the questions in dispute, and strikes resulted.

Mr. IRVINE: The minister apparently takes the view that I suggested that the act was not of any value. I asked him a question as to what the department could do in cases of dispute and he told me that if there were a real dispute in which each side held to its position the department could do nothing. I accepted that as a correct statement of the situation. Now the minister moves his ground seemingly and says that the department can do something and has done so in 428 cases.

Mr. MURDOCK: I said no such thing.

Mr. IRVINE: What did the minister say?

Mr. MURDOCK: I said that where in 36 cases a settlement was not reached the department was powerless; and in any cases where both sides bow their necks and say they will have nothing in the form of a settlement the Department of Labour is powerless. But the intent of the act is to afford Canadian citizens, who have disputes, an opportunity to come to a mutual agreement; and in 95 per cent of the investigations held a settlement is effected where this spirit is manifested.

Mr. IRVINE: I would say that the minister was badly advised in basing the interpretation of the powers of the act on the 36 cases in which a settlement was not reached, and in omitting to mention the 400 odd cases in which it operated.

Item agreed to.

Canada Gazette, $45,000.

Mr. MURDOCK: This item is for the printing of the Canada Gazette. It may be noted that there is a reduction of $6,000, based on the belief that we can get along with that much less money for the current year. The expenditure for the period from April 1, 1922, to December 31 last, was $26,318.89 and the expenditure for the fiscal year 1921-22 was $43,345. We are asking for $45,000 in this item.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Cannot the minister give the expenditure for the fiscal year ending March 31 last?

Mr. MURDOCK: I have not the figures for 1922-23.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The amount being asked now is more than was spent in 1921-22?

Mr. MURDOCK: Yes, a little less than $2,000 more.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I understand that the contract for the printing of the Gazette calls for just the same amount as it did for the year before? I think that is what the minister said the other day?

Mr. MURDOCK: Are we not getting the Labour Gazette and the Canada Gazette mixed? The Canada Gazette is the official record of orders in council and other things—

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK: —and is printed in the Printing bureau. That is not the Labour Gazette.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is no need of the Canada Gazette having this union label on it apparently?

Mr. MURDOCK: No, there has not been any general demand for it yet.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Referring to the Labour Gazette again, I understand I am right in assuming that it costs just the same now to print as it did a year ago.

Mr. MURDOCK: I do not think that the master printers generally throughout Canada have changed their tabulated rates for printing. There is a schedule of rates in effect which is 10 per cent higher west of the Great Lakes. If any printing is done in any office anywhere in Canada, no matter what the printer may claim for that printing, he is paid on the basis of this schedule.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes. But the company that the hon. minister deals with pays the printers; he does not pay them. He has a contract with the company. Now, does that contract call for the same amount of money as it did a year ago with the old company that did not suit him for some reason he could not explain other than that they were not Liberals?

Mr. MURDOCK: We have long since passed that item. I am not altogether clear as to whether slightly more is being paid per month for printing the Labour Gazette than was paid a year or two years ago, but I think not.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is no less?

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. MURDOCK: I would not say it is no less. I will get an itemized statement for my right hon. friend indicating what the cost of printing the Labour Gazette has been per month for the last five years.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I would suggest that with that statement he also submit particulars of the size of the Gazette. I may tell my hon. friend that though this is a good Liberal firm that has the contract now, I understand it is getting the same amount as was paid its predecessors.

Mr. MURDOCK: I did not know that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is all the minister did know the other day. I am sorry if he has lost that little bit of information.

Mr. MURDOCK: My right hon. friend is mistaken. The other day I was asked if there were some good Liberals in the firm, and I think I intimated that possibly there might be.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, I think that is about the residuum of information he had on the question. I know there are myself, so if his information wants supplementing in any way I can help him. It is Simon pure information. There is no doubt as to the party fidelity and prejudice of the firm, not the least. My information is that the Gazette that is now being printed is smaller than the old Gazette, but the amount of money paid for its printing is just the same—the balance is so much extra party remuneration. I should like therefore the information the minister has promised to also indicate the value that is being obtained for this printing, giving the dimensions of the Gazette, the number of pages, and so forth.

Mr. MARLER: I suppose this item is made by contract?

Mr. MURDOCK: Mr. Chairman, I should like to know just what it is the right hon. gentleman desires, because I am quite sure that his information in regard to the printing of the Labour Gazette is entirely inaccurate, and we should, for the relief of the right hon. gentleman himself, clear up his doubts. I would ask him to tabulate just exactly what he requires, because I want that information as badly as he does and in as detailed form.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The last time I asked the question the minister said he could not understand me, nor could anybody else. His leader rose just afterwards and told him exactly what I wanted. As it is now six o'clock I will admit that his leader or any other hon. member could understand me.

The CHAIRMAN: It being six o'clock I do leave the Chair.

Mr. MURDOCK: We seem to have this six o'clock touch every night.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. MURDOCK: Before we rose at six o'clock I was asked what the expenditure on this item was for the past fiscal year. Up until December 31st last the expenditure was $26,318.89, and for the preceding whole fiscal year $43,345.17. The committee possibly are unaware that this is a self-sustaining item so far as the Printing bureau is concerned. The committee is being asked to vote $45,000 for the printing of the Canada Gazette during the fiscal year, but the revenue derived from the printing of the Gazette is equal to, if not slightly greater than the amount which we are now asking the committee to vote.

Mr. BOYS: There is no contract, as I understand it. You simply pay according to the contents, so much per line, I suppose.

Mr. MURDOCK: This is to reimburse the Printing bureau for the cost of printing the Canada Gazette. The work is done at the Printing bureau, and this $45,000 is to pay the wages of the men who are employed, overhead and so forth.

Mr. BOYS: Pardon me. I thought the minister was answering the question of the leader of the Opposition regarding the Labour Gazette.

Mr. MURDOCK: No, this is the Canada Gazette.

Mr. BOYS: The Labour Gazette is not under contract either? It is so much per line, I suppose, and the cost depends upon the length?

Mr. MURDOCK: When the leader of the Opposition comes in, if he desires further information on the Labour Gazette I have additional information here indicating just how this matter was handled when the change was made, and on what basis the change was made. We have the order in council, which may be of interest to the committee.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I am wondering whether it is not possible in the interests of economy to change the form of printing the Canada Gazette, the form in which a great deal of information is given. I am speaking now on behalf of a good many of the ordinary people, who perhaps are not familiar with legal phraseology and with the very elaborate governmental forms which hitherto have been carried out. I have in my hand a number which I picked up almost at random, and here is a proclamation:

Byng of Vimy
(L.S.)

Canada

George the Fifth, by the Grace of God, of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and of the British Dominions beyond the Seas King, Defender of the Faith, Emperor of India.

To Our Beloved and Faithful the Senators of the Dominion of Canada, and the members elected to serve in the House of Commons of Our said Dominion, and to each and every of you,—Greeting:—

A Proclamation

Whereas Our Parliament of Canada stands prorogued to Saturday, the twenty-fifth day of the month of February, 1922, at which time at Our City of Ottawa, you were held and constrained to appear, Nevertheless, for certain causes and considerations, We do will, by and with the advice of Our Privy Council for Canada, That you and each of you, be as to Us, in this matter, entirely exonerated: commanding, and by the tenor of these presents enjoining you, and each of you, and all others in this behalf interested that on Wednesday, the eighth day of the month of March next, at Our City of Ottawa aforesaid, personally you be and appear, for the despatch of business to treat, do, act and conclude upon these things which Our said Parliament of Canada, by the Common Council of Our said Dominion, may, by the favour of God, be ordained.

In Testimony Whereof We have caused these Our Letters to be made Patent and the Great Seal of Canada to be hereunto affixed. Witness: Our Right Trusty and Well-Beloved Julian Hedworth George, Baron Byng of Vimy, General on the Retired List and in the Reserve of Officers of Our Army, Knight Grand Cross of Our Most Honourable Order of the Bath, Knight Grand Cross of Our Most Distiguished Order of Saint Michael and Saint George, Member of Our Royal Victorian Order, Governor General and Commander-in-Chief of Our Dominion of Canada.

At Our Government House, in Our City of Ottawa, in Our said Dominion, this third day of February, in the year of Our Lord one thousand and nine hundred and twenty-two. and in the twelfth year of Our Reign.

By Command,
THOMAS MULVEY,
Under-Secretary of State.

Which, if I can wade through and really interpret, means that the Senate is being adjourned from the 25th of February to the 8th of March. Then follow other proclamations and orders in council. I have seen a number of them, one after the other, in which the phraseology and these titles are repeated. Now I am not discussing orders and titles, but if it is necessary to give them somewhere in the Canada Gazette why not give them at the very beginning once and for all, and then state in the most concise manner possible the business of the country and the notices to be given? Perhaps if I were an older member of this House I would hesitate to speak frankly about this matter, but it does seem to me most absurd that in a democratic

country we should not adopt some little more democratic and modern means of giving information as to the transactions of the country. Here is a large and bulky volume of the Canada Gazette. We talk about curtailing expenses along a lot of lines. I think we might well begin by curtailing expenses right here in this House by simplifying these forms, as other forms have been simplified in other times and places.

Item agreed to.

Printing Bureau—plant, repairs and renewals, $30,000.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): What amount was spent last year on these repairs?

Mr. MURDOCK: This item is for general plant renewals and includes upkeep. This is the same amount that was voted for the fiscal year 1922-23. The expenditure for the past fiscal year was only $7,091.33. Expenditure for the fiscal year 1921-22 amounted to $17,488.10. This amount is asked for the following reasons. For the total plant valuation of $350,000 a vote of $30,000 for general plant repairs, renewals and upkeeps is believed to be reasonable, being less than the usual commercial provision of 10 per cent for such purposes. While it is true that the plant could be carried on for an uncertain period on a smaller vote, such a procedure woud be undesirable, and the inevitable result would be depreciated and obsolete machinery giving smaller production, growing labour expense and accumulative expenditure on repairs which, although to some extent hidden in the payrolls would nevertheless exist and a continuation of the former policy of granting a $30,000 vote for general plant repairs, renewals and upkeep, together with a minimum vote for new plant, would tend to bring back the former condition without consideration of the attendant evils of overstaffing. I have here an outline of what may be needed in the general plant renewals and it is believed that the amount needed is within the mark. I can give the details of expenditures for the last fiscal year:

Hand composing division	$ 352 97
Monotype division	5,868 50
Linotype division	4,505 36
Stereotype	81 78
Press	1,833 63
Bindery	2,138 17

And so on for various other items totalling, as I said, $17,488.10. During the last two fiscal years, as I have indicated, the full amount of appropriation voted by parliament has not been used, but it is believed that it may be necessary to use almost the entire amount of the present appropriation for the purpose of plant renewals.

Item agreed to.

Printing Bureau—Plant, new, $45,000.

Mr. CHAPLIN: How much was spent of last year's appropriation which amounted to $67,000?

Mr. MURDOCK: I have here a document which indicates that the entire amount was spent. The details of the expenditure I can give to the committee if it is desired.

Mr. HANSON: What new plant is contemplated for this year?

Mr. MURDOCK: The following plant is provided for:

Pressrooms

No. 1 item—		
Two 2/0 size Miehle printing presses, complete with all the latest improvements, bed size 43" x 56"		$15,650
This replaces two old 1907 installation Miehle printing presses, bed size 33" x 46".		
No. 2 item—		
Two individual drive, direct current motors.		1,200
This is to operate Miehle printing presses in No. 1 item.		
No. 3 item—		
Two combination extension deliveries and lowering tables		1,700
This is accessory equipment for Miehle presses in No. 1 item.		
No. 4 item—		
Two Camco continuous Sheet Feeders		5,450
This is accessory equipment for Miehle printing presses in No. 1 item.		
		$24,000

Credit

No 5 item—		
Sale of: Two old equipment, 1907 installation, No. 3 Miehle printing presses, as and where they stand—bed size 33" x 46", at	$2,000 each	4,000
These are to be replaced by new and larger bed size Miehle printing press in No. 1 item.		
		$20,000

Bindery

No. 1 item—		
One Rowe Straight Line Automatic Trimmer, to trim books and pamphlets three sides, 5" x 7" to 9" x 16" sizes		$11,000
This replaces one Seybold three-knife trimmer old equipment.		
No. 2 item—		
Conveyor system for automatic delivery of books and pamphlets from the combination side stitchings, gather, stitch and cover machine, and also from the saddle back stitching machine onto the Rowe Straight Line Automtic Trimmer in No. 1 item		3,500
This is an addition to plant.		

No. 3 item—		
One job folding machine, with not more than two folds, equipped to take heavy pamphlet thickness, known as mail fold..	3,500	
This is an addition to plant.		
No. 4 item—		
Renewal of numbering heads or machines..	1,500	
This replaces necessary old equipment.		
		$19,500
Credit		
No. 5 item—		
Sale of: One old equipment installation, Seybold three-knife trimmer, as and where it stands, and refers to No. 1 item..	500	
This is a dangerous machine on the building because of its uncontrolled thrust and vibration.		
		$19,000
Ruling room		
No. 1 item—		
One 44" 10 cam-wheel unit "Lindbladh" Duplex "L" Ruling Machine. This replaces one 38" two-beam striker ruling machine and one 36" two-beam striker ruling machine, old equipment.	6,000	
No. 2 item—		
One Frohn Simplex Automatic Feeder for Lindbladh Duplex "L" Ruling Machine in No. 1 item..	2,000	
This is accessory equipment for No. 1 item.		
		$8,000
Credit		
No. 3 item—		
Sale of: One single 38" two-beam, and one 36" two-beam ruling machines, old equipment, with attached simplex feeders, as and where they stand, and refers to No. 1 item. Credit allowance $750. each..	1,500	
		$6,500
Total amount required..		$45,500

Mr. CHAPLIN: It seems to me it refers more to renewals than new machinery. A few moments ago, in connection with another item, the minister said that he was making renewals of machines. Now we are called upon to vote another amount for further renewals. The minister told us that the machinery should be renewed on the basis of ten per cent a year. I can tell him that the Finance department will not allow renewal on any such basis as that when you go to pay taxes. Yet in this case, instead of showing ten per cent, it shows nearly a twenty per cent renewal.

Mr. MURDOCK: What would the hon. gentleman suggest? He is probably more familiar with depreciation than I am. Is ten per cent too much for depreciation incident to the upkeep of a $350,000 Printing bureau?

Mr. CHAPLIN: I suggest to the minister that he should not have two accounts, mix up renewals with new machines and tell us that these are all renewals.

Mr. MURDOCK: If the hon. member will follow me in the particular items, he will see that item 299 was definitely specified as "Printing bureau, plant repairs and renewals", while item 300, which we are now dealing with, is specifically presented as "Printing bureau plant, new," and, therefore, these items aggregating $45,000 which I have read to the committee represent new plant, excepting that I think in three cases we are eliminating certain obsolete machinery that is out of date and should be renewed by new machines. For instance, if my hon. friend would come down to the Printing bureau, which I hope he will, and look at one of these big cutting machines there which we propose to discard, and observe how it vibrates almost the entire building every time it comes down, he would understand the position. We have moved it from the third floor to the lower floor, so as to eliminate, as far as possible, unnecessary vibration which is detrimental to the building, but even now, it would well pay this government to discard that machine on the basis proposed, considering the length of time it has been in service and the other conditions referred to. I hope my hon. friends will understand that I do not set myself up as being an expert on Printing bureau requisites. I am taking the advice and the experience of gentlemen dealing with these matters.

Mr. CHAPLIN: We are not saying that the minister knows his department thoroughly, and he need not excuse himself on that account particularly. In respect to this item, when a minister produces an item, part of which is marked renewal, and part of which is new, the new part means entirely new plant, and does not mean the replacement of old plant at all, and he has shown us that he is substituting new machinery and throwing out some of the old machinery. He tells us at the very commencement that he must put in renewals of this plant up to a certain percentage, and, instead of relying upon a ten per cent renewal, I claim that he is making a twenty per cent renewal. I say that if he were running a commercial business, his financial department would not allow him any such renewal at all.

Mr. GRAHAM: Did he not keep the old machines too long?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Now that we have all this new plant, would it be possible to

print the Labour Gazette in the Printing bureau?

Mr. MURDOCK: That matter has been receiving attention since February, 1922, and considering the discussion that has occurred and the suggestions that have emanated from the so-called labour representatives on this committee, I think it will be possible to do as the hon. member suggests.

Mr. MEIGHEN: How many more months of consideration is likely to be given to the subject?

Mr. MURDOCK: I think we ought to be able to come to a determination very shortly. If it were only a question of making up my mind individually, I am sure that it could be done, but, of course, I have to confer with and carry out suggestions and instructions of council.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There are no instructions. The minister is in charge of the department. This is a departmental matter. Surely he does not have to persuade his colleagues on a detail like this. He has now had, according to his own calculation, fourteen months to consider the question of having the Labour Gazette printed in the Printing bureau. How many more months he will require he does not know, and he attributes the delay to slow-thinking colleagues. Perhaps he can inform the House who are the worst of them in that respect.

Mr. MURDOCK: I am sure my hon. friend understands that it is necessary to pass an order in council to deal with this matter and determine how the Labour Gazette shall be printed.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Under what act?

Mr. MURDOCK: It took an order in council to determine the location of the work incident to the printing of the Labour Gazette, and perhaps my hon. friend would be interested in hearing read the order in council and the documents which I have here in connection with that. I brought them here because such a marked interest has been displayed in that matter, and I want the committee to have all the information I have.

Mr. CHAPLIN: A few minutes ago the minister told us about one of his machines racking the building. I was rather apprehensive that he might be coming shortly to the committee for a new building to put the machine in. I hope he will assure us that the change he is making will obviate the necessity of erecting a new building.

[Mr. Woodsworth.]

Mr. MURDOCK: There is an item, as I am sure the committee will observe, for a new building, to be dealt with later.

Mr. HANSON: Under what statute is it necessary to pass an order in council to provide that the Labour Gazette shall be printed in the Printing bureau?

Mr. MURDOCK: There is no specific statute that determines that particular question, but for some twenty years the Labour Gazette has been printed outside the Printing bureau for certain specific reasons that were held to be sufficient to warrant an order in council being passed to authorize the printing of the Labour Gazette outside of the Printing bureau. It is quite true, as my hon. friend suggests, that such condition could be changed and the Labour Gazette could be printed in the Printing bureau, but, as I frankly stated some days ago, for the reason that it has always been regarded as desirable to have the union label on the Labour Gazette, it has been by order in council printed for some twenty years outside the Printing bureau.

Mr. HANSON: Is it because you want the union label on the Gazette that it is printed outside the bureau? Is that the only reason? It does not seem to me to be a good business reason. It may be a good political reason.

Mr. MURDOCK: My hon. friend should not say "you". It has been considered necessary, in order to have the union label on the Labour Gazette, to issue an order in council to have it printed outside the Printing bureau.

Mr. HANSON: That is the only reason?

Mr. MURDOCK: Yes.

Item agreed to.

Distribution of parliamentary documents and other government publications, $40,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: How many people distribute these documents and from where?

Mr. MURDOCK: We have an establishment in the Printing bureau to distribute these documents and then there is in addition the House of Commons Distribution office.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I was just wondering whether the minister had thought of looking after the whole of the distribution and of cutting down the double staffs. The war is over now, unemployment is gone and all troubles have ceased. Has the minister had time to look after domestic economies yet?

Mr. MURDOCK: If my hon. friend had been in the House during most of the time that my estimates have been on, he would have heard my being taken to task for economies by cutting down the establishment. It has been intimated to me that I have put the Labour department right out of business and various other things of that character have been said because I have undertaken to cut out unnecessary expenditure by getting rid of employees whom we thought we could do without and at the same time properly function and carry on all the necessary work of the department.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not know whether the minister has any designs, good, bad or indifferent as regards the department, whether he is scrapping it, whether he is looking after it, or anything else. He may be doing any of these things. I do not know. I do not know whether he thinks the department is a good thing or not; but has he considered the advisability of combining the distributing forces into one? How many have we on our distributing staff and what weight of periodicals is distributed?

Mr. MURDOCK: The staff of the Distributing branch in the Printing bureau was during the past fiscal year, a total of 29. It is proposed in this fiscal year to have a total of 25. The salaries run as follows:

Salaries, $2,000 to $3,000.	
One at	$2,280
Salaries, $1,000 to $2,000.	
One at	$1,500
Three at	1,260
One at	1,200
One at	1,125
One at	1,092
One at	1,080
One at	1,040
Three at	1,020
Under prevailing rates.	
One at	$1,692.60
Two at	1,300
Salaries under $1,000.	
One at	$960
One at	900
Two at	780
Under prevailing rates.	
One at	$832
Four at	728
One at	1,040
Three at	1,020

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am sure the committee is greatly indebted to the minister for the very interesting information he has given us. Could he supplement that a little? We had twenty-nine employees last year; we have twenty-five this year. The cost is, I think, the same. I do not know, although I may be wrong, that there is any reduction in this item. I was not so much addressing myself to that point, and I think the minister knows perfectly well I was not. I was asking him whether we could not get a combination of these distributing forces. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would be kind enough to tell us what it costs to distribute these documents by the House of Commons staff, how many are employed there and how much duplication and overlapping there is.

Mr. MURDOCK: I am very sorry I have not that information before me. I have been so busy looking after my own business that I have not yet been able to go into that.

Mr. MARLER: A vast quantity of material is distributed under this particular item. What happens to all this stuff? Is it thrown away? It is never read. There must be an enormous wastage in paper and that kind of thing.

Mr. MURDOCK: There are considerable quantities of waste paper and also of wasted publications.

Mr. MARLER: Are they sold?

Mr. MURDOCK: Yes, sold for waste paper.

Mr. MARLER: How are they sold? Are tenders asked for the sale of them?

Mr MURDOCK: Yes, sold by tender. Waste paper from all departments of the government service is sold by tender.

Mr. MARLER: What does the country get from all this waste paper now, and what has been got in the past?

Mr. MURDOCK: For the year immediately prior to February 1, last, waste paper was not sold by tender, but a contract was given in November, 1921, on the basis of the former yearly rate of $11,000 in a lump sum for the collection of all waste paper from the various government departments. The 1922 contract commenced on January 1, and this year it was necessary to run it over 31 days into 1923, so that the new contract is now in effect from February 1 of this year. For the five years prior to January 1, 1922, the rate for gathering all waste paper from government departments was $11,000 a year. When it became necessary recently to renew that contract or to determine how waste paper from the various government departments would be sold, tenders were called for, and the contract now in effect is that waste paper from the various departments of the government brings to the government $22,700 for this year.

Mr. MARLER: How does the minister explain this great divergency? Prior to January 1, 1922, this same paper brought $11,000,

not by contract. How was this new contract at $22,700 let for this waste paper? There is something very extraordinary in the divergency in these figures.

Mr. McMASTER: Better management.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It may be that paper, like everything else, is more prodigally wasted by this government.

Mr. MURDOCK: On the other hand, the facts are entirely to the contrary that there was very much more waste paper under previous conditions than there is at the present time, and I think the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) conveyed that impression when, in such eulogistic terms, he referred to the great saving that had been brought about by the Editorial Committee in preventing unnecessary duplication and consequent waste in the Printing bureau.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That committee has been in force for some time.

Mr. MURDOCK: During the six years prior to the present year with that enormous waste, many publications went into the waste paper basket. As a matter of fact, I do not think it is any exaggeration to state that $150,000 or $200,000 were made out of the waste paper contracts for the six years prior to the present year.

Mr. MARLER: Which contracts were not let by tender?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister is a little wrong in that. The Editorial Committee has been in charge for four or five years, and no doubt when that committee was in charge, the waste would be a minimum. The present government's policy is to abolish the Editorial Committee.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It is still there.

Mr. MEIGHEN: And naturally there would be a larger tender for the waste paper. I cannot say, not having had the departmental charge, just how the contract was let. It was let, however, as I understand, some six years before and then was re-let. If I recollect rightly, it was let by tender, just as it is claimed it is let this time by tender. I should be very much surprised if I am wrong. The highest tender was accepted.

Mr. MURDOCK: You are mistaken.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think I am.

Mr. MURDOCK: I am sure you are.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Perhaps, while we are talking about waste, the minister will explain, seeing that he has not had time to get the information for the committee, how he came to waste time going to the Moose Jaw election and coming back without having been allowed to speak.

[Mr. Marler.]

Mr. MURDOCK: I took my holidays out there instead of going to Atlantic City. Now, I am very glad indeed that my right hon. friend has called my attention to something I was going to overlook, that is, certain enormous waste of government publications and printing that occurred during the course of the six years immediately preceding the present year. The gentlemen of the committee do not need to take my word for this at all. They can go to the report of Judge Snider, who was appointed royal commissioner to look into the enormous waste of hundreds of thousands—.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh, no.

Mr. MURDOCK: —hundreds of thousands, I think, of government publications which were discarded and thrown away and which became part of the plunder of individuals who secured waste paper contracts at $11,000 a year. Judge Snider's report will indicate just exactly what happened and I hope that hon. members of this House will look into that record and not take my word for it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I presume that the reason my hon. friend was not allowed to speak was because the friends of his party in that district felt that the peculiar style of oratory of which we get so much in this House—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. MEIGHEN: —was not—

Mr. McMASTER: Order.

Mr. MEIGHEN:—useful in that part of the country.

Mr. McMASTER: I rise to a point of order. I understand that discussion in committee must be closely relevant to the item under consideration, and it seems to me that the leader of the Opposition is wandering somewhat far afield in discussing either the Moose Jaw election or the type of oratory displayed so ably by the Minister of Labour.

Mr. MURDOCK: I should really apologize to my right hon. friend for having answered so shortly as I did when he asked his question. As a matter of fact I was due back here yesterday afternoon to go on with my estimates and I did not want to disappoint my right hon. friend or others. I wanted to get to business.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It was not the coming back that I was marvelling at; I thought that was natural; it was the going out. Now, the minister tries to intimate to this House that there was some dark and serious scandal unearthed by Judge Snider's report, and hon. members have a right to some information in that regard. The minister's "hundreds of thousands" talk is oratory of a kind; that is all. There were some books, quite a number of them—I do not know whether they were blue books, but at all events they were publications—that were by error consigned to waste by an official. The facts were difficult to get at. The late government did not know why this waste had occurred, nor did it know who was responsible. No member of the government had authorized it or had had anything to do with it. The late government appointed Judge Snider to get at the facts because there were facts to be got at, and Judge Snider investigated the matter and submitted a report. He was not able to find that there had been any intentional error or wrongdoing on any one's part. Undoubtedly, there had been an error in consigning the documents to waste, but I do not think they were of such tremendous cash value. It was unfortunate, however, that they were destroyed, because they were of a character that could not be replaced, some of them being historical. But the numbers of them as stated by the minister are only representative of a very elastic imagination.

Mr. MURDOCK: If my right hon. friend will look into the matter again and consult Judge Snider's report he will find that there is no particular exaggeration in what I have stated.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Is there any increase or decrease in the quantity of parliamentary documents and government publications distributed under this item?

Mr. MURDOCK: The number of parliamentary documents printed is not determined by the Printing bureau. As my hon. friend knows, there is a committee of this House that determines what shall and what shall not be printed. But as to the various government documents and publications, the number is determined by the various departments under proper authorization, and this item takes care of their distribution.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Perhaps the minister could give the information even though it does not come strictly under this item.

Mr. MURDOCK: I am sure my hon. friend is not serious in asking me to give such an estimate as he desires, because no one in this House could do anything of the kind. This item is to take care of the distribution of parliamentary documents and other government publications.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The minister misunderstands me. I am asking whether there is any increase in the quantity distributed. I am anxious to find out if there is really any necessity for the continued voting of this $40,000 year after year for a service that may be on the decrease.

Mr. MURDOCK: I cannot even suggest whether there might be in this particular fiscal year either a slight increase or a decrease. I can only assure my hon. friend that if the money were not all expended it would still belong to the government, while if it were found necessary to use it it would be available.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: How many copies of Hansard are printed, and how many go to subscribers?

Mr. MURDOCK: I have not the exact information, but the best estimate I can give would be about 150 copies sent to paid subscribers out of a total of 1,800 printed. These 150 are subscribed for on the basis of 5 cents per copy or $3 per session.

Mr. COOTE: What does it cost to print Hansard? I have been approached by a number of people who want to know whether the subscription rate for Hansard could not be reduced. They consider $3 an exorbitant sum to pay for it. I believe that if they knew the quality of some of the speeches recorded in the publication they would be willing to pay their $3. Speaking seriously, however, I think it would be good policy for this House to reduce the subscription rate, and perhaps the minister might give us some information on this point.

Mr. MURDOCK: I can assure the hon. member that the rate of 5 cents per copy or $3 per session is only a nominal figure; it is like sending out the Labour Gazette at 20 cents per annum. It does not begin to pay the actual cost of printing Hansard.

Mr. COOTE: I think the minister will admit that it would not cost as much proportionately if we printed twice the number that we are now printing, and I believe if the subscription rates were reduced by one half we could easily double the subscriptions.

Mr. MURDOCK: My hon. friend will realize that it would cost twice as much for

paper, which is an important item, and for ink, which is a less important item. It is quite true that mere printing, once the type has been set up, would not amount to a great deal extra. But I really do not think it would be advisable to cheapen the present nominal rates. However, I must say frankly that I had not heard it suggested before that the subscription rates should be reduced, and it may be a subject worthy of consideration from my hon. friend's point of view.

Mr. BOYS: Is this item sub-divided at all?

Mr. MURDOCK: Yes. Here is the estimate for the year:

Office printing, $2,000; office stationery, $2,500; postage, $2,500; express and freight, $200; char service, $2,000; sundries, $100; salaries, $27,613.60; motor car supplies and upkeep, $500; mechanical repairs and upkeep, $2,000; or a total of $39,413.60.

Item agreed to.

Miscellaneous Printing, $20,000.

Mr. GOOD: I should like to bring to the attention of the committee a little point in connection with this item. Since I have been in parliament I have been impressed with the amount of stationery which is embossed instead of printed. Most of our letterheads are printed, but a good many are embossed, particularly the departmental stationery, and practically all of the envelopes. I understand that it is very much more expensive to emboss than to print. I would suggest that we can all get along just as well with printed letterheads and envelopes and I would very much like to see a change in this direction, especially in view of the financial conditions now existing.

Item agreed to.

Industrial Disputes Investigation Act—Further amount required, $4,000.

Mr. MURDOCK: We ran slightly over the estimate last year to the extent of about $4,000, and consequently we are asking for this supplementary estimate.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Does this item include the cost of the telegrams that passed between the hon. minister and one Mr. McLachlan in connection with the strike of miners in Nova Scotia?

Mr. MURDOCK: Yes—to some extent.

Item agreed to.

PUBLIC WORKS—OTTAWA PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS

Public Works—Public Buildings—Ottawa Parliament Buildings, $700,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is to be done for this?

[Mr. Murdock.]

Hon. J. H. KING (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Chairman, this proposed expenditure is to complete the restoration of the parliament buildings. The itemized expenditure will be as follows:

Salaries of office staff, maintenance of plant and upkeep of staff	$ 10,000
Carpentry and doors	9,000
Asphalt surface and new roadways to rear of buildings	6,000
Grading and sodding around buildings	11,250
Post office fittings and alterations	15,000
Stone carving and modelling for interior	35,000
Pointing and stone work	6,000
Re-wiring library	10,000
Painting and decorating	10,000
Special lighting fixtures	100,000
Main tower, required for cutting stone	111,000

If we are able to proceed with the erection of the tower there will be an expenditure of $136,000, consisting of:

Amount for setting stone stairs	$ 5,000
Amount for steel work	2,000
Elevator, clock and stone work of memorial chamber	86,000
Balance to sub-contractors on contracts	8,341
Contingencies, miscellaneous and unforeseen	93,960

I may say that the items as read will probably not conform to the expenditure this year, for it is very doubtful if it will be possible to have the plans completed and the stone cutting done in time to carry on the erection of the tower to completion.

But from this item there will be an expenditure to cover the settlement with the architects. A settlement has been reached recently whereby payment will be made to them for the balance of their commission on the work that has been done to date. For the information of the committee I will give a short review of the conclusions that we have arrived at in making a settlement with the architects: The total expenditure on the buildings to November 28th was $9,910,972. Mr. Pearson's commission on that amount at $4\frac{5}{8}$ per cent would be $458,382.48.

9 p.m.

We have not settled on that basis. We have followed to some extent the line suggested by the parliamentary committee, and we did make an adjustment with the architects in 1921 when they were allowed certain commissions on an expenditure over and above $5,000,000. There is no doubt that when the parliament buildings contract was entered into there was a desire and an effort made to limit the expenditure to some $5,000,000 but as the work proceeded alterations took place, the designs were changed, and in 1920 we find that the expenditure had exceeded the limitation of $5,000,000 by over $1,034,000; in January, 1921, the expenditure had amounted to $7,966,000, and on November 1, 1921, it had amounted to $9,157,229. The original plans

as suggested by the architect, and desires probably of the committee were changed, with the result that this larger expenditure was made on the buildings that we are now occupying. Some of that increased cost, in fact, a considerable proportion of it can be accounted for by the increase in the cost of material and labour that took place during the years between 1918 and 1921, but in addition to that, the buildings as originally designed have been changed, accounting for an additional expenditure.

So far as the architects are concerned, they did originally indicate by letter that they would design and construct a building limited in cost to $5,000,000, and on receipt of their letter accepting the above offer and stating that the terms there set forth were satisfactory to them, a contract was prepared by the department with a limitation fee. When the contract was presented to the architects they took exception to the limitation in a letter dated July 6, 1916. Although that contract was presented it was never executed, the architects stating that they could not agree to the clause limiting the fee as no such limitation had ever been discussed with the committee. They acknowledged acceptance of the terms of the joint committee in which the limitation of fee was made, but stated that their acceptance was an inadvertence so far as the limitation of fee was concerned, it being intended to apply to the other conditions only.

Mr. CALDWELL: What date was that?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): In 1916. Although the architects did not sign this contract, the work continued, and as I have pointed out in the year 1920 the limitation of $5,000,000 was exceeded, further exceeded in 1921, and by November, 1921, the cost had amounted to $9,157,229. In the year 1920 the architects did complain and ask that they be given further consideration in regard to the over-expenditure. The department under instructions from the committee had Mr. Ewart, the Consulting Architect, make an examination of the building to try and indicate wherein the plans had been altered and new works undertaken, and to estimate the additional amount that might be paid to the architects. Mr. Ewart reported an amount of $1,396,999 as representing extra work and stated that further consideration of various items would be necessary before a final estimate could be arrived at of the value of the extra work done up to January 31, 1921. Unfortunately Mr. Ewart became ill and died, and Mr. Sutherland was then employed to report further on these additional items, and he found an amount of $337,401 that might be attributed to extra work. The committee at that time recommended and did pay an extra commission on $1,734,401.13. This estimate as compared with an estimate presented by the architects showed that the committee did not allow the full amount. In other words, the architects claim that they should have received in addition to the commission on $1,734,401.13, an additional commission on $946,277.

In December, 1921, Mr. Pearson was still urging further consideration of his claim. The then outgoing minister advised him that it would be necessary for this matter to be dealt with by the incoming administration. The architect at that time advised the minister that it would be necessary for him to close down the works. In a letter written on December 21, 1921, he advised the then minister that he had no alternative but to close down the work and that he would issue instructions to that effect to the general contractor, and on the same date he wrote to the general contractor giving him instructions to close down the works at the end of the week. I merely mention that as a matter of information for the committee. Mr. Pearson at that time felt it was necessary for him to retire from the work, and since that date he has not been associated directly with it. In fact, as is well known, there has not been any large undertaking since that date. The matter of adjusting the differences between the architects and the department was one presenting some difficulties. I think, generally speaking, that those who have followed the construction of the building and who have knowledge of the original intentions of the committee and of what has transpired since, will realize that there was a further obligation by parliament to the architects in the matter of payment for their work in connection with these buildings. That was recognized by the parliamentary committee and payments made as I have indicated.

We have taken up the situation where we found it in 1921 and with the aid of three hon. members of this House—the hon. member for London, the hon. member for Brandon and the hon. member for St. Lawrence and St. George—who have acted with myself and members of the department in bringing about what we considered a fair and reasonable adjustment of this claim we have arrived at the conclusion that the architects would be entitled to a payment of commission on $9,910,-972.59 less a deduction on account of increased cost not allowed on $1,683,463.46. In other words the commissions payable to Mr. Pear-

son would amount to a total sum of $458,382—less a credit of 4⅝ on $1,683,463.46 of $77,860, or a commission of $380,522.30 plus a fee for work of a special character of 2⅞ per cent on $932,960.74, or a commission of $31,822.62 plus a sum of $5,000 allowed for advertising and receiving tenders for special furniture and special work; making a total commision of $412,344 to Mr. Pearson, with a credit of payments received of $289,340, leaving a balance due Mr. Pearson of $123,004.20. Mr. Marchand's settlement is worked out on the same basis, he being allowed a commission of ⅞ of one per cent on the total, his total commission being $71,199, and he having received payment of $52,848, leaving a balance of $19,142. That is the settlement that has been entered into with the architects and an agreement has been made as the result of which there will be no overlapping of commissions. It will be a complete and distinct settlement. For the completion of this building it is hoped that we will be able to enter into a contract that will be distinct and separate from the old contract. This settlement of $142,000 will be paid out of the vote of $700,000 that is now before the committee. I think this statement pretty well explains the item of $700,000.

Mr. CALDWELL: The minister spoke of the alteration of the plans having increased the price. Who was responsible for that alteration?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The architect in conjunction with the parliamentary committee.

Mr. CALDWELL: Who were the members of the parliamentary committee?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): They varied from time to time.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: There was a big change in the personnel the first year.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The original committee consisted of Hon. Robert Rogers, Hon. William Pugsley, Hon. Charles Murphy, Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux and Hon. Robert Watson, the Minister of Public Works in each instance acting as chairman of the committee. Later, I think, Hon. Mr. Reid, Hon. Mr. Calder, and Hon. Sir James Lougheed became members of the committee.

Mr. CALDWELL: Did these gentlemen all serve upon the committee at the same time?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No.

Mr. CALDWELL: May I ask what was the method of control by the government of expenditure on the Parliament buildings? Was it left to the architect, or did this committee really supervise the work or did they only act in an honorary capacity?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No, the committee exercised an active supervision and control. Meetings were held from time to time and the architects reported from week to week, or month to month, as to the expenditures. The committee, I think, were in control and information as to the work as it proceeded was laid before them from time to time.

Mr. McMASTER: My recollection is—the minister will correct me if I am wrong—that the Hon. Mr. Murphy was a member of the committee for a very short time. I think the House would be interested to know when Mr. Murphy was appointed and when he retired.

Mr. CALDWELL: If I am not mistaken Hon. Mr. Murphy told us in this House, since I have been a member, that he only attended one meeting of that committee. However, that is not the material point under discussion. The government started out to spend $5,000,000 on the erection of a parliament building. To-day the expenditure has been in the neighbourhood of $10,000,000 and we are not nearly through yet. I would like to ask another question: How was the contract let for the construction of this building in the case of both the architect and the contractor, or was there any contract?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Going back to my hon. friend's first question I now have the information in regard to the composition of the committee. The original committee consisted of Hon. Robert Rogers, chairman, Hon. William Pugsley, Hon. J. D. Reid, Hon, J. D. Hazen, Hon. R. Lemieux, Hon. C. Murphy, Sir James Lougheed, Hon. P. E. Blondin and Hon. R. Watson. This committee was appointed in May, 1916. Mr. Murphy resigned on the 24th June, 1916. Hon. Mr. Lemieux resigned on September 1, 1916. Hon. Mr. Hazen having retired as Minister of Marine was replaced by Hon. C. C. Ballantyne, on October 24, 1917. Hon. Mr. Pugsley resigned on 23rd February, 1918. Hon. P. E. Blondin left for overseas military service on October 7, 1917. Hon. J. A. Calder and Hon. G. A. Robertson were nominated by Sir Robert Borden on March 25, 1919 to replace Hon. Messrs. Pugsley and Blondin respectively. Hon. J. A. Stewart and Hon. R. Monty were nominated by Right Hon. Arthur Meighen on September 22, 1921 to replace Hon. Dr. Reid and Hon. Mr. Calder elevated to the Senate. On September 25, 1921, the joint committee consisted of Hon. F. B. McCurdy, chairman;

Hon. Mr. Ballantyne, Hon. Mr. Stewart, Hon. Mr. Monty, Sir James Lougheed, Hon. Mr. Robertson, and Hon. Mr. Watson.

Mr. CALDWELL: Who compose the committee at the present time?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): There is no committee at the present time.

Mr. BOYS: The minister referred to the original estimated cost as $5,000,000. It seems to me that the thought at first was that the walls of the building which stood after the fire were to remain, but that it was necessary to put on an extra storey and the foundations would not carry it. For that reason the walls were pulled down. Could the minister inform the House as to what the contract which called for $5,000,000 included?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): In the original investigation after the fire the architects who were called in reported that they thought there would be a salvage of $1,000,000 or more on certain walls—

Mr. CALDWELL: Was it not $2,000,000?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No, $1,000,000 odd.

Mr. CALDWELL: It was stated at the time that it would be $2,000,000.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Nearer $2,000,000 than $1,000,000, I am advised.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Approximately $2,000,000.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): On later examination it was decided that the walls should come down and they were taken down.

Mr. CALDWELL: Who decided that?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I think that was done on the advice of the architects.

Mr. CALDWELL: If my memory serves me correctly, Mr. Murphy told me that these walls were torn down while he was a member of the committee, without the knowledge of the committee. The committee had never been consulted and that was one of the reasons why he resigned.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I am not sure of that history. I know the report was as I have given it. First, they thought they had a salvage in the walls of some $2,000,000, and later on the walls were taken down, and the contract entered into for $5,000,000, was for a new building, not taking into account the old walls.

Mr. BOYS: Was there an extra storey decided on after that $5,000,000 estimate was made?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No, I think the original plan for $5,000,000 provided for the walls such as we have to-day. The memo I have in regard to it reads:

> The plans for the lay out of the building were submitted to the members of the Senate and House of Commons on two or three occasions, and it was explained to them that in order to carry out the scheme it was necessary to tear down the recently erected west wing and all the walls standing north and in the rear of the external south walls and the east and west pavilions. This was in order that the two chambers, the Senate and House of Commons, might be placed at the extreme east and west ends respectively of the new buildings so that they would have outside light. It was also decided, in order to reduce the danger from fire, to make the building as fire proof as possible and remove the boilers and heating plant to a central heating station outside of the building.

Mr. CALDWELL: He speaks of a contract. What kind of a contract was it that was let to the P. Lyall Company for the construction?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The contract with the architect was for a 5½ per cent commission.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Cost plus.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): That was for the full architectural service for the construction, the architect acting as agent for the committee. A contract was entered into with Messrs. P. Lyall & Company, general contractors, for the erection of the building, they being paid 8 per cent on the first $4,000,000 and 7 per cent on the balance, not to exceed $5,000,000.

Mr. CALDWELL: Do you not think, Mr. Chairman, that method of contract shows the reason we spent $10,000,000 to get a $5,000,000 building?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): That is for the Chairman to answer.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not think the minister can do much better than he has done. Personally, I think the architects earned every single cent they got. The minister has cut off the commission on $1,600,000, and I suppose, the way things are now, they can stand that all right. As I recollect it, the architects, besides doing the architectural work, had to look after drafting work, preparation of all estimates, tenders and the like, and had to maintain a large staff at the building. Could the minister tell me what is going to be done to the building now? Very little requires to be done. I do not suppose the minister is serious in wanting to spend a lot of money in carving stones, or a lot of decorations, that might just as well stand for a period. I should like to get some information in regard to the completion of the tower. Who is to do it? The minister spoke of the architect's strike last year and of

his going off the work. Is he coming back again? Is the same architect to complete the tower, or is somebody else going to complete it? What is the present situation?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It is not the desire of the government to continue large expenditures. We feel, however, that it is desirable that we should proceed with the completion of the tower and possibly we may do it. I had hoped that arrangements could be made whereby it might be carried through to completion this present year. I am advised that unless detailed plans are submitted within the next few days it will probably not be possible to carry it to final completion this year. In that case we will carry on with the details of the stone cutting, with a view to the erection of the tower early this coming year.

As regards inside stone carving, I think that work may well be deferred and carried out at some future date, as the parliament and the government of the day see fit. It is not essential work. A certain portion of it, especially in the main corridors and around the throne of the Senate chamber, in fairness, having regard to the expenditures already made and the desirability of having the effect of that carving, I think should be proceeded with in a reasonable time. Even in this chamber there are opportunities for the expenditure of money in carving. I think that can very well stand for the present. There are some expenditures on the outside of the building, on the driveway, the sodding, grading, and in the post office, which should be made this year. The lighting fixtures in the main corridors are temporary, and possibly the proper designs should be developed and carried out there, in order that the entrances might have a finished appearance.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I would suggest to my hon. friend that there is only one possible excuse for spending any further money in the building at the present, and that is that you should get a building that is properly completed and finished, having regard to the spirit of its conception as a whole. I do not know whether it is true, but I was told when I was on the other side of the House that it was absolutely necessary, if we were going to get a properly completed building, to have the same architect who had erected the building complete the tower, in order to give the final effect to the whole of his work, and that nobody else except that gentleman could do it. It was only bearing in mind what I have been told by people who, I suppose, know something about it that I thought perhaps the tower ought to be completed, but if the tower is not to be completed by Mr. Pearson, it might just as well wait another ten or twenty years, if another architect is to be employed to do the work, and we might as well be ahead that much money. I wanted to know whether Mr. Pearson was going to build the tower or not. If not, I think it could well stand.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I do not agree with my hon. friend. I think it is desirable that those who designed and worked on the original construction, if proper arrangements could be made, should have an opportunity of completing the tower. I am hoping it will be possible to enter into proper arrangements for them to continue and carry on this construction.

Mr. BOYS: What is the estimated cost of completing the tower?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Between $400,000 and $500,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Does the minister not think that he can do with less than $700,000? We have pretty heavy appropriations this year, and apparently the only thing that we know definitely is that we have to pay some back claims. Why not put in the amount for the back claims and let the other work stand altogether?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I have given a recital of some of the expenditures proposed, and I think they are important. The grading and sodding around the building are certainly important, and we do not want to leave a matter of that kind unfinished. The matter of post office fittings and alterations is important and should be attended to. The rewiring of the Library, which is outside of this building, is also essential and should be done this year. As regards the lighting fixtures, some of those should be designed and placed. Then, as I have already stated, there will be commissions to pay, and I think the estimate of $700,000 is not excessive. It is not the desire of the department to expend lavishly; the desire is rather to curb expenditures. A similar amount was voted last year, and the expenditure was kept within reason and bounds.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: How much was the expenditure last year?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The expenditure amounted to $459,241.17 made up as folows:

Paylists and services	$102,008 80
Materials	159,803 77
Furniture and fittings	144,763 60
Workmen's Compensation Board	1,917 81
Water for Sussex street shop	181 15
Coal	2,509 26
Contractors' commission	45,344 16
Sundries	2,712 62

Mr. BOYS: Do I understand the $700,000 item we are now considering will provide for the completion of the tower, electric light fixtures, which I think the minister said would cost about $100,000, payment of fees due to the architect, grading, sodding and so on, and cement work around the outside of the building?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No.

Mr. BOYS: I fully endorse what the minister has said. It would be a great pity if completion of the tower to this building was deferred much longer, because the building will never look as it should until the tower is completed. I also endorse what the minister has said regarding grading, sodding and cement work around the building. One cannot properly enjoy many of the rooms of the building with the outlook we have, particularly at the back. The item for electric light fixtures at first blush seems heavy; but at the same time I realize that the fixtures must be in keeping with this building, which is one of the finest in the world, and possibly they cannot be procured for less than $100,000. As to the cutting of the stone, as we look about here now, there are flat stones in this room which are supposed to be cut, and there are others throughout the building. That matter can stand; but I would like to see the tower and the other things to which I have referred proceeded with.

Mr. CALDWELL: Last year representations were made that some change should be made in the arrangement of this chamber in order to improve the acoustics. Some changes have been made that have effected a considerable improvement. Last year the minister said that he would look into the matter and see if the Speaker's Chair could be moved down on one side and the seating rearranged so that members could hear better than they can at the present time. While improvements have been made, the acoustics of this chamber are very poor. I would personally feel like fining the architect if he was responsible for designing this chamber because the designing was very poorly done for an assembly of this size. This assembly will increase in numbers as time goes on. In fact, after the next general election we shall have an increase, and it is quite possible that it will be in this section of the House. A number of the members of this party cannot hear very well, although after the next election, we may be on the other side. Is this ceiling the permanent ceiling that will be left, or is it to be built over?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): We had certain investigations made after last session as regards the acoustics, and we were advised to carry on the scheme as hon. members see it before them, that is, of placing felt and carpet on the floor, and the hanging of draperies and curtains. I think it is evident to all members that a great and satisfactory improvement has been made by this simple expenditure. We also had models made, and I think I shall have them brought to the House and placed where members can see them, showing a rearrangement of seating and the placing of the Speaker in the centre of the chamber. Since the changes have been made during the interval and in view of the success of those changes, my view—and I think this is the view of many members with whom I have discussed the matter—is that we should not disturb the present arrangement, but possibly carry a little further next year the scheme as carried on last summer. It has been suggested that in and around the upper balconies further draperies or coverings might be placed which will tend to absorb the vibrations or voice sounds and probably add to the acoustic properties of the chamber. Personally, I am fairly well satisfied. I think in a chamber of this character, of this height and extent, the members are probably not suffering a great deal to-day, and that those who are accustomed to speaking and who speak clearly and distinctly do not have great difficulty in being heard. It would be a mistake to rearrange the seating; moreover, it has been estimated that to carry out a scheme of that kind would cost about $45,000, and at the present time, I would not feel disposed to ask that a change of that kind be made.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): I would like to make one suggestion as regards improving this House as a chamber for discussion and speaking. That would be to take the four front seats on the middle of each side and let those be made a bench where members could go to make set speeches whenever they wished to be heard in all parts of the House. A minister making a statement on behalf of the government involving the policy of the government or of his department could thus speak from the centre of the chamber, and if somebody on this side wished to criticise him, he could speak from the centre also, if he had an argument he wished, not only the House, but the country to hear. We have been spending a good deal of money to improve the acoustics of this chamber and such a change would cost very little. I have several times felt that I could, perhaps, put my case a little more clearly if I could sit nearer the

centre. There are plenty of other seats left; the whole of the chamber is not occupied, and such a change as I have suggested would not inconvenience anyone but would be a great improvement and might lead also to improvement in the character of the debates. If we had such a speaking bench on either side of the chamber, this would not involve an expenditure of $1,000. It would not change the character of the chamber; but it would improve it as a chamber of discussion and speaking, so that everybody could hear, especially those who had something important to say and who were willing to go to the centre of the House to say it in order that they might be heard by the members and that their speeches might be in a better shape to go to the country.

Mr. CALDWELL: I should like to hear from some of the members who sit at the far end of the chamber, how much they have heard of the minister's explanation of this item and of the discussion that has been going on at this end. I remember the time when I sat at the far end of the chamber. There were ten of us in that little group and there were days when we never heard one thing in regard to the estimates that were being considered. All we knew about them was what we read the next day in Hansard. I realize the very great disadvantage under which hon. members are placed in that end of the chamber. At the time I refer to we used to ask the minister to move further down as a concession when he was putting through his estimates, and I think it would be wise if the same thing were done now, because I am sure that hon. members at the lower end cannot hear well enough to be able to enter properly into the discussion of questions before the committee. I should like to know the views of those hon. members.

Mr. GOULD. Reverting to the tower, who possesses the original plans of that part of the building?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): In the original drawings submitted of this building there is given an outline of the structure together with certain plans. But I am advised that the working plans have been developed from month to month as the work proceeded, and the working plans of the tower are not in the hands of the department. I am not sure whether they have been fully developed yet, but they will be as Mr. Pearson proceeds, if he does proceed.

Mr. GOULD: It is some years now since picture postcards were sold around this city purporting to illustrate this building as it will be when completed. I have looked at these post cards closely and they correspond with the building so far as it has been constructed. I presume that the photographs were taken from some plan, and I thought that possibly there might be two plans, one of the main building and another of the tower. There has been some discussion around the city during the past two months in regard to some rumoured change in the plan of the tower, and I should like to know whether it is contemplated to have chimes placed in the tower on its completion.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Of course, we have the original draft of plan showing the elevation, and in addition to that models have been prepared which I have no doubt were photographed, as my hon. friend says. But these would not constitute the complete or detailed plan. The working plans that are required are not in the department.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: There is one thing the minister can do for hon. members and it will not cost anyone a cent, while it will make for much more livable conditions in this chamber. I wonder whether the minister has ever gone down to see the kind of ventilation we have in this building and the tremendous amount of pipes, fans, and other apparatus which, if kept in operation, would give us an atmosphere not quite so humid and stuffy as we usually have here. Instead of spending money I think the minister should see to it that, by the simple process of exercising some common sense in ventilation, conditions were improved in the building. Hon. members have been told that the ventilation was being looked after, and that there were fans all round the walls, in addition to an exhaust draft, and so forth. In fact, we were given to understand that the whole atmospheric contents of this chamber could be emptied in either two or five minutes. If that is the fact, why is not this humid atmosphere emptied sometimes?

Mr. CAHILL: It is cold air?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Cold air, I hope.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I am advised that the artificial ventilation of the building is up-to-date in every particular and that the air can be changed and renewed immediately. But I am also informed that the ordinary method of ventilation by the opening of windows and the artificial systew of ventilation cannot be carried out simultaneously. You have to depend on one or the other.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: At present we are depending on nothing.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): If that is the case, the matter is one that should be inquired into. The apparatus that has been provided for the purpose of ventilating the chamber should be utilized, and if it is not we will make inquiries.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I have no doubt the minister has a pretty good idea when a room is stuffy. Does he think that the air in this chamber is as it should be?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Sometimes I hardly think so.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I see there is $35,000 for cut stone ornamentation. Is there any other item for this kind of ornamentation?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): That is the only item.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I would seriously ask the minister if he thinks the country ought, even with this government, extravagant as it is, to spend $35,000 this year in ornamental stone carving.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Personally I am not disposed to spend a great deal of money.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then why ask for it?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): There was very little carving done last year, and I do not think we shall do a great deal this year.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: If the minister does not want this money I would move that the item be reduced by $35,000.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I explained to the committee that there was some carving that ought to be done this year in connection with the entrance to the main corridor and in the vicinity of the throne in the Senate. In view of the expenditure that has already been made on the building this work should be carried on at an early date, and I do not see the necessity for reducing the vote. If the money is not necessary we will not spend it, but in justice to the building as it stands to-day there is certain work that should be done, and the amount suggested here by the estimate clerk is not large. I am not of the opinion, however, that it will all be expended.

Mr. BOYS: It seems to me that the original estimated cost of the building and the actual cost to date are so much at variance that we ought to have a fuller explanation from the minister as to how the difference came about. We are all aware that the committee of seven gentlemen in charge of the work was composed of some of the ablest men in the House on both sides of politics, as well as of gentlemen from the Senate; and as the matter stands to-day it seems to reflect more or less on the work of that committee. I have not the details, but I remember distinctly that when the restoration of the building was first under contemplation it was said that the old walls would be utilized, and later it was decided to put on an extra storey. I asked the minister definitely whether the $5,000,000 estimated cost included the tearing down of walls and the putting up of new walls, in addition to the extra storey, and he said he thought it did.

Mr. CAHILL: Who was the minister at that time?

Mr. BOYS: I am not criticizing any minister.

Mr. CAHILL: No, but I am asking for information.

Mr. BOYS: At this moment I cannot recall, but I suppose it was the Hon. Robert Rogers, although I am not positive. But it makes no difference who it was, he was one of the seven. There can be no doubt that any changes that were decided upon were first investigated by the architect and submitted to the committee, and in the end, I believe, received its endorsation. I am aware that the Postmaster General (Mr. Murphy) withdrew for some reason, but so far as I know the other members of the committee were unanimous in regard to the changes made from time to time. I think it is due the House that a full explanation should be given by the minister as to exactly what was under contemplation when the estimate of $5,000,000 was given, and how it was that the figure rose from that sum to $10,000,000. The minister has been quite fair. He has pointed out that a considerable proportion of the increase was due to increased cost of material and labour, but I hardly think that this would account for the whole increase, and I am sure the House will be interested to get a fuller explanation of the matter.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): A few moments ago I gave briefly some of the information my hon. friend is now requesting. But so that the committee may have fuller information I would read from this report:

Mr. John A. Pearson, architect, Toronto, Ontario, and Mr. J. O. Marchand, architect, Montreal, Que., were instructed by Hon. Mr. Rogers, then Minister of Public Works, to report on the condition of the ruins of the parliament buildings as they stood after the fire, and the report of these architects was presented to the Minister of Public Works on the 17th February, 1916.

The architects stated that the ruins of the building as it stood represented in labour and materials an

asset of $2,000,000. This estimate with the architect's detail is as follows:

The new west wing..	$ 425,000
The library building valued at..	650,000
The boiler room, heating plant in basement and chimney stack, all of which would represent a value of about..	1,000,000

I find my impression was right when I said at first that I thought the value was between one and two million dollars.

Messrs. Pearson and Marchand were instructed to prepare sketch plans for the reconstruction of the parliament buildings. These were submitted to the committee, and after discussion it was considered advisable in rebuilding the structure to provide greater accommodation than existed in the old building. The architects were requested to prepare sketch plans showing an additional storey.

There was an additional storey.

Mr. Pearson submitted these plans at a subsequent meeting of the reconstruction committee and pointed out in discussing them that the addition of another storey would necessitate the taking down of the upper storey of the building, also the main tower. The committee carefully considered the matter and it was finally decided to add the extra storey to the building.

The plans for the layout of the building were submitted to the members of the Senate and House of Commons on two or three occasions, and it was explained to them that in order to carry out the scheme it was necessary to tear down the recently erected west wing and all the walls standing north and in the rear of the external south walls and the east and west pavilions; this was in order that the two chambers, the Senate and House of Commons, might be placed at the extreme east and west ends respectively of the new building so that they would have outside light. It was also decided, in order to reduce the danger from fire, to make the building as fireproof as possible and remove the boilers and heating plant to a central heating station outside of the building.

A report from the architects, dated July 29, 1916, was subsequently submitted to the committee dealing with the reasons for demolishing the walls of the old Parliament Buildings which were left standing after the fire; the architect explaining that several sketch plans were prepared in an endeavour to have the Commons chamber within the area of the block so as to retain the west wing, but it was impossible to get a properly balanced plan and the idea had ultimately to be discarded as the architects were convinced that no satisfactory scheme could be arrived at by endeavouring to tack the building on the west wing. They further stated that no portion of the walls above the foundation of the west wing could be used. The foundations of the remaining portion of the south or front wall were built of inferior masonry and the architects considered it better to tear out this masonry, and the wisdom of this decision was proved when they discovered stretches of the wall in the centre had been built of dry rubble.

I think that gives a fairly clear explanation of what led up to the destruction of the old walls.

Mr. BOYS: Is the minister reading from the minutes of the committee?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No.

Mr. BOYS: Were minutes kept?

[Mr. J. H. King.]

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It is a summary from the minutes of the committee as prepared by the estimate clerk for the information of the committee. I think it covers everything pretty fully. This report was made in July, 1916, after the old walls had been taken down, and the estimate of the new building was fixed at $5,000,000.

Mr. BOYS: Do the minutes show what members of the committee were present when that was agreed upon, and whether or not there were any dissenting voices?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I have not the minutes of the committee. Of course, they are very extensive, many meetings having been held. I am not sure whether the minutes would show that information, but I have no doubt they would confirm what I have stated to the committee.

Mr. BOYS: It would seem to me in view certainly of the implied, if not actual, criticism that it is important to know whether the committee was unanimous, or whether this work was forced on, so to speak, by a majority of the committee against the views of the other members. If so I have never heard of it, and I have been a member of the House for all these years.

Mr. CALDWELL: Did the members of the reconstruction committee receive any remuneration besides their indemnities?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No.

Mr. CALDWELL: Were they supposed to stay on the job all the year round and look after this work at their own expense?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Mr. CALDWELL: Then it looks to me as if the reconstruction committee were not expected to exercise very much supervision over the building of this structure the year round, and this impression is strengthened by the discussion we have had. In fact the architects and contractors were left largely to themselves. Due to the fact that the contract was on a cost plus basis and that no very close supervision was exercised by the reconstruction committee, the government or anyone else in authority except the architects, it is my candid opinion that herein lies the reason for the very high cost of construction. I am not blaming the present Minister of Public Works (Mr. King). I think he has had a very undesirable legacy bequeathed to him. I do not know just where to place the blame, but I think this committee should know where the fault lies, because already the country has spent more money than should have been spent for the value received.

Therefore I think we should have some record of how often the committee met and what took place at the various meetings.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): This House must take responsibility for what has been done. At various times information was presented to the House and the necessary money voted. Therefore the government of the day was more or less responsible, and as far as I can gather from the statement we have just listened to it is a substantially accurate summary of what took place. But we have the building on our hands and we must do something towards its completion. If the tower must be completed we will have to resume work on it If the several votes now before the committee would complete the tower and the Senate Chamber, I think that is nearly all we ought to do at this stage. I would suggest that we should not neglect the improve-
10 p.m ment of the acoustic properties of this chamber,which improvement can be effected for a very small sum of money. If the building can be completed for the sum stated, and the House so decides, well and good, but I certainly would not be in favour of increasing the vote beyond $500,000 at this stage. I think this House ought to take the responsibility of placing a limitation on any further sum to be spent to have the building, say, three-quarters completed at least, but without including any unnecessary items in such expenditure.

Mr. GOULD: This discussion as to the difference between the initial estimates and the total amount which the building has cost up to the present time might well remind us of the old proverb of locking the stable door after the horse is stolen. It also seems to me that the committee that was appointed and acted under the supervision of the various ministers of Public Works should have remembered the old maxim that you may estimate the cost of a building in the most careful manner—and I think this applies not only to the large buildings in Ottawa, but to buildings in all other cities whether private or public buildings, large or small—but you will find that the contractor usually adds one-fourth to the initial estimate which has been arrived at after careful consideration. I think that the committee which acted from time to time should have remembered that maxim, and then there would not have been the need for this expenditure, because the added cost of materials, the added cost of labour and so forth, would quickly account for the extra moneys this building has cost. I think it is unnecessary to discuss any further the difference between the initial estimate and the cost of the building up to the present time.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think it is important that the House get no wrong impression on the question of responsibility. It is true the joint committee which had charge did not exercise day to day supervision over the conduct of the work. It never was constituted for that purpose. It was constituted to determine the general plan of the work, the scheme of construction, the method of construction, whether by contract, cost-plus or by any other method, and in general to see that men suitable to the House as a whole, Senate and Commons, were in charge of the execution of the work. There never was any estimate of $5,000,000 in the world for the House as it has been built. That never was made. There was an estimate of $5,000,000 for what might be described as a portion of what we have to-day, but that would be based on the contemplation that it would be built on a contract basis. The committee decided against that, and my memory fails me very much if the committee did not decide unanimously that it would not be built by contract. There was some dispute, so far as my recollection goes, only on one point, as to whether or not the old walls and foundations should be used. There was not a party division even on that, but there was I think one member, possibly two, felt that we should not put on the extra storey and consequently might be able to use these walls. The better architectural opinion was that we could not, and the committee decided not.

As to building by contract or not by contract, I am quite satisfied from memory that there was no division whatever. It is true it costs more not to build by contract, but a building such as this, not upon any particular model, a building in respect of which new problems arise in the course of its construction over the years and must be dealt with at the time, new decisions be made as to what is to be done here and there, it was decided that the construction of a building such as that could be better done and be a greater credit to the country if it were done on the cost-plus basis, though it was known it would undoubtedly cost far more.

The government adopted the policy of having a committee of Senate and Commons, composed, I think, equally, with one majority only for the party in power at the time—otherwise equal of members of both sides. The decisions were made by that committee and the responsibility taken by them, and I do not know that there is anybody in the House to-day who is disposed to criticize those decis-

ions. I know the building has cost a considerable sum, but when we compare it with the cost of other buildings of similar purpose and like character in the country, I am not sure it has gone beyond any of them when we have regard to the results that we have obtained. We have real results here for the expenditure made, results we never could have got had the committee come to another decision as to the method of construction and let the work by contract. So that we need not sit here with an air of superiority and feel that simple maxims were forgotten by the members of that committee. I venture to think that very full and ample consideration was given to all these things not only by members of the committee but by members of the House in that parliament, and taken all in all, when one considers the contingencies and exigencies that have to be met in the matter of a construction such as this, we have got through with it certainly without scandal of any kind great or small, and I think without any very great modicum of error.

Mr. BOYS: I just want to make one other point sure, I think it was the member for Carleton, New Brunswick, who suggested that the extra cost was due to the cost-plus system being adopted. I think I understood the minister correctly when he said the contractors were paid eight per cent on the first four million and seven per cent on the balance, but not exceeding $5,000,000. If that be so they got nothing whatever for work done over $5,000,000, so in that case there is nothing left of the suggestion of the hon. member referred to. I just wanted to make sure I caught the minister correctly on that point.

Mr. CALDWELL: Do I understand the minister to say that the contractor gets nothing for the work he did over a cost of $5,000,000, that he receives no remuneration for his work over that amount?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): There have been no payments made to the general contractor beyond the commission as set forth, eight per cent on the first four million and seven per cent on the balance up to five million. It is true the contractor does maintain that he is entitled to further consideration but to date there has been no payment made.

Mr. CALDWELL: But he is claiming payment, and the government will eventually have to pay him on the whole cost at seven per cent will it not?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): In all probability there will have to be some payment. There has not been a settlement arrived at with the contractor, but he is claiming commissions and I would be inclined to think that a settlement probably will be arrived at. It has not been arrived at as yet.

Mr. CALDWELL: The hon. member (Mr. Boys) would have us believe that the contractor will not be paid on the extra cost above $5,000,000. Will the minister say that the government is not going to pay the contractor anything for his work above $5,000,000?

Mr. BOYS: I would like to interject one remark. What I said was that if I understood the minister correctly the contract did not entitle the contractor to anything beyond a $5,000,000 construction. I do not suppose the minister at this stage is going to judge the matter himself. That is for him and not for me, but I want to put myself right. All I said was that the remuneration of the contractor did not go beyond a cost of $5,000,000, if I understood the minister correctly.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The contractor contracted to build a building which the architects estimated would cost $5,000,000. We do not have to go very far in this discussion because it has already been stated by a number of members of the committee who were in the old parliament that this is a different building. It is true it is a different building. There have been many changes which have added to the cost, I have no doubt. I know that the contractor is claiming an additional amount on the full work done.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But does not the contract provide that these additional works shall be done by him and all be subject to the general limitation, that he gets so much up to I think it is two or three or four million, and then so much up to five million, but nothing beyond? In other words, is he not bound by the general limitation notwithstanding the fact that there were alterations in the building itself? The alterations were provided for in the contract.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I am not going to argue the contractor's case here. I have a settlement probably to make with the contractor. The argument presented by the right hon. leader of the Opposition is one that would be maintained to a certain extent, but we are dealing with a fact, and we must deal with the facts as they appear. It was only a moment ago that my right hon. friend said that this building was not the building as originally designed. The contractor will make the same representations, I have no doubt, to the department. It is a claim that will be under consideration shortly.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): How much is it?

Mr. CALDWELL: The architect, I presume, was bound by a similar contract. He was to receive a certain percentage up to $5,000,000 and nothing above that.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Supposedly.

Mr. CALDWELL: But he has been paid, or there is an agreement to pay him on the whole present cost of construction.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I thought I made that plain. He is paid on the cost less $1,600,000 odd not allowed.

Mr. CALDWELL: He is being paid a commission on about $8,000,000 instead of $5,000,000, and it is more than probable that you will have to settle with the contractor in much the same way. So that while I have great respect for my hon. friend's opinion on most matters I object to his trying to convey the impression that the contractor is not going to get paid anything on extra work in excess of the $5,000,000. That is not a reasonable thing and I do not think there is any thought in the minds of anyone that he shall not receive something for that extra work.

Mr. HANSON: Is not this matter subject to a written contract? Was there not a written contract entered into with the contractor at the start? If there was, unless that contract has been varied in some way, it seems to me it is a matter of the construction of the contract and the document should speak for itself?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I have no doubt it will be claimed that the contract has been varied and varied very materially; that is shown by the expenditure. The committee realized that when they had Mr. Ewart and Mr. Sutherland assess the new features of the original plan and allowed the amount of $1,733,000.

Mr. HANSON: There was no written contract with the architect but if the contractor agreed to the changes and did not stipulate anything for commission I do not see any legal liability whatever. A moral liability there may be, but that is another question.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The architects also were limited as to fees. It is true they did not sign a contract but in acknowledgement of a letter sent to them they wrote to the department accepting the conditions and the limitation of the fee.

Mr. CALDWELL: The architects?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not expect the minister to agree with what we say in this connection at all, but if he goes to his lawyer he will find that he ought to agree with it. There is a great deal of difference between the position of a man who writes a letter overlooking something which is contained in a formal communication and then repudiates it afterwards, and the position of a man who signs a sealed contract and whose action is bound within the four corners of that contract. The one would doubtless always maintain afterwards that he was not bound, while the other man continued to work under the contract. I think, however, we are, perhaps, getting a little bit away from this item. I wonder if my hon. friend does not want now to withdraw that $35,000. No? Then I am going to move in amendment that the item be reduced by $35,000, to the extent of that cut stone.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I do not know whether in the course of the discussion of this item the attention of the committee has been called to a very serious lack of proper accommodation for the housing and comfort of members of parliament which is evident in the construction of this building. Hon. gentlemen who have visited public buildings elsewhere, or who have been in other houses of parliament, have always found that a room was provided where members representing the different parties might meet together in conference and enjoy some of the good comradeship which every member realizes is one of the most interesting phases of parliamentary life no matter on what side he may sit. In the old parliament buildings the supporters of the government of the day had what was known as "Room 16," whilst the opposition had "Room 6." Opportunities were thus afforded of meeting the ministers, of meeting one another, of meeting gentlemen who came to Ottawa on public business, in addition to other advantages that accrue from gathering in such a common meeting place. I want to say that the gentlemen who composed the committee that had to do with the construction of this building apparently paid not the slightest attention to the provision of these rooms which I regard as absolutely essential to the carrying on of public business, as well as the ordinary business affairs of the members themselves. It would seem to me that the architect—and a very able and clever man he was, and he has given us an ornate building—ignored these

considerations which gentlemen who have had an experience in parliamentary life regard as so essential. Not only that, but the members of the parliamentary committee in failing to make provision for such accommodation either neglected their duty absolutely or, if they gave any thought to the matter at all, failed to insist upon the architect providing for these wants. I do not know whether it is yet possible, by some rearrangement, to have provision made for accommodation corresponding to the old time "Room 16" and "Room 6," but to me it seems the greatest possible anomaly that whenever anyone comes to visit an hon. member on business he can only be taken to the member's private room—which involves quite a journey and absence from the House—or be allowed to stand in the corridor. The consequence of the existing lack of suitable accommodation is that members are greatly inconvenienced; there is no common meeting place where hon. gentlemen composing the respective parties in the House can meet together or to which they can take their business or political friends. We have spent a tremendous amount of money on this building, and we have a very ornate structure, but the building is entirely lacking in those facilities which are so essential to the proper discharge of the functions of the members of parliament. Everyone who has visited Westminster knows of the facilities of the character of which I have spoken to be found there, and I would like to draw the attention of the minister to those facts and to state that while it is a serious proposition to suggest the tearing down or renovating of such a fine building as this is, some attention ought to be paid to the provision of accommodation of the character I have described.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Start by cutting out this $35,000 in the matter of the cut stone.

Amendment (Sir Henry Drayton) negatived.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I would ask the minister if it is not possible to have some more satisfactory system of lighting the offices on the sixth storey in the front part of the building. Hon. gentlemen who have offices there find it is necessary to have recourse to electric lights even in the day time. I do not know whether the committee or the architects are responsible for this defective system of lighting, but it is to be deplored that we should have to turn on the electric lights in order to carry on our work in the day time. Such a system is far from satisfactory; the conditions are very hard to work under. We have the worst lights in the rooms which need light most. These lights should be replaced, in order to make the rooms liveable at all, by the inverted lights which are used in the other rooms and which do not need them at all in the day time. I cannot understand why it was necessary to put the small windows along the front of the building, if the rooms were intended to be used for offices, because it is certainly a disgraceful thing to have such poor lighting, or rather the lack of lighting, in rooms of that kind. I recognize that it would be very difficult at this stage to enlarge these windows, but surely we can have electric light fixtures there which would give us lights which would not ruin our eyes.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): This is the first occasion on which I have heard complaint of the lighting. I will be very glad to have an examination made of the rooms my hon. friend speaks of, and if artificial lighting can be secured we will have it.

Mr. McQUARRIE: These are not the only rooms; other rooms are in the same position. The matter has been under investigation for some time, because I have been complaining about it; the requisition was put in for proper light and was headed off. This investigation does not do us much good. If the minister will see that the matter is looked into, I think he will provide proper lights for these rooms.

Mr. BANCROFT: While the minister is looking after the matter of better lighting on the sixth floor, I hope he will not overlook the lighting of the chamber. It is impossible to read in the day time on the back benches, and better lights should be provided.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): That matter has been brought to our attention and will receive consideration. Apparently the achitect thought he was making sufficient provision.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The curtains cause the trouble.

Mr. CALDWELL: In speaking of the members' rooms on the upper floors, I wish to remind the minister that there is no ventilation, except when the windows are thrown open, and that creates a draft through the room which is very injurious to health. If windows were made which could be let down from the top, we could have some ventilation and the drafts would not strike us so badly. The conditions spoken of by the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. McQuarrie) applies to the fifth as well as the sixth floor, especially the room next to the Library. I have a good-sized room with a

deep recess in it, and there is just a little light in the centre of the room. The room is poorly lighted and the ventilation is worse than no good, because the whole window swings on a hinge, and you have to open it to let the air in.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am afraid there is a whole lot of trouble ahead of the minister. First he is told the building is too ornate, then he is told the building is not ornate enough, and then my hon. friend for Victoria and Carleton (Mr. Caldwell) says the light in his room is not good enough, and the government should provide a better system of ventilation. I think the trouble is not so much with the building as with the use to which the building is put. I think that is the real trouble. I do not know what has become of all the rooms. When we were in power—and we had a good many more members on that side of the House than they have now—we were able to accommodate the members of the opposition. We were able to see that ex-ministers and others who had business to look after were given rooms they could work in, so that they would not have to work with borrowed lights. That is all over now, and we are fitted up with artificial lights. But it is the same building, and there are far fewer gentlemen on the other side of the chamber than there were under the old administration, and they are not becoming any more numerous either. They will not have to provide a brand new first-class room for the member who is coming from Moose Jaw. We had good rooms before, and what the hon member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) said is perfectly true. We had rooms for the members on the government side, and we gave the members of the opposition first-class rooms in the fourth storey. The opposition of to-day does not get that accommodation. Oh no, we are put in the cellar now—the cellar on the one hand and the garret on the other—and we are not grumbling an awful lot.

Mr. FIELDING: You are on the ground floor.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Yes, we are getting nearer.

Mr. McQUARRIE: It seems to me that the members who have to spend the greater part of their time in their rooms, the ones who come from a distance, are given the worst rooms in the building. I think those who require to remain in Ottawa over the week end, and who have to be in their rooms so much, should have the best rooms in the building, whereas, as a matter of fact, we get the worst rooms, and the members from Ontario and Quebec, some of whom are not in their rooms very much, have the good ones. I think there might reasonably be some different arrangement made.

Mr. McMASTER: Before the item carries, I should like to call the attention of the minister to the inadequate provision for the friends of private members on the government side in the gallery. We have very little provision made for the friends and relatives of the private members in the galleries, and a great deal more space than I think is necessary is devoted to those members of the other House who occasionally look in upon our labours. More space is also devoted to the Speaker's gallery than necessary. I think the private members' gallery should be extended 20 or 30 feet to the north, and the Speaker's gallery and the Senate gallery cut down somewhat. There is really not enough room for the private members' families in the members' gallery. I did not complain of our position when we were on the opposition side. At that time we bore with equanimity, courage and fortitude all these things and made no complaints. We had a large gallery, where those who admired us might sit and watch us in the successful effort we made to obtain power and assume the reins of government. But now that we have obtained the sunny side of power, we find that those who like to look at us and listen to our debates are cramped, confined and cabined in very small space. This is a matter of real importance to private members on this side of the House. I have dealt with it in a light way in order that I may receive the attention of the House, but it is a serious question and the present arrangement is unfair to the private members on this side of the House.

Item agreed to.

Ottawa, new departmental building, $500,000.

Mr. BELAND: I beg to move that the item No. 141, "Ottawa, new departmental building, $500,000" be struck out.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister might explain how the government came to make that blunder.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No blunder was made. The matter of the new departmental building was carefully and seriously considered by the government. Anyone who is familiar with the manner in which the various departments of the government are scattered about the city of Ottawa, and anyone who has business with the various departments will realise

that it is desirable that some of these departments, at least, should be housed in a better condition than they are to-day. It was, however, finally decided that it was not opportune this year to undertake a construction of that character, although, through inadvertence, the item appeared in the estimates. No mistake was made.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not quite get the reasoning. The government decided to build the building because it was far better to have the various departments housed in a government building, and the government decided that they would not do that this year. And no mistake was made. In which decision was no mistake made? In the decision to build, or in the decision not to build?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I think my explanation was quite satisfactory.

Mr. FIELDING: I think I shall have to take the responsibility of striking this out. The construction of this building was proposed at one stage by the Department of Public Works, and after further discussion it was decided that the item should be stricken out. My right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) knows the difficulties that arise in the clerical work of preparing the estimates, and in this work the clerks neglected to pay attention to this item. I am responsible for this. If there is a blunder, I am the guilty man.

Amendment agreed to.

Ottawa, addition to Dominion Archives building, $150,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This is an entirely new item, and we should have an explanation of it.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I am very glad to give an explanation. The matter of further building for housing the archives is important and urgent, and if members will make themselves familiar with conditions that exist to-day, they will realise the necessity. In fact, in 1912, the government of that day considered that it was necessary to construct an addition to the Archives building in order that public records might be stored with safety. A commission was appointed which reported on the plan and the form of addition that should be made, and an estimate of $50,000 was then placed in the Estimates. I think this was repeated in 1915. Since the years 1914 and 1915, many valuable records have been and are in the possession of the government and of the people of Canada, and there should be no tendency on the part of the government to neglect the proper storage or housing of these valuable records. It is the intention of the government to make an addition to the present Archives building.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I think there was a plan or a scheme for the extension of the Archives building, on a system of additional units to be constructed every few years. Is this appropriation to construct one of these units, or is it for a new building?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): There was a scheme drawn up, but not a complete scheme. The architect is studying the present building now with a view of arriving at what he considers is best in the way of an addition to the present building, and plans are being developed along that line.

Item agreed to.

Ottawa Printing bureau—new building, $500,000.

Mr. BELAND: I beg to move that this item of $500,000 for Ottawa Printing bureau, new building, be reduced by the sum of $350,000.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): When the matter was originally considered by the government, an amount of $500,000 was placed in the estimates as the sum that would be required and that could be expended during the coming year. At that time, it was thought that investigations and information necessary to be secured in order that proper plans and a proper building might be developed could be secured in time for plans and arrangements to be made for construction. There have, however, been unavoidable delays; we have not been able to proceed as rapidly as we would like, and I, in consultation with the architect, have been advised that a sum of $150,000 will be sufficient for this year's expenditure in the matter of constructing a new Printing bureau.

As regards the necessity for a new Printing bureau, the present building was constructed some thirty-six years ago. It does not lend itself to the proper installation and equipment of what would be considered as an up-to-date Printing bureau, such as the government would require. Apparently, there has been a necessity for enlargement for printing purposes, because we find that during the last four or five years a very large sum of money has been expended on that building constructed some thirty-six years ago. I believe some $111,000 have been expended since 1919 in additions and changes to the building, in an endeavour to make it adaptable for Printing bureau purposes. In addition to that, the department found it necessary to rent, outside of the present premises, very considerable space, and they find a very considerable expenditure is required in the matter of trucking back and forth

from storehouses and rented space in other portions of the city. We are advised by the Printing bureau officials that a properly constructed bureau with proper equipment would make a very large saving to the people of the country, and after this matter was gone into thoroughly, it was considered good economy by the government to undertake the construction of a new Printing bureau, it also being intended to utilize the present building for departmental purposes. It will be possible, probably, to utilize this building, after it is vacated by the printing establishment, for the Statistical branch, a very large branch of the service that, I am informed, is to-day housed in some temporary buildings on Vittoria street. The matter has been carefully considered, and it is the intention of the government to proceed with the construction of a proper printing establishment.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Can the minister give us some details? He gives us some general information. It is quite true that some money was spent on the building and many rearrangements were made as a result of the report of the Civil Service Commission, which rearrangement resulted in very large savings being made at that plant. At that time, as a result of the reorganization, the staff was largely reduced; it is to-day largely reduced, and large economies have already been effected. Will the government promise further similar resulting economies if this building is put up? What is the real reason for building it? The staff is now considerably smaller than it was before, for hon. gentlemen's predecessors cut down the cost of administration by over half a million.

Mr. MURDOCK: My hon. friend referred to the money that had been expended in making additions to that building during the past few years. I think the exact figure is about $195,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The minister gave $110,000.

Mr. MURDOCK: The additions, I am told, amount to $150,000. There have, as my hon. friend suggests, been great reductions in the staff in the past few years affecting some 400 or more employees. For example, there have been, I believe, about 61 retirements, most of which have been in the nature of a reduction of staff, the positions not having been filled. I believe it will be possible to continue to reduce the staff by future retirements and have a Printing bureau reasonably modern and up-to-date, obviating the duplication of effort back and forth, as is now necessary. It is believed that if this were done substantial reductions could be made. Then the floor space of the present Printing bureau is worth, on a rental basis, about $95,000 a year, possibly for some other branch of the public service, as has been suggested. In the matter of storage and the truckage of supplies back and forth between the two or three storage houses which the bureau now has to rent, this storage should all be within the Printing bureau itself, so as to avoid this unnecessary expense.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Where are these storage houses that are referred to?

Mr. MURDOCK: They are scattered within three or four blocks of the Printing bureau. One of the storage houses is the old Hawkesbury building near the Archives. The building, of course, belongs to the government and it requires certain expenditures for fuel, light and janitor. It is an out-of-date building and the supplies cannot be kept in proper shape in it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is kept there?

Mr. MURDOCK: Many publications that may or may not be required immediately or in the near future. We have, I think, two other storage buildings about three blocks from the Printing bureau, entailing an upkeep for watchmen and truckage.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is stored in those other two?

Mr. MURDOCK: Paper supplies, and binding and other materials of various kinds used in the bureau, for which there is not room down there, and which are carried on hand for the use of the various departments.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What area have we now for storage purposes in the existing bureau, and how many weeks' supplies can we carry there? It seems to me that this was all gone into two or three years ago, and my recollection is that there is enough room in the existing bureau to look after necessary supplies for a reasonable length of time. I think there is room for such supplies as any commercial man would have on hand.

Mr. MURDOCK: My information is that that is not the case and that there is not sufficient room for many of the supplies that are carried. As a matter of fact, not very long ago there was considerable pressure brought to bear for the renting of additional storage space and for some rearrangement at the Printing bureau. We are carrying on with just the

rented outside space and the Printing bureau somewhat rearranged.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: If new buildings are to be built simply because pressure is brought to bear on the minister, then there would be no vacant land left for buildings if the minister remained in the department long enough. I want to know what the real facts are. I do not want to be told that this or that interest, or this or that person wants the minister to rent a building or to have a new building put up. I want to know what area of storage is available and how much material can be carried in that storage space for maximum operations during any given period. I want the business end of the matter.

Mr. MURDOCK: There is rented an area of 40,000 square feet outside. The space in the Printing bureau is entirely insufficient, as my hon. friend would readily admit if he took a look at it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I was not asking what space was rented outside. I want to know what space there is in the building and what supplies can be carried in that space.

Mr. MURDOCK: I do not think that information could be accurately given. When you come to determine what supplies are necessary in order to carry on, you have to assume that supplies when ordered will come forward promptly, and my hon. friend knows well enough, with his railway experience, that you cannot figure on any such thing, but that you have to store sufficiently in advance so as to be sure to have on hand the stocks of paper and binding material and everything else that may be necessary. As my hon. friend knows, the various departments of the government, when they have printing to do, place their orders with the bureau and the stocks have to be secured to fill those orders. Those stocks have to be kept in a proper place until they can be used, and my hon. friend can readily convince himself that there is no spare storage space in the existing bureau if he will take the trouble to-morrow morning to go there and look the place over. If he cares to go I shall be glad to accompany him.

Mr. CAHILL: What time?

Mr. MURDOCK: Any time.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What quantities of material, such as paper, are ordered? What quantities do you take delivery of? What is your contract?

Mr. MURDOCK: That would depend entirely on what the order might be. Quite frequently you have to call for tenders for 10, 15 or 20 tons or more at a time, according to the orders that come from the various departments. The Printing bureau does not send out these orders for material until the various departments indicate their desire to have certain printing done. When they require such printing done they present their order to the bureau and the necessary material has to be purchased.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the committee might as well make up its mind to vote the whole half million with the information it has before it. We are simply invited to instruct the government to go ahead and spend the $150,000 on the building. Why, the minister himself will tell us that $150,000 is a mere flea bite. I do not think he will guarantee for one moment to get us a site and build a new Printing bureau for half a million dollars. This is one of the most vicious features we have in connection with government matters—the commencement of works without any proper information, without any reliable estimate of cost, without anyone being responsible if the estimate is exceeded. We are merely invited to give a blank cheque for a new Printing bureau. The committee sees how much information we have. The amendment helps just a little bit, but so far as the Treasury is concerned it does not save one single dollar, for just as much money will be spent as may be required, and every member of the government knows it. Surely we can get something definite before we are asked to vote this money? Surely the minister will tell us exactly how much he is going to spend before he asks us to pass this vote? And surely we are entitled to a little more definite information as to the real necessity of this work at the present time.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I thought I had made myself clear in my first statement, that we have an old building erected some thirty-six years ago and no longer suitable for present day equipment used in the printing trade, and that for some four or five years extensive additions have been made to this old building at an expenditure which I would be inclined to consider was wasted. We had the alternative this year of making another addition to this old building, which we did not think would be a wise expenditure, or consider the advisability of utilizing it for departmental purposes and providing a new building for the Printing bureau. The bureau is an important branch of the government service and requires a very large expenditure each year, and it is essential if its work

is to be carried on economically and efficiently that proper equipment and adequate buildings should be provided. We are advised by the bureau people that they are to-day operating under serious difficulties. In fact, as the Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock) stated this afternoon, it was found last year unsafe to run one of the heavy machines on the third floor and it was brought down to the ground floor. Then again we find high pressure boilers for the operation of the machinery placed in the centre of one of these wings. The great heat from these boilers makes it uncomfortable for those working in this section of the building, and the fire hazard must also be taken into account. Under all the circumstances I think we are quite right in advising parliament at this time not to expend further money on the old building, but to construct a new building for the Printing bureau and utilize the present building for some other departmental purposes. That is the explanation I tried to make in the first place. I think it is sound.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Let us see how far we have got. I am going to ask my friend the first thing that one would naturally want to know when requested to undertake a new work—how much will the completed work cost? We have not had the slightest suggestion yet as to that.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I explained to my hon. friend that it was hoped when the original item of $500,000 was put in the estimates that we would have complete details and plans and be ready to go ahead. We have not been able to develop those details, and therefore I have asked the committee to reduce the estimate to $150,000. I am advised that the building will cost in the vicinity of $500,000 at least, but the whole matter is to be worked out in detail before any expenditure is made.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The explanation is simply that the minister cannot tell us. He does not know, and he gives his excuse for not knowing.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): A very sound excuse, too.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That is what the minister thinks. It seems to me that he might have had his work in hand and been ready with full particulars before asking parliament to vote this sum. What is the floor area of the present building, and of the projected building?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It is proposed to make a careful survey of buildings of the character of an up-to-date Printing bureau. That survey is to be made jointly by a representative from the bureau and the architect of the department. We have not been able to make this survey to date, and that is why I am asking that the estimate be reduced. Nothing will be undertaken until full details are supplied.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: If that is the case there is no reason why this item should not be struck out.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Is the department now able to do all the government printing work, or is some of it being done outside?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I am not sure.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): We ought to have that information.

Mr. MURDOCK: Practically all of the government printing is done in the Printing bureau. There have been—

Mr. MEIGHEN: Exceptions.

Mr. MURDOCK:—some slight exceptions—not so many as a short time ago.

Mr. BAXTER: I heard the minister say the old building would be used for other purposes. We ought to know definitely what department he intends to accommodate there so that we may judge as to the suitability of the building for the purpose.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): In my original statement I said it was considered that the building would be very suitable for the Statistical branch. This branch has a large staff, ordinarily about three hundred, and during the census operations the number runs up to some six or seven hundred. I am advised by the Architect's branch that suitable accommodation could be provided for them in the old building.

Mr. BAXTER: Where are they housed now?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): On Bank and Victoria in some temporary buildings.

Mr. BOYS: I suppose there is no question that once we pass this item we are irretrievably committed to an ultimate expenditure of $500,000 or more?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Two million dollars practically.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It might be anything.

Mr. BOYS: That being so, I am prompted to put another inquiry. When the item stood at $500,000 was that for the complete building or only for partial construction?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It is estimated that $500,000 would probably complete the building. That is only an estimate. There is to be a thorough inquiry made by the architect of the department in conjunction with the Printing bureau people. There is nothing new in this procedure. Only in the last vote it was mentioned that in 1912 the government of the day placed $50,000 in the estimates for the enlargement of the archives building. I am informed that that was purely
11 p.m. an estimate. An estimate of this character is presented every year. I would very much prefer to have had the matter developed in order that I might have definite information for the committee, but that has not been possible under present conditions.

Mr. BOYS: That shows very clearly that if $150,000 is passed we are of course committed to an expenditure of at least $500,000.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I think so.

Mr. BOYS: As it is not really essential at the present time to undertake this work, could not the item stand until next year?

Mr. BAXTER: I presume the minister has informed himself, but I think this committee ought to have information as to the cost of rented buildings in the city of Ottawa upon a floor space basis as a comparison with similar figures for buildings constructed by the Dominion government, taking into account the interest on the cost, and the upkeep, including repairs and everything else, so that we may see whether it is more or less expensive to own buildings or to rent them. While personally I would rather favour the idea of the government owning and controlling the necessary buildings for the public service, still I have understood that the same thing obtains in Ottawa that obtains in other cities throughout Canada, and it is that the investments made by owners are not very profitable in the larger buildings, and that it will cost the government more annually to meet the interest charge and the upkeep of a building constructed for a specific purpose than to rent equal space in privately-owned buildings. I do not know which is correct, but I do think before we are asked to pass upon any such project we ought to have some information of that character. So far it seems to me to be just a little bit nebulous. The minister has told us that an architect is to consult with some one who will know the requirements of the Printing bureau. We do not seem to know the area to be covered nor the floor space that is requisite. It is very difficult to see how upon such a slender footing you can make an estimate of $500,000 or any other sum, and feel that it is even tolerably within the limits of accuracy. It may be, but I must say it is rather a nebulous proposition.

To avoid the necessity of speaking again, I would like to suggest this on the broader view of the question. If economy is worth anything it ought to begin here, and this government, this parliament, ought to try to set the example of getting along under existing conditions rather than incurring expenditure at a time when it seems to be simply impossible to make the annual revenue commensurate with the annual expenditure. Now if we start with that proposition I should think we would have very little of new building for some years. We have just heard a criticism in the House to-night as to the result with regard to this building in which we are. It may be that the criticism is not well directed, but there seems to be in the committee a feeling of dissatisfaction that the cost had so largely exceeded the amount that was predicted. Surely that must have come to some extent from the very practice that the minister, and I give him all credit for good intentions, is introducing to-night of embarking upon construction without first having a rigid analysis of the cost.

Might I suggest this, that the Dominion government at all times is doing too much printing, and that to contract the Printing bureau instead of expanding it would be decidedly in the interests of the country. There are tons of printed matter distributed to this House and distributed throughout the country that no one ever reads, and if we went so far in my judgment, which may not concur with that of other members of the House, as to bring about the suppression of Hansard itself, I think the country would not be much worse off. I must say I do not see any great benefit in recording what people have said when it seems to be one of the criteria of latter day politics that no one is bound to stick to anything he has said in the past. Against this expenditure which produces nothing for the country is the absolute need in every great harbour of Canada for the expenditure not merely of one hundred thousand or five hundred thousand dollars but millions of dollars, in order to promote the trade that is vital and necessary to this country if we are to keep the people within it and give them something to live for. I do not mind enlarging the capital debt for something that will promote the trade of the country even if it does seem to be running into extravagance. Why cannot we stop these things that are not vitally necessary, these things that do not produce any results until we have caught up with the things that are

necessary from a business standpoint? I would ask the minister, because I believe he is a man of sound intentions and fair judgment and wants to do the best he can, under the circumstances to fairly consider the wisdom of dropping this item and all items of this class until we have met these other expenditures that the country needs to a vastly greater extent.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It is true that our rentals of ordinary office space show a cheaper cost than in buildings owned and operated by the government but a building suitable for a printing bureau could not, I think, be rented in the city of Ottawa. I do not think you could find that type of building here. It is a building which is required for a specific purpose and my information, my advice, my inquiries lead me to believe we would be well advised in constructing a building for this purpose rather than trying to make additions to the old building which we are now occupying. We think it better business to provide this building, that it will be real economy in the end, and that is the reason why we are asking for this appropriation.

Mr. MEIGHEN: My suggestion to the minister is that we abandon the item; abandon any plans for additions to the present Printing bureau and the estimates for a new building. For the life of me I do not know why the government is starting to build another printing bureau now. I thought that pressure for everything that was needed, or for everything that was not needed, came on the late government, but I cannot recall any pressure for a printing bureau. I cannot recall any demand for that at all, and it seems a strange thing to me that it has been discussed now; that the one new thing we want in this country is a new printing bureau. Why are the additions required? Of course we could use them. There is some storage required at times for stationery, and if that stationery was at the bureau it would be a little handier. That is all correct, but it is no ground for embarking on an expenditure that is going to run to a million dollars.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Oh no.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh, pshaw. The minister has got to get ground, unless he is going to come down here on Wellington street, and I venture to say he is not. He is going to erect a building of the dimensions of the present bureau or larger. Will he tell me that the present building did not cost a million dollars, and erected at a time when building was far cheaper than it is now? I have never had the figures, but I venture to say that building has cost close to a million dollars. Once we pass this item the minister can enter into a contract for the erection of a building of the present dimensions or larger. When that is done he will have paid a million out. Then he has to take his old building and reconstruct it virtually from top to bottom, because as it stands to-day it is valueless as a departmental building; the walls are there, it is true, but the whole of the interior would have to be reconstructed. He is launching on a new building at the present time because he has been informed that the present structure is not suitable for a modern printing bureau. Does the minister mean to suggest that the need or call for a new bureau compares at all with the need of scores of farmers of this country who are drawing grain for sixty miles to get it to a railway station? The grading of the railway which is to provide them with means of transportation has been done but the government cannot provide the money to put down the rails. Let the minister get along with the building he has. We do not need a building to-day as much as we needed it years ago; we have fewer employees. I have a statement in front of me which shows that the annual pay of those employees, notwithstanding the increased wages we are paying out to-day, is something like $526,000 less than in previous years. We have some 460 less employees, if I understood the Minister of Labour aright, than we had before. Now if we have fewer employees and less expenditure to provide for, owing to the reorganization effected by the late government, why is it, with all that done, we have got to cast the whole thing away and erect a new building? The minister, I think, should abandon the item and abandon the project. Let us go on with the Printing bureau that we have, let us hold to the saving we have made, and let us possibly present some case to those in other parts of the Dominion who have to be denied improvements that are necessary for productive purposes on the score of economy.

Mr. MURDOCK: There is one very important reason for the proposal to build a new Printing bureau that has not yet been referred to. I was in hopes that it would not be necessary to allude to it but it seems that it is. I would like very much if my hon. friends opposite who have so eloquently talked against the building of a reasonably modern, safe and up-to-date Printing bureau would go down to that bureau and verify whether what I am going to state is warranted by the facts

or not. I do not possess special knowledge with respect to printing bureaux but I regard the present building as being absolutely unsuitable for the employees under present conditions having regard to the location of the heating plant. When I was first placed in charge of the Printing bureau and went down to look at the situation and examined the location of the heating plant, what did I find? It is located in the centre of the bureau, the structure has been built around it, so that in the rooms above the heat in the summertime is unbearable while the risk from fire, and possible misadventure, at all times, seems to me to be beyond question. I frankly state that I have been anticipating, month after month, some unfortunate occurrence to happen down there, with possibly great loss of life. If there should be any such occurrence, under the conditions which now exist, would we save money in view of the fact that 675 or 725 employees would be thrown on our hands to be supported by the government while they were out of work. Then the fact of the heavy machinery in the bureau has been touched upon. I do not know that the building conforms to the requirements of the Ontario Factory Law; I am afraid that instead of being held to conform to the provincial statute it would be regarded as entirely unsafe. As to the aspect of this proposition from a financial standpoint, the committee have not yet been told that we pay out in rent of buildings in the city of Ottawa every year the sum of $626,000; that we pay for the upkeep of these buildings—for char service, heating and lighting and so on—$275,000, or a total of $901,000 a year for these purposes. Yet the proposition to build a $500,000 modern, up-to-date, printing plant, constructed so that the heaviest machinery could be utilized and operated without undue vibration, is subjected to criticism. This is a business proposition, if I know anything about it. I certainly would like hon. members who are opposed to the vote for this purpose to go down and inspect the situation for themselves and then come back and say whether this proposition is not a practical and businesslike one. I do not regard the conditions under which employees in the Printing bureau are working as being safe, and I think we are fortunate indeed that untoward occurrences have not happened before this.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not know why there should have been any hesitation in stating that the building is dangerous from a fire standpoint if that is the real reason for the government's action. I really do not know what the government were afraid of in concealing that fact and only bringing it out at the last minute. But let us consider the argument presented from that standpoint. It has not been shown that any great change is needed now from what has existed for thirty-six years at all events for several years. I have not heard this fire peril advanced before.

Mr. MURDOCK: Will my right hon. friend pardon me? He probably is aware that in very recent years an additional wing has been built right over the boiler. That is a material change which affects the situation.

Mr. BAXTER: Where should the boiler be put? Not on top of the building.

Mr. MURDOCK: You usually have the boiler in a spot where you will not encounter improper hazards.

Mr. BAXTER: The boiler is in the cellar generally.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Sometimes you do, but certainly it is not the rule by any means. Suppose the building is turned into a departmental building, what about the employees that are going to be put into it? The minister's intention is to take the government employees from some other sphere and hive them in this building, and the boiler will still be under the building. The boiler will not be moved out.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): There is a difference. These boilers are used for power purposes; they are under high pressure. The old heating boiler would be a low pressure boiler, which is quite different.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the minister mean there is danger of the boiler bursting because of the high pressure?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The boilers are under high pressure and high fires all the time.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I presume they are built for that. I understood the danger to be that there was something above, and in case of fire starting below it would quickly spread. That danger will exist just the same if the building is of the other kind. It may be there will be less fire on. It seems to me it is drawing the line pretty fine. If there is danger of the boilers bursting, then they were not built for the purpose for which they are being used. If there is danger from fire, there is just as much danger if it is heated as a departmental building as there would be in the other case. The minister says it is going to pay, because now we are paying out some $600,000 rentals and $200,000 odd for lighting and charring in the

rented buildings. Well why not pay it out? After we have built this building, will we not have to light it the same as in the other case? Do we not get along more cheaply when we rent these buildings? Is not the reason he is erecting this building the fact that there is not a building he can rent which is suitable for the purpose? I have not the least doubt at all—and I have gone very carefully into some of the comparisons—that we cannot erect buildings and maintain them as cheaply as we can rent, save under very exceptional conditions of renting, and at the present time in this city there are liable to be more buildings in the market to rent, and there are to-day more buildings to rent, than there have been for some years. The government is in position to get cheaper rentals, if only it will exercise the opportunities at hand. The government can get cheaper rentals than we have had for some time, and while we are in that position, when we should be contracting rather than expanding departments, needing less year by year, we are launching upon a building programme, and we are asked to give a cheque for a building which is going to run to $1,000,000. It ought to be possible to obviate any special fire peril in this building. If there is any special fire peril I do not want the bureau employees or any other employees to be subject to it. It should be possible to obviate this peril, without abandoning the thing after 36 years, merely because we are told that by reason of the boiler being underneath there is some special danger to the occupants.

Mr. WHITE: In view of the statement made by the Mininster of Labour (Mr. Murdock) I would like to know if this bureau was not subject to the inspection of the factory inspector, and if the boilers are not regularly inspected by the inspectors of the insurance companies, and whether any complaint or any condemnation has been made in either case.

Mr. MURDOCK: I do not know whether any inspection has been made. I think not, and I do not want to convey the impression that the boilers are not safe. I do not know as to that. It is the location and the general way in which the wing has been built over, and the number of years that have elapsed since some of the work has been done and added to, that makes the structure, particularly in the centre, appear to me to be entirely unsafe and as though we might expect something serious to happen.

Mr. BAXTER: What is the matter with taking a recess, getting the architects and the chief of the Printing bureau and all the other necessary persons together, and coming back next session with a definite knowledge of what is the matter with the old building? The doubts of the Minister of Labour will be relieved by that time, and he can find out whether there is really a peril or not. We can have a plan made for a building, and know exactly what its floor space, height and cost will be, as accurately as any of these estimates can be made, and then parliament will be furnished with the information it should be asked to pass upon. I do not see there will be very much economy in time by putting the estimate through now, as all these things will have to be done, or I presume they will be done, before the government enters upon the construction of the building. It is only a question whether we will pass the estimate after the government has the information or before. I think perhaps the Minister of Public Works (Mr. King) might enlighten me a little more as to what they are going to do with the old building? Are they going to put the old Bureau in the Senate?

Amendment (Mr. Beland) agreed to.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I move that the item be further reduced by $150,000.

Mr. FIELDING: One suggestion on the part of hon. members opposite impressed me, and that is that this building will cost $1,000,000. The leader of the Opposition suggested the old building cost $2,000,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No.

Mr. FIELDING: I thought he said it probably cost $2,000,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, $1,000,000.

Mr. FIELDING: I think if this building is going to cost $1,000,000, before we go on with it the minister should come back to parliament and inform us. I think the request that we should know what a building is going to cost before we enter upon its construction is a reasonable one. I have been impressed with the representations as to the urgent need of the building, and if we are going to do anything this appropriation of $150,000 is not too much to make a beginning. If the minister finds on investigation that the building is going to cost about $1,000,000, I think he should not go on with it, but that he should stop operations, and come back and lay his plans before the House. Subject to that, I think the appropriation might properly pass.

The CHAIRMAN: This is a direct vote against the item, because it will reduce it to nothing.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is what I intended.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not know that the hon. member can move to reduce the whole item to nothing. He can move to reduce it by a certain sum.

Mr. GOULD: Listening to the remark of the Minister of Labour, I was impressed with the thought that, seeing that he had gone down and, in his judgment, proved the building to be unworthy and unsafe, he might have followed up that idea by getting an engineer to investigate and make a report, and submit that report to the House. It seems to me that it would be more authentic, and we would have more to go on, if an engineer would submit a report and state that the building was unsafe or that portions of it were unsafe, and it would not in any way depreciate the ideas or the sentiments of the Minister of Labour. It seems to me the committee here has a right, if buildings are alleged to be unsafe, to have reports from some competent authority in regard to them.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I do not think there should be any idea in the minds of members of the committee that these boilers which are high pressure boilers under steam are not being properly inspected and taken care of. I have no doubt examinations are being made from time to time to see that they are in proper condition. But as regards even boilers that are looked after, things happen at times, and nobody will undertake for a moment to say that a high-pressure boiler should be under a building in which six or seven hundred people are employed. There is not only the danger that might happen of explosions which are more or less remote, but which, through neglect or some other cause, occur at times, but a very considerable danger from fire. Boilers carrying steam are usually fired to produce the heat required for the generation of steam in quantities, a much greater heat than one finds required in low-pressure boilers for heating purposes, and there is a real risk there, a risk that I do not believe the employees in the Printing bureau should be subject to. They were not originally subject to this, but they have been more recently on account of additions that have been built around this boiler, which at one time was outside of the building. That is a phase of the question that has been brought to the attention of the committee, and I think in fairness to the employees of the Printing bureau, proper inspection should be made from time to time. There is an increased fire risk and some danger that explosions from that boiler might occur, although the latter danger is remote.

[Mr. Chairman.]

The suggestion of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) is quite in accord with my view. I have assured the committee that it is the intention of the department that the Architect's branch and representatives from the bureau will devote considerable time to informing themselves as to what will constitute a proper building for printing purposes, one that will be of service to the government. They will then proceed to design plans and to submit plans to the government. If after careful inquiry, we find that this is going to commit us to a larger expenditure than the original expenditure suggested I have no objection, in fact, I will advise that the matter be stayed over until the House is consulted next session. But I think it is necessary for us to make some progress in the matter. Let us make the investigation; let us have the plans. If necessary, let us secure the site, although I do not think that will be necessary because the government owns a considerable amount of property, and I believe we can find a location for the plant. Let us go ahead, however, with the reduced appropriation of $150,000, and if it is found by the officials, after careful consideration, that this expenditure is to exceed the estimate as originally placed in the estimates, I will advise that the government hold the matter up and that parliament be consulted next year. In the meantime, I would like that this vote should receive the sanction of parliament.

Mr. MEIGHEN: On the undertaking of the minister that if, after the plans are fully provided, they know what the cost is to be of the land and of the building, and if they find that that is likely to be over $500,000, then he will not proceed to make any expenditure, I am prepared to withdraw the amendment. The result will be just the same.

Amendment (Mr. Meighen) withdrawn.

Item as amended agreed to.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, the House adjourned at 11.35 p.m.

Wednesday, April 11, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

MINES AND MINERALS

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou), for Mr. Carroll, presented the second report of the select standing committee on Mines and Minerals as follows:

Your committee recommend that they be given leave to sit while the House is in session.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou) moved that the first and second reports of the select standing committee on Mines and Minerals be concurred in.

Mr. SPEAKER: By unanimous consent.

Motion agreed to.

TORONTO PENNY BANK

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 104, to change the name of the Penny Bank of Toronto.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

UNSCALPED OR UNCLEANED SCREENINGS

Hon. Mr. MANION:

1. Have there been any complaints since 1915 regarding the purchase of unscalped or uncleaned screenings from the government elevators to the Board of Grain Commissioners?
2. If so, was any action taken by the board?
3. Is the minister willing to lay on the table of the House all correspondence and papers connected with such complaints if there were any?

Hon. Mr. ROBB:

1. According to the records of the board, it would appear only one complaint was made to the Board of Grain Commissioners with regard to screenings shipped from the Canadian government elevators since 1915.

2. It would appear from the file that this complaint was allowed to lapse, owing to the complainants in this case failing to prove by evidence they did not get delivery of the product as called for by the document surrendered.

3. Yes, if moved for, but at the same time there is nothing particularly in the correspondence beyond the information given above.

Mr. C. T. YOUNG

Mr. CARRUTHERS:

1. Is Mr. C. T. Young an employee of the government?
2. If so, what is his official position?
3. When was he appointed, and what are his duties, and salary?
4. What industrial operation does the government carry on at Poleyet, Ontario?
5. What was the net profit or loss of such operation during the past three years?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM: Dropped.

DOMINION NOTES

Mr. KELLNER:

In regard to Dominion notes issued in 1914 under P.C. 2325, P.C. 2450, P.C. 2670, P.C. 2921, P.C. 3170, to the amount of $10,000,000 P.C. 2326, P.C. 2451, P.C. 2671, P.C. 2922, to the amount of $6,000,000; P.C. 2750 to the amount of $10,000,000; total $26,000,000.

1. How were the above issues put into circulation?
2. Were these issues withdrawn? If so, how?
3. Has the amount of Dominion notes in circulation last year been reduced? If so, why and how?
4. What is the total amount of Dominion notes known as "bank legals" in the hands of the banks, and what is the nature of the transaction giving the banks possession of these notes?
5. What is the amount on deposit in the Central Gold Reserve by banks, what portion is gold and of what is the balance composed?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING:

1. By deposit for credit of the Minister of Finance and Receiver General.

2. No.

3. No. Dominion note circulation at Mar. 31, 1922, $241,461,426.42; at Mar. 31, 1923, $242,657,765.42.

4. Notes known as "bank specials," legal tender between banks only, outstanding at March 31, 1923, amounted to $202,337,000. These notes are issued in exchange for ordinary Dominion notes, or upon deposit of the equivalent in gold or as advances under the provisions of the Finance Act.

5. At March 31, 1923, deposits in the central gold reserves amounted to $55,252,533.33, of which $9,502,533.33 was gold and $45,750,000 Dominion notes.

MARA, B.C., POST OFFICE

Mr. MacKELVIE:

1. What is the salary paid Cyril E. Rosoman, Postmaster at Mara, British Columbia?
2. Who represents the estate of the late Mary E. Rosoman with whom the Post Office department has contracted for the carriage of mails between the railway station and the Mara post office?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Salary and allowances, $315.69.
2. The legal representative is C. Rosoman.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

PURCHASES OR SALES OF RAILWAY LANDS OR PROPERTY

Mr. BOYS:

For a copy of all orders in council passed since January 1, 1922, authoriing or ratifying purchases or sales of lands or property either by the Canadian Northern Railway Company, or any of its subsidiaries, or by the Canadian National Railways, or by the Grand Trunk Railway Company, or any of its subsidiaries.

STIPENDIARY MAGISTRATE IN ROCKY MOUNTAINS PARK

Mr. SHAW:

For a copy of all letters, papers, telegrams, orders in council and other documents dealing with and relating to the abolition of the office or position of police or stipendiary magistrate in the Rocky Mountains Park of Canada and dealing with and relating to the dismissal of B. W. Collison, Esq., of Banff, Alberta, from said office or position.

MILITIA PENSION ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM Minister of National Defence) moved that the House go into committee to-morrow to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend the Militia Pension Act, chapter forty-two of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, and to provide that pensions of retired officers, who served in the war and are employed in public service, be continued, and that the annual emolument of any such officer shall not exceed the annual rate of pay and allowances upon which the pension was computed; also to provide that pensions which have been paid to such officers shall not be recoverable from them.

He said: His Excellency, the Governor General, having been made acquainted with the subject matter of this resolution, recommends it to the favourable consideration of the House.

Motion agreed to.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—THE BUDGET

On the Orders of the Day.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I would like to ask the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) whether during the adjournment he has been able to make up his mind when the budget shall come down.

Mr. FIELDING: Not as to the precise date, and I like to be precise in such a matter.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Later on this week?

Mr. FIELDING: If my hon. friend will bring up the question later on, I will try to be more definite.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: This week?

Mr. FIELDING: Not this week.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Next week?

Mr. FIELDING: Wait and see.

THE FRENCH TREATY

On the Orders of the Day.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the Minister of Finance propose to go on with the French Treaty prior to the budget?

Mr. FIELDING: Yes, I think so.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This week?

Mr. FIELDING: If not this week, then during the first days of next week we will go on with the French Treaty.

[Mr. Graham.]

SUPPLY

NATIONAL DEFENCE

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

Dominion Arsenal, Quebec, $390,000.

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of National Defence): Some hon. members wanted this item to stand when we were discussing the estimates on the last occasion.

Mr. BOYS: The minister will recall, no doubt, that when this item was under discussion some weeks ago certain information was asked for and promised, and I am pleased to say that privately I received most of the information asked for when the item was under discussion. I would ask that the minister give me that information now, so that it may be placed on Hansard. I wanted to know, (1) the quantity of ammunition received from England; (2) the value of the ammunition received from England; (3) the quantities of that ammunition still on hand, and (4) the portion of ammunition which would not be useful to the militia of Canada.

Mr. GRAHAM: I might say, Mr. Chairman, as to the last question that, as far as I have been able to ascertain, there is no portion of it that would not be useful, if it is expended before the expiration of the life of the ammunition. The quantities of ammunition received from England, asked for by my hon. friend, are as fallows:

Q.F. 18-pounder shrapnel, rounds	98,980
Q.F. 18-pounder high explosives, rounds	4,000
Q.F. 13-pounder 9 cwt. shrapnel, rounds	2,500
Q.F. 12-pounder 9 cwt. high explosives, rounds	2,500
Q.F. 4.5 in. Howitzer, rounds, H.E.	33,000
B.L. 60-pounder shrapnel, rounds	5,400
B.L. 60-pounder high explosives, rounds	600
Q.F. 4.7 in. shrapnel, rounds	5,400
Q.F. 4.7 in. high explosives, rounds	600
B.L. 6 in. 26 cwt. Howitzer, high explosives, rounds	8,000
B.L. 8 in. Howitzer, high explosives, rounds	2,000
Bombs, high explosives, M.L. 6 in. trench mortar, complete	6,000

That makes a total of approximately 169,000 rounds.

An estimated value of $3,000,000 was placed on this ammunition. My hon. friend asks how much of that ammunition has been expended. I could give that to the House, but this situation arises; the chief of staff of the Department of National Defence takes strong objection to making public the quantity of ammunition in Canada. He said it was not done by the war office of any country and was contrary to the practice of military heads. Of course, the House is supreme and if the House thinks I should give that information I will

do so. If I give the amount expended, of course hon. members will have the amount on hand, to which my chief of staff objects.

Mr. BOYS: That would be assuming we would be making no ammunition here in Canada. I do not ask as to the exact amount of ammunition on hand all told, but it would seem to me that we might, in view of what has transpired in the past, have some information as to what portion of the ammunition that came from England since the war is still on hand, and I certainly did want to know, with as much certainty as possible, what portion, if any, will not be useful. The minister said it would all be useful, except any portion that may not be used up to the time at which it is not supposed to be useful, which I think is 1925. Could the minister not tell us, assuming the consumption continues at the existing rate, whether or not all that munition will be used before it becomes useless in July 1925?

Mr. GRAHAM: At the present rate of consumption of ammunition, it will not all be used before 1925.

Mr. BOYS: Will the minister go just a little further and give us some idea of the quantity? Is the quantity to be on hand trifling?

Mr. GRAHAM: It will be trifling.

Mr. BOYS: That is satisfactory.

Mr. CHAPLIN: The minister says that the heads of his department do not want him to tell how much ammunition there is in stock. I would remind the minister that last year he gave us that information. He evidently did not at that time follow the advice of his military advisers. This year, when we require similar information, we cannot get it because his military advisers tell him that he should not give it.

Mr. GRAHAM: I know quite well I gave figures last year, and that is the reason why I was warned by my Chief of Staff that I did a wrong thing last year. I was asked on the floor of the House to give certain figures and I gave them as nearly as possible. When this year I asked my Chief of Staff what I should do, he said that I should, if possible, refrain in the meantime from giving the quantity of ammunition on hand.

Mr. CHAPLIN: As a consequence, the minister is not prepared to state how much small arms ammunition was used at the camps this year. The last time these estimates were up I asked whether it was necessary to continue manufacturing these goods. That can be determined only by knowing how much we have on hand. We are running an ammunition factory at considerable expense, and if we have on hand enough ammunition for a period of years with a reduced military camp, the best thing to do is to give the ammunition factory a rest for a while.

Mr. GRAHAM: The approximate quantity of small arms ammunition used last year was 4,000,000 rounds. As regards the other question, there is a limit of reserve under which Canada has gone. I will go that far. She will be manufacturing for some little time before she arrives at the place at which she ought to arrive and make provision for the annual expenditure.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I am glad to know that we used about 4,000,000 rounds of small arms ammunition. Last year, the minister told us that assuming that we were using about nine or ten million rounds a year we required of small arms ammunition enough for about a five years' supply. That would be about 45,000,000 rounds. Now, he tells us that the amount we used last year was 4,000,000 rounds. According to those statements, we have enough small arms ammunition to do us for ten years, assuming that we shall not use it at a higher rate than we did last year, and from the militia estimates that we are passing, we cannot use more because we are reducing the camps. This ammunition will spoil if we keep it without using it for ten years, and as far as I can see we have enough on hand now to last us for ten years. What is the use of making more?

Mr. GRAHAM: I tried to explain to my hon. friend a point that has some delicacy to it. We are supposed to have on hand in Canada at all times a certain number of rounds of ammunition for safety. We have not that nor anything approaching it, and if what my hon. friend said were true, that would not help the situation in the least degree, because if we are to approximate the number of rounds we ought to have in the Dominion of Canada, we must manufacture all we use and a great deal more.

Mr. KNOX: What is the life of small arms ammunition? How many years is it supposed to be good for?

Mr. GRAHAM: About ten years.

Mr. KNOX: After that, provided there is any of it on hand, what is done with it?

Mr. GRAHAM: It is tested at certain times. Of course, one can understand that ammunition that was dangerous could not be used for any remanufacturing purposes. It is generally destroyed.

Mr. KNOX: Would there be any reason why it should not be given out at a much reduced rate to some of the civilian rifle associations?

Mr. GRAHAM: If it were no good, it would be of no use to them except for junk.

Mr. KNOX: For practise purposes?

Mr. GRAHAM: As long as it was good for practise purposes, I imagine we would use it. The moment it became useless for practise purposes, because in the long run in peace times, it is used mostly for practise purposes, it would be of no use to civilian corps either.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is it a fact that of heavy arms ammunition, the officers have advised that we have only one day's supply, that is to say, one day's reserve, assuming that it would be expended at the rate at which it was expended in the late war in case of difficulty?

Mr. GRAHAM: No such suggestion as that has been made to me. I am inclined, however, to think if we were thrown immediately into the midst of war with a high or peak expenditure of explosives, we would not have enough to last very long.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Did General MacBrien not advise that we had just one day's supply in such an emergency as that?

Mr. GRAHAM: He never advised me to that effect.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I may inform the minister that that is in his evidence, and I thought likely he had so advised the minister. Has there during the minister's charge of this office been any of this ammunition brought over from the Old Country out of the reserve there from the war?

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes, I am sure there has.

Mr. MEIGHEN: How many shipments?

Mr. GRAHAM: In August, 1922, the Challenger brought out a certain shipment. What I have in my hand is just the amount of the freight.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Can the minister give the nature of the material?

Mr. GRAHAM: I have not that here. I imagine it would be heavy ammunition.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The same material as had been brought out before?

Mr. GRAHAM: Of the same character, yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: How many shipments altogether since the minister took charge?

Mr. GRAHAM: One, I think.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I should like the minister to make more careful inquiry. My information is that there have been four.

Mr. GRAHAM: There may have been. I have only one in my figures. There has been at least one.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I should like to get this right, if I can. Surely the deputy knows.

Mr. GRAHAM: I will look it up. I find only one here.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I appreciate to the full the minister's desire, to reserve as much information as possible as to the quantities of ammunition we have. This is all the more imperative, because undoubtedly our quantities are below the mark rather than above. Does not caution in that regard apply just as much to divulging information of ammunition received as of ammunition on hand?

Mr. GRAHAM: It might not be in the same category. Ammunition received might be in addition to a full reserve on hand. It is the quantity that we have on hand that makes for the safety of the country, and not the amount we receive.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Was the heavy ammunition which we had on hand a full reserve in 1921?

Mr. GRAHAM: I have not been given the figures in regard to the amount of heavy ammunition necessary as reserve, but speaking offhand I should say that Canada has had at no time anything over the amount necessary for reserve, of either heavy or light ammunition.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Would the minister say that all the kinds of ammunition brought over, some of which has come under his own ministerial control, are being actually used in rifle practice in this country?

Mr. GRAHAM: I would not say in rifle practice—

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, I mean in training.

Mr. GRAHAM: —because there was no small ammunition brought over. As I informed my hon. friend (Mr. Boys), I have every reason to believe that all the ammunition brought over is useful for the purposes of the Canadian militia if it be used before the expiration of its life.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What I want to know is whether, for the training that we give, all the ammunition of that kind is not necessary.

My point is this: If we do not get it from one source we must get it from another, because it is necessary for training purposes. Is this any class of ammunition,—and if there is I want to know what it is,—which is brought over that is not necessary for the kind of military training we give in this country?

Mr. GRAHAM: I know well what my hon. friend wants me to say.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh no, I want just the facts. I know the facts myself, and I want them brought out in this House. I think I have a right to ask for them.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am not saying that my hon. friend has not that right, and I accept the compliment of being cross-questioned in order that he may elicit the evidence in the shape in which he wants it. As a matter of fact the Canadian militia had the right to choose its own ammunition and would not choose anything that was not useful.

Mr. MEIGHEN: And it did not?

Mr. GRAHAM: No, not as far as I know.

Mr. BOYS: If we did not have this ammunition from overseas and we wanted to give the training that was regarded as necessary, we should have to pay for that ammunition, whether it was made in Canada or elsewhere. Is not that so?

Mr. GRAHAM: This is not evidence in rebuttal now, is it? Certainly we could not have used ammunition if we did not have it, and if training with the same guns had taken place, ammunition of this kind would have to be used.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is not the point at all.

Mr. GRAHAM: Of course it is.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not at all, and the minister knows it. Is there any other kind of training given? Are we training our men properly or are we not? Is it not the regular training we are giving, and should we not have to have this ammunition for the purpose? If that is not the fact I should like the minister to say what is.

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend is getting unreasonable, but I do not mind that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not at all, and I do not want to be unreasonable.

Mr. GRAHAM: Evidently he is not a soldier any more than I am.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Hear, hear.

Mr. GRAHAM: There is training and training. There can be training without this artillery at all; for instance, the infantry could be trained. I say again, however, that if there is to be artillery training of this kind we must have this ammunition or ammunition of a similar kind. I am not a judge as to whether the training is proper or not, as my hon. friend evidently wants me to appear to be, and I do not think he is.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Coming back to the item of small arms ammunition, last year the minister had an item in his estimates of nine million rounds for .22 rifles. I presume that this was for the purposes of boys' training. How much approximately of this was used last year?

Mr. GRAHAM: The .22 ammunition would be for the cadet service. The total estimate for the Dominion arsenal in 1923 was $425,000, but it was reduced by $50,000. My hon. friend will remember when the reduction was made. The re-adjustment then took place, and all the figures we had given before were consequently out of proportion to the reduced estimates. It became necessary to adjust expenditures and we were forced to reduce the production of .22 ammunition to 500,000 rounds, which is all we have manufactured this year.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I want some information with regard to the subject of medals. It was at one time thought possible to produce in the arsenals of Canada, a service medal for Canadian troops. As the minister knows, the medals which have already been issued for service in the Great War are the Allied medal and the British war medal. There has been so far no distinctively Canadian medal issued and those troops who served in Canada but who did not go overseas or get to the actual theatre of war have not received, so far as I am aware, any medals for their services. A letter was handed me yesterday which I brought to the attention of the minister, to the effect that the British war medal, which was granted, in the first instance, only to those who had seen actual service in France, was being furnished to the troops in South Africa. I know that while I was Minister of Militia the British war medal was withheld from Canadian troops as well as from British troops who had not actually served in France, and I should like the minister to say whether there has been any change in regard to the conditions upon which the British war medal has heretofore been awarded. Further, I would ask, is it the intention of the government to issue a Cana-

dian medal for those who served in Canada, and if so will it be made at the arsenals of Canada?

Mr. GRAHAM: The question my hon. friend raised regarding the British war medal I submitted to my department this morning, but I have not been able to get the information so far. I will submit it to him privately; I could not obtain it before coming here. The question of medals for those who served in Canada is one that has been before the department, as my hon. friend knows, for years, and it has always struck me that it would be a good thing if the men who served only in Canada could be given some distinctive medal. But the cost is pretty heavy, and up to the present time no minister has seen fit to recommend that the expenditure be made just yet. If I remember rightly, the cost would be about $1,000,000 or a little more, and owing to the financial condition of the country we have thought it best to postpone the matter for a while. That is a plain statement of the situation.

Mr. MANION: Apart from the possibility of providing a Canadian medal, have all the medals that are to be distributed been disposed of to the soldiers?

Mr. GRAHAM: They have not all been distributed yet. They have been purchased but have not yet all arrived; but we are distributing them as fast as they come in.

Mr. MANION: What percentage of them has been distributed and what percentage remains?

Mr. GRAHAM: I have not the figures, but I fancy that the distribution has largely taken place. We have been sending them out every day.

Mr. CHAPLIN: How much of the appropriation under the item we are discussing was actually spent last year?

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend is referring to the Quebec arsenal?

Mr. CHAPLIN: Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM: The expenditure to date is $358,704; $375,000 was voted.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I understood the minister to say a moment ago that because of a general reduction in his militia estimates it was necessary for him to go over all these other estimates and rearrange them. I cannot comprehend that. Does he mean that he could go over these other estimates that we have passed and change them?

[Mr. Guthrie.]

Mr. GRAHAM: The estimates as they went through the committee were the estimates for the year, not as they were brought down before the reduction was made. When we had the item of $425,000 it was for the Quebec arsenal in the first place—

Mr. CHAPLIN: Oh no. I have before me the item for the Quebec arsenal. As brought down it was $425,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is what I have just said.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Last year?

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes. I gave certain figures on the basis of $425,000, but afterwards that was cut down to $375,000, and thereupon we changed the detail, as we were compelled to, the amount having been reduced.

Mr. CHAPLIN: The vote for the Quebec arsenal last year was reduced $50,000?

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes.

Mr. CHAPLIN: And because of that the minister had to rearrange this particular estimate?

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Has the minister not made a mistake in saying that we purchased the English war medals? My recollection is that these medals were given by the British government.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am sure we are paying a large amount for medals.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: For these British war medals?

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes; for silver and bronze war medals and stars we have paid in Canadian currency altogether $893,945.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is that Allied or British medals?

Mr. GRAHAM: All the war decorations I have any note of here are—British silver war medals, Victory bronze medals, stars, war service badges.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I have been endeavouring to gather from the minister's statements what is the government's policy with regard to national defence. I understand from the minister that the supply of ammunition on hand is very much below the estimated reserve necessary to ensure the safety of the country. The arsenal at Lindsay has been closed, but there is an increase in the vote for the Quebec arsenal. The naval service has been sent on a fishing expedition. The colleges for training cadets for the naval ser-

vice at Esquimalt and Halifax have been closed. Does the minister consider that any useful purpose is being served by the vote now under consideration for national defence or for the training of what is left of our militia? I must say that I am unable to understand from the explanations which have been given what the ultimate object of the government is. Some time ago the people were led to believe that certain hon. gentlemen opposite were horrified to think that large quantities of ammunition were being brought to Quebec from Great Britain. Now we are told by the minister that the supply is largely below the quantity required for the national safety in the event of any trouble arising. Is it prudent or advisable to get below the safety line in connection with national defence? Surely the dignity of the country and our national self-respect must be maintained, and these can only be maintained by keeping our reserve of ammunition at a point which will enable us to take care of ourselves in the event of any emergency.

Mr. GRAHAM: It is hard work to divide my affections in this matter. An hon. gentleman (Mr. Chaplin) near my friend from Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) chastised me a moment ago for making more ammunition while we have some on hand; my friend from Oxford says that we are not going fast enough in building up a reserve. The purpose of this vote is the manufacture of ammunition. I agree with him that as rapidly as possible we ought to approximate at least to what our officers in charge of national defence think is the proper reserve.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: It is quite evident from the minister's reply that the officers of the department did not report that the ammunition which was unloaded at Quebec a couple of years ago was any menace to this country as then intimated by hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I want to correct the minister. The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Chaplin) was only urging that on the scale of training now going on he felt there was abundance of small arms ammunition on hand. He did not for a moment say that he considered the scale of training to be sufficient or that the minister was carrying out his own self-expressed obligation of keeping the defences of the country at least at the minimum of safety.

Item agreed to.

Adjustment of War Claims—National Defence—Militia Services, $4,000,000; Naval Services, $274,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: Last year the vote was $7,380,000. The amount expended during the year was $4,086,000. Among some of the larger items was a payment to the British Shipping Board. My hon. friend will remember that a claim was made for a very large amount in connection with the sinking of the Llandovery Castle, a hospital ship under charter to the Canadian government. After much discussion between the British Ministry of Shipping, the steamship company and the arbitration board, and after obtaining the opinion of four private valuators, the British Ministry of Shipping paid the steamship company £553,540, or $2,693,894.59, and presented the account to Canada. Serious objection was made to the basis of valuation by the former minister, the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) and again this year by the representative we sent over, Mr. Garrison, with the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding). The result was that the valuation was reduced to £503,540 a reduction of £50,000. Other items were: refunds for coal supplied, port charges, etc. $500,508.18; refund on victualling account, $420,639.73; claims withdrawn, $113,687.75; refund on gun contracts, two items, one of $930,167.74, and another of $14,600, making a total reduction, including that in respect of the Llandovery Castle, of $2,222,936.70. On that basis we settled with the British Shipping Board and we do not now owe them anything in respect to these accounts.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Were they paid out of the vote of last year?

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes.

Mr. GUTHRIE: What does the minister propose to do with the $4,349,000 for which he now asks?

Mr. GRAHAM: There are two large items outstanding which are provided for in this estimate. One is an interest account of £375,000 or $1,824,999, which is more than offset by the interest charges of the Dominion for advances made to Great Britain for war purposes, etc. The British government have recently made a payment of interest amounting to $1,631,602.48, and it has capitalized a further sum of $8,000,000. The other item is with respect to pensions to dependents of sailors who lost their lives. The British government has made a claim against Canada for whatever amounts should be paid to the families of the sailors who lost their lives on the Llandovery Castle. We have not admitted that responsibility, although there is an item here concerning it. My hon. friend will remember

also that Vickers made a claim for cancellation of contracts, the amount being decided upon by a board as being about £62,000. If I remember correctly the Vickers Company offered to take £45,000 in settlement. When Mr. Garrison was in London this year the Vickers people reduced that offer to £33,000. The Finance Minister thoroughly investigated the matter and he is not prepared to admit that we owe Vickers anything. That is the way the matter stands at present, although I must say that within the last few days the company has written to the department going back to their old demand of £45,000.

Mr. GUTHRIE: It is true that the company put in a very substantial claim, amounting in the first instance to something like £70,000. Then the matter was re-
4 p.m. ferred to an English board which had investigated a great many claims against the British government arising in the same manner. The claim is really one for damages for cancellation of contracts at the outbreak of the war. An award was made by the British investigators in the sum of about £62,000, but it was considered that that amount was excessive and that the company had not suffered damages to that extent. We offered, in my time, to give the company a fiat to prosecute its claim in the Exchequer Court of Canada, but they demurred. Finally they offered to accept £40,000 in full of their claim.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is not in the correspondence.

Mr. GUTHRIE: That was a verbal offer made to me in London which I submitted to my right hon. friend who was then Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen), and whose impression was that the amount was still too high. That is the furthest point which the negotiations had reached at the time of the election and the resignation of the government. I personally have no recollection of any £45,000 offer. Various conversations on the subject took place in the corridors of the House, in the Militia department, in England, and elsewhere. Several offers were made, but no official adjustment had been arrived at when the government resigned. I understand now that the company have reduced their offer to £33,000, but that that amount has not been paid. I think the government has done well in the settlement of the Llandovery Castle claim. I had the advantage of having with me in London in 1921 Mr. Garrison, an accountant of the Militia department, and certainly Mr. Garrison's work as an accountant was of the highest kind; he spent a great deal of time over the accounts. After a great many interviews and consultations and a good deal of bickering and quarrelling with some of the minor officials, we at that time succeeded in reducing the claim by about $700,000. But we refused to approve the offer of the British government in regard to the Llandovery Castle. The chief objection to settling at that time was that Canada had not been represented directly on the board of arbitrators which fixed that loss. The British Admiralty undertook to appoint a board, and that board assessed the damages on the basis of the replacement value of the ship. The ship was a British ship originally under charter to the British government, but Canada had become the charterer. When the vessel was sunk as a result of submarine operations in the English Channel, the question was who was to bear the loss. At that time it was next to impossible to procure insurance, and the decision was reached by the Admiralty, concurred in by the Canadian authorities, that on account of the enormous rates that had to be paid it would be better for each country to carry its own insurance. In this case no insurance had been taken out. My recollection of the figures was that the claim for replacement value of the ship ran to something like £600,000, while the original cost of the vessel was only about half that amount. Our objection, therefore, was on the ground that Canada was not a party to the award or to the arbitration that made the award, and that the replacement value of the ship was not a proper basis for a settlement—although the British Admiralty had settled a great number of cases on that basis. If a settlement has been effected, as I understand from the minister, at £503,000, a very substantial reduction has been made from the original claim and I think the department has been very wise in effecting such a settlement. At least a quarter of a million dollars have been saved on this one item, and I only hope that in respect to the other outstanding items the department may be as fortunate.

The question as to compensating the families of the sailors who lost their lives on the Llandovery Castle may give rise to some nice points of law. Having heard of the matter for the first time now, and speaking offhand, I would be inclined to think that as the ship at the time of the disaster was under Canadian charter there is rather a strong probability that we will be liable. However, I understand from the minister that that item is yet to be considered.

Mr. FIELDING: I did not hear the first part of my hon. friend's remarks about the

Vickers case. Will he tell me what he refers to as the basis of the Vickers case? What is the ground of their claim?

Mr. GUTHRIE: The basis was damages for the cancellation of a contract.

Mr. FIELDING: That is the crux of the whole matter. The whole matter hinges on that word "cancellation". There was no cancellation; that is the vital point of the whole thing. In the discussion which took place a year ago my hon. friend made a similar remark; he understood there had been a cancellation of a contract, and therefore there would have to be compensation paid in some form under it. It may be that there are facts in this matter which did not come before me. The settlement of the claim was not part of my mission to England, but while there I had an opportunity of making some inquiries into the matter and had the privilege of hearing the views of Sir Trevor Dawson, managing director of the Vickers Company. As I found the case there was no cancellation at all. The Vickers Company made a contract with the government of Canada. The government of Canada were ready to honour the contract; they were ready to take the goods and pay for them. But the Vickers Company did not deliver the goods; they could not deliver them. The war came on, the British government took possession of the Vickers concern, and the Vickers people were busy from that time forward in fulfilling contracts with the British government. There was no cancellation on the part of the Dominion of Canada. That is the vital thing. If I am right in that then the Vickers Company have no claim. I have to emphasize that fact as matters all depend on that. It was said the claim was admitted later on. Even if that were so it would not be fatal at all; much would depend on the party who had admitted it and his authority to make the admission. But there was no such admission. An officer representing my hon. friend, who was then Minister of Militia, stated to the Vickers that if there were to be any further orders given, all things being equal, a preference would be given to the Vickers over other parties. But no further orders were given about that time, and there came no opportunity for the granting of the preference which was indicated. But if I am right in my statement the whole thing turns upon the question: Was there a cancellation of the contract? My information is that there was not. The government made a contract, the government were ready to receive the goods, the government were ready to pay for them, but the Vickers never could deliver the goods. The contract contained a clause respecting penalty and technically speaking there might be a claim for damages. But that would not be urged under the circumstances. The Vickers Company were not able to deliver the goods because the British government took possession of their works. I think there would be great difficulty in saying that the Vickers Company made any large expenditure bearing on the contract. If they made any expenditure it would be a very small one. If they did incur any expenditure designed to serve the contract, I suppose we might say technically there was a claim against the British government, because it was something the British government did, and not anything the Canadian government did, that prevented the carrying out of the contract. If the claim were made that the Vickers Company had expended some money in preparing for the contract, to that small extent there might be a fair claim; but any claim based on the contention that there was a cancellation of the contract is, if my own information is correct, entirely unfounded.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Before the item carries will the minister give us all the items making up the $7,833,800, the aggregate of the naval and military ingredients of this vote?

Mr. GRAHAM: The following is a statement of the expenditure for militia services from 1st April, 1922, to 8th March, 1923:

Pay and allowances	$ 111,411 93
Separation allowances	76,884 10
War service gratuities	227,982 14
Printing and stationery	2,835 21
Postage on medals, records, etc.	35,883 76
Ordnance services—repairs to rifles, machine guns, etc., from overseas	19,666 22
Engineer services and works	9,781 13
Civilian employees	309,115 81
Transport and travelling	2,299,276 50
Historical section	9,017 45
Pay and allowance board	1,670 00
Camp Borden site	Nil.
Medals	475,177 00
Difference in exchange	9,094 01
Miscellaneous and unforeseen expenditure	326,411 79
	$3,914,207 05
Battlefields memorials	172,361 69
	$4,086,568 74

Mr. MEIGHEN: Would the minister tell us what really makes up the item "Transport and travelling"?

Mr. GRAHAM: The amount we are just speaking about, for the settlement made in connection with the Llandovery Castle was included in that item.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Then "Transport and travelling" includes the loss?

Mr. GRAHAM: The ship was transporting troops when this loss took place.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The vote is really the same as the old demobilization vote.

Mr. GRAHAM: Under the same heading.

Item agreed to.

Canadian Air Force—operation, maintenance, repairs, etc., $1,000,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: I want to say that in this vote for the air force $250,000 is for the purchase of equipment, flying machines, etc. This service is going to be more useful year by year, as hon. gentlemen will see if they look into what has been done during the past year. I may as well tell the committee that this service is not going to be an inexpensive one. Machines last but a very short time and wear out quickly; the spare parts that have to be carried are expensive; the whole service is quite a costly one. But in one year it more than repays what it will cost in ten in the preservation of our forests and other preventive measures. This $250,000 will include the purchase of nine amphibious machines; in other words, flying boats. They will cost in the vicinity of $175,000. Tenders were accepted—they have not been delivered yet—from the Vickers people, seven of these to be manufactured in the Dominion of Canada and two to be manufactured in Great Britain and sent over. The wireless, for which an appropriation is asked in the $250,000, is one of the branches of aerial service. Without the ability to communicate with their headquarters on the ground, flying over the forest is somewhat precarious and not practicable. In addition to that, in the city of Winnipeg, for the purchase of some land, on which an amount has been spent this year in the erection of hangars, I think in the vicinity of about $1,000 will be expended, and the balance of this is for operation and maintenance, etc. I might say that last year some difficulty was found, I think particularly in the province of Quebec, with some of the large machines. When they got into difficulty and alighted on some of the small lakes, it was almost impossible to get them out. They were unsuitable for that work. These machines were practically all given to us by the Royal Air Force of the British government, and of necessity a good many of them have got to the point where they are unsafe for use and others are of a nature and construction not quite practicable in this country. In another year we will have to buy more machines for two reasons, first, because the machines are constantly wearing out, and, second, because men must not be sent in the air in machines that are considered unsafe. Furthermore, the demands being made on the air force are doubled every year. Last year the Attorney General of British Columbia came in to see me, and asked if we could not extend the service in British Columbia. He pointed out two or three instances in connection with the work out there that would impress one with the value of the service being rendered by the air force. He is Minister of Lands, and in one instance there was a point which he, with those in his department wished to reach. He told me it would have taken him several days, I forget how many, by pack train to get to this point. He went in with one of our machines and made the inspection, and only three hours were occupied in getting there. In expense, feed and practicability the air service has overcome time and distance.

Last year we received from the province of Quebec $20,000, and the same amount from the province of Ontario. Ontario has paid us $38,000 this year, having increased its service. British Columbia paid us a certain amount but the attorney general told me they were prepared to pay $20,000 this year and were prepared to extend and enlarge this service.

Mr. MILLAR: Has this service been extended to Saskatchewan? If so how much was spent there last year?

Mr. GRAHAM: The province of Saskatchewan is looked after largely from the Winnipeg depot. There has not been any work done, except some observation work, as far as I can recollect, in the province of Saskatchewan. We cannot very well locate these provincial activities, and distance does not mean much, if anything, to a flying machine, and for the present at least the officers of the department are confident that with the improvements they intend to make at Winnipeg, all the needs of Saskatchewan can be amply taken care of for some years to come.

Mr. MacLAREN: Has provision been made for the province of New Brunswick and the province of Quebec?

Mr. GRAHAM: I think we have not been successful in entering into any arrangement with the province of New Brunswick as yet, although we have a station in Nova Scotia from which they can do work in the province of New Brunswick and Quebec.

Mr. CLARK: Some weeks ago we had a debate in this House with regard to the building of the Hudson Bay railway. Has the minister given any consideration to the feasibility of using the air force for the purpose of investigating the Hudson bay route and

of determining the exact time in each year that that route would be open to navigation?

Mr. GRAHAM: I think it has been decided already by the department that a portion of the air force shall visit Nelson and Churchill during the summer. An attempt is being made now to have an excursion trip by boat up to Nelson. A member of the air force proposes to accompany that party, if it materializes.

Mr. CLARK: That only applies to a certain season of the year. What I meant was a prolonged investigation over the whole period of one year, say, so that we could ascertain the nature of the channels and the route during the fall and winter months, and spring as well.

Mr. GRAHAM: Up to date we have not had sufficient money to enlarge to that extent. I might say that the Northwest branch has been urging us to establish a post much further north, but we have no money in this estimate for that purpose.

Mr. CLARK: Does the minister not consider that it would be advisable to postpone further expenditure on the Hudson Bay railway until such an investigation could be carried out, it being about the only means we have in our power of carrying out a thorough investigation as to the feasibility of that route?

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend from the other angle here would not agree to take that as a reason for postponing any work on the Hudson Bay railway.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not after the promise of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell).

Mr. GRAHAM: Which seems to have been ineffective. Consequently I do not feel like making any more promises. A good many miles of the Hudson Bay railway, of course, have been constructed and investigations have been made. Everyone who has a library has volumes replete with investigations of the Hudson Bay railway, and I think we have got beyond the point when we can say that the Hudson Bay railway cannot be constructed unless we can further convince ourselves of its necessity.

Mr. BOYS: In connection with this item, is any provision made for the improvement of the approaches to this camp? The camp is in my riding, I am very familiar with it, and I certainly approve of this item. I think that in the interest of heavy trucks which operate there something should be done. The camp is reached from Angus on the Grand Trunk, and on the south from Alliston. There is about a mile of road within the camp from the Angus end which is simply a disgrace. It is not a road at all. It is a sand trail winding all over, the trucks get stuck, and I have no doubt considerable damage is done to the trucks from time to time. Within the camp itself, I do not know how many miles, but from 6 to 10 miles of cement pavement have been constructed during the activities of the camp in the years 1915 and 1916. It seems a pity that those stationed at the camp and many citizens of Canada who have occasion, from time to time, to visit the camp, should have to use the bit of road to which I refer. The work would not cost very much. I think the matter has been brought to the attention of the minister by some of the residents of Angus, and I feel satisfied that the municipalities interested would take care of the very small portion leading from Angus to the entrance to the camp, if the department would devote simply a reasonable amount of money to improve the road from the entrance to the camp to connect with the cement pavement now there. I am sure if the minister saw the place, nothing further would be necessary to convince him that the work should be undertaken mainly in connection with the heavy loads that go in and out of that camp. If there is nothing in the item now for this work, I would express the hope that the minister might economize on some of the other items making up the total and take this work in hand. If any other evidence is necessary respecting the need of this road improvement, I would be glad to busy myself and to supply the minister with it. I remember a gentleman coming down from Angus and interviewing the minister. He presented the matter very forcibly; but so far as I know, nothing has been done since. I hope the minister will give this matter his consideration.

Mr. GRAHAM: We will certainly give it consideration. It has been brought to my attention by the hon. gentleman before and by a gentleman in that vicinity. I had hoped to be at Camp Borden last summer with my hon. friend, and if we could not travel over the road any other way, we would fly over it.

Mr. LUCAS: I understood the minister to say that several of the provinces had contributed $20,000 to the military air force, is that right?

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes.

Mr. LUCAS: Does the air force do any flying for private concerns?

Mr. GRAHAM: We have a receipt for $733 for urgent work done during a fire. I imagine that if there was any commercial work to be done, the air force would not be above handling it, if it did not interfere with their other work. At the present time we have not a sufficiently large vote to go into that; but I think it has been the general consensus of opinion that commercial flying for purposes of gain should be left largely to private enterprise rather than that it should be undertaken by the government.

Mr. CLARK: I would like to revert to a matter I brought to the attention of the minister a few moments ago. I have been advised by people who, I consider, are experts in this service, that it would be possible to carry on such an investigation as I suggested. In the debate on the Hudson Bay railway, considerable doubt seems to exist as to the exact period of time that the Hudson bay is open to navigation. I have also been informed by an authority that appears to be fairly good that there is a possibility that Hudson bay is open for navigation for a much longer period of time than was suggested by the mover of the resolution the other day; that furthermore, we could prove or disprove that by an investigation carried out by the air force, and that if such an investigation was properly planned over a full period of one year, we could determine almost to a final degree the exact period of time that that bay would be open to navigation during a year. I seriously commend this to the attention of the minister in the hope that in the very near future our air force can be used for the purpose of carrying out such an investigation. It seems to be perfectly futile to send an expedition up there in the summer time to gather such information.

Mr. KNOX: I might say, as the mover of the resolution, that I took the reports of a number of investigations which had been made covering a number of years, because conditions in Hudson bay and in the strait are not always the same, and it is necessary to take a number of years before one can reach a proper conclusion. I really believe an investigation such as has been suggested might do a great deal of good. It has been suggested that investigations should be made by the air force up in the Fox channel to discover the sources of the field ice which comes down in the spring and fall. It is possible we might learn a great deal regarding that by an expedition of that kind. I do not think, however, an expedition into Hudson bay or strait for one season would determine anything more than what we know at the present time. I took it as conclusive that the investigation which had been made by the Senate committee at that time and which was brought down in their report, covered the matter as far as we could get at it just now.

Mr. LUCAS: Is it the policy of the government at the present time in the air force to have the machines all shipped to one central point to be repaired? If so, does the minister think that is the best way of handling repairs to these machines?

Mr. GRAHAM: We have now three central shops in which they could be repaired, and it is questionable whether it would pay to establish shops with all their equipment at any more points for the limited number of machines we have. This is not like anything else. When a machine needs some repairs, but is not altogether out of repair, it can go in a very few minutes quite a long distance to a shop, and it can return at the same speed.

Mr. LUCAS: Where are those three central repair shops?

Mr. GRAHAM: High River, Ottawa and Camp Borden. There is a small shop at Vancouver. There are two or three other small shops besides the one I mentioned.

Mr. LUCAS: When I was coming down to this session of parliament, there were five airmen on the train who were being shipped from Vancouver to Camp Borden to engage in repair work. Very shortly after the session opened, I received a letter from those men. I think it is in the interest of this House that we should know these facts, and if there is any truth in them, I feel sure the minister would be glad to look into the matter. This letter is dated Camp Borden, February 5, and it goes on to say:

> I learn that militia estimates are now before the House, so am taking this privilege of offering more facts to bear out our claims as to the waste of public funds under military control.

The letter refers to the Air Board. That has now been changed to the air force. It continues:

> There are men here sent from every Air Board station, including High River, Winnipeg, Roberval and Quebec, to do work on engines and wings that are shipped from above stations and which will be reshipped on completion. Outside of this waste in men's time, travelling, fares and freight on engines and wings, we can truthfully say after being here ten days, that the amount of work done here is about 30 per cent of what we do at our own stations.

One instance of waste came before us to-day in so much that a man examined by a military doctor in Vancouver was shipped to this camp, examined by the military doctor here and proclaimed medically unfit.

At Vancouver air station men are being drilled three hours a day and three days a week. At the above station we have one serviceable machine, yet with seven men away doing duty here, the remainder are forced to waste their time forming fours and saluting, stuff that we all got during the war and quite unnecessary.

The men that have been relied upon this last three years are Air Board men, men that got their knowledge during the war and have trades behind them and which are an asset to Canada and aviation. These men are now wasting their time here, owing to a poor organization and military red tape.

I have gone amongst these men and in fact working with them right now and can safely say that not more than two per cent would join a permanent force. It's quite evident as to the class of men that would go to make up Canada's air force, should one be formed, just men that are out for an easy time and men unable to do so well outside.

Another instance of military inefficiency, a man here was made sergeant who has to get a second-class mechanic to do his work, being quite incapable to handle tools himself at all. I could go on relating instances of waste and inefficiency and am confident that any money voted to the military cause will be an absolute waste of public funds.

The men that know this business and are behind this letter, and have made a name in commercial aviation will have nothing to do with such a cause, so where the military party have an argument at all I fail to see.

I hope the minister will look into this matter and ascertain whether or not these charges of military inefficiency are substantiated by the facts.

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not know who signs that letter, but whoever he is, he is a first-class grouch. I will not ask for his name.

Mr. LUCAS: I do not care to give his name.

Mr. GRAHAM: No, I do not want it, but I shall have the contents of the letter looked into. I feel confident that they are not borne out by the facts. At all events I shall have the matter investigated.

Mr. LUCAS: I thank the minister.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Could the minister go on with some other items instead of this? We should like to have this stand over for a day, and we could proceed with others. We have no intention of holding up the estimates at all.

Mr. GRAHAM: This winds up my Defence estimates, except for the supplementaries.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is this the only item?

Mr. GRAHAM: There are two items which we are discussing together.

Mr. MEIGHEN: So far as I am concerned I have no objection to one of the items going through, but I would ask that this one be allowed to stand.

Mr. GRAHAM: Very well.

Mr. KNOX: At what distance can these machines operate from the base of supply?

Mr. GRAHAM: It depends on the size of the machine I should say, 200 or 250 miles.

Mr. KNOX: In that case I would point out that an air force with a base at lake Winnipeg could not operate in northern Saskatchewan. We have immense areas of forest there that should be protected and an up-to-date system is absolutely necessary. Seeing that the forests in Saskatchewan are the property of the federal government, I think it is only fair that a station should be established in some part of northern Saskatchewan where the work could be looked after better.

Mr. GRAHAM: There has been an urgent appeal for the establishment of a station at Cowan lake, but we shall have to ask for a larger estimate if we are to set up more flying station establishments. At present there are orders from the various provinces for more work than the department can supply machines or men to cover, and it is a question whether we shall not have to enlarge the scope of the air force both as to men and machines.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall item 114 carry?

Item agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: Item 115 stands.

National Defence—amount required to pay cost of living bonus to employees of the Dominion arsenal and others at Quebec, discharged without receiving bonus for certain periods for which it was later granted to those similarly employed and not discharged, $26,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: In 1920 the Quebec arsenal was closed for a short period, and at that time it had not yet been decided whether these men were entitled to the bonus. In the interval, however, it was held by the Civil Service Commission that the bonus was due. Those men who were taken on again and who returned to work were given the bonus, but those who did not resume work did not get it, although the bonus was earned before the closing of the arsenal. It is maintained, I think in perfect honesty, that the men were all equally entitled to the bonus once the commission had held that it was properly payable.

Mr. GUTHRIE: If I remember the facts rightly, during the year 1921 both the arsenal at Lindsay and the arsenal at Quebec were closed for two or three months and the staffs were also considerably reduced. I was not aware that a bonus was at all payable to these men. Has it been subsequently decided that

those who were retained were entitled to it? As I understand, they were men working for wages at so much per day; they were mechanics and the like who were laid off. Was there any bonus applicable to them?

Mr. GRAHAM: I would not express an opinion on that. In 1920—it was not 1921—the bonus was paid to the men who were taken back after the arsenal was re-opened. It was paid on the decision of the department and the Civil Service Commission. The men who were not taken on did not get it although they had earned the bonus equally with the others. They now claim it and the commission decides that they are entitled to it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not understand it yet. Were the men wage-earners or salaried, and if they were wage-earners, did they not follow the regular scale of advance given at that time in lieu of bonus? I do not claim to have a distinct recollection of the matter at all, but it would occur to me that this means two bonuses. Does it apply to both arsenals?

Mr. GRAHAM: I am informed that although the men were working by the day it was decided they were entitled to the bonus and they got it in 1920. The Deparment of Labour, I believe, took a hand in the matter, and it was finally decided and approved by the Civil Service Commission that these men were entitled to the bonus. The men who were taken on again got the cash. The men who were not taken on again were entitled under the decision just the same as the men who did come on after the reopening of the arsenal.

Mr. MEIGHEN: These men were not taken back?

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes; but the bonus was earned before the arsenal was closed, and it was paid to the men for the period prior to the closing.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not remember the matter ever coming up in the time of the late government.

Mr. GRAHAM: It was in 1920.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It may have been advanced, but I do not think it was. Were there not advances made in lieu of bonus to the same men? And would there not be quite a number of these men now dead? I do not know how you are going to pay the bonuses three years afterwards.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am not familiar with the situation but I do know it was in 1920. After the arsenal reopened the men that were taken on were paid the bonus for a time prior to the closing of the arsenal. This vote is to pay the men who were not taken back.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I would not have the least sympathy with any neglect to pay extra wages to wage-earners commensurate, or even more than commensurate, with the bonus as extra remuneration to salaried employees. The minister says that this is merely the pro rata allowance based on time of service of the men who had to be laid off commensurate with that secured by those who did not have to be laid off, or who being laid off were taken back. Does it apply to the men employed in both arsenals?

Mr. GRAHAM: I am told it did not apply to the Lindsay arsenal. For what reason I do not know.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is just possible, of course, that none were released until just lately. But I think we should have the reasor before we pass the vote..

Mr. GRAHAM: I have no objection to letting the item stand. The situation I believe is quite clear. Certain men who claimed the bonus were working at the Quebec arsenal. Before the arsenal closed it had not been decided that they were entitled to the bonus. After the reopening it was decided and approved by the Civil Service Commission that these men who had claimed the bonus prior to the closing were entitled to it. Those who came back got it under the decision: those who did not come back, did not get it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Before the item comes up again perhaps the minister will bring down the report of the Civil Service Commission on the subject so we will see the argument by which they arrived at their decision.

Mr. THURSTON: For what period was this bonus paid?

Mr. GRAHAM: From the 1st April to the 1st August 1920.

Item stands.

RAILWAYS AND CANALS

Railways and Canals—Chargeable to income—To increase the amount of loan authorized by Vote No. 136 Main Estimates, 1922-23—Additional amount required, $13,099,493.34.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): The explanation of this item is that when the estimates were voted for the railway service it was contemplated that these sums, amounting to about $13,000,000, in the form of obligations coming due might be renewed, in which case it would not be necessary to provide for them in this way. When the obliga-

tions became due it was found convenient for the moment to pay them out of the general treasury, and it became necessary to vote this amount to cover the payment. It is still possible they may be consolidated, but in the meantime it is necessary to make the appropriation because the payment that was made was not contemplated when the estimate was voted.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In connection with the general subject, it would seem to me that in case of a renewal of this sort the item shoul ! be in the estimates anyway so that each year we could easily see just how much of the money and of the credit of the country was advanced for deficits or for capital expenditure to the railways. Supposing it were a fact that this was a maturing obligation, and it was expected to renew the obligation, in that event, as the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) has stated there would be no need of making the amount of the renewal appear in the estimates at all. On the other hand, suppose it had been intended that that obligation would be paid off by the issue of a new security guaranteed by the government. Then, as I understand the system that has always been followed, that new undertaking of the government would appear included in the estimates voted for the year. Well, had there been an intended renewal it would be a renewal with a government obligation. Consequently it seems to me it should have been included anyway.

I think I have a correct idea as to the facts and I hope I have made myself clear. I would like to have the minister's version of the situation. Is it not a fact that the estimates are supposed to include all the moneys advanced and as well all the obligations to be incurred direct or indirect by the country for the fiscal year in respect of the railways? If so, would it not have been right to have had this included anyway if it was the intention of the government to guarantee the obligation?

Mr. FIELDING: There is something to be said for my right hon. friend's contention that these maturing obligations might be shown in the estimates. I think, however, that that has not been the practice. Where an appropriation is made it is an appropriation in anticipation to meet a deficiency and not to include renewals. I think there is something to be said in favour of showing renewals but I am quite safe in saying that it has not been the practice in the past. New securities have been issued to make way for old ones, but I do not think they are shown in the estimates. I am not sure that there is not something in the contention of my right hon. friend, and that matter may be considered when preparing the estimates in the future.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have been somewhat bothered by that complication of the entire railway financial situation. I do not know whether it has been conducted in exactly the right way in the past or not, but I do urge that we ought to have a system by which the estimates will include all obligations, whether by way of cash advances or guarantees for the ensuing year by the country with respect to the railways. I am sure I am right. If I had the former Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) I might get along by asking him instead of bringing it up in this way. Is it not a fact that the minister's estimates for the year include not only cash that is going to be required from the Treasury by way of loan—for everything is by way of loan as I understand it—whether for capital investment, extensions of lines or for deficit? All the money that is advanced is included in the estimate for the roads, and as well, all the obligations intended to be entered into by way of guarantee—for I know the estimate reads in such a way as to enable the minister to do it by way of guarantee. Is it not a fact that the minister's estimates for this year include all those obligations to be incurred in respect of the railways, whether by cash advance or by guarantee?

Mr. FIELDING: I think the estimates are for what I may call the current expenditures of the year. The wording of the estimate very properly allows the government to make payment either by way of cash or by bonds or by guarantees—in any form it pleases. But I do not think it covers renewals—that is my impression. I am inclined to the view, however, that we might well show the nature of these maturing obligations from time to time; and that thought may well engage our consideration hereafter.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think I have the point now: The intention of the estimates, as the minister understands it, has been to include all moneys to be advanced to the roads, and, as well, all obligations, whether by guarantee or otherwise—

Mr. FIELDING: No, not renewals.

Mr. MEIGHEN: —whether by guarantee or otherwise that go to increase the debt of the railway.

Mr. FIELDING: To meet the obligations of the railway for the current year.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes—that go to increase the debt of the railway. For example, if the railway required to raise some money, not for renewal but for new commitments or new purposes, for extending its lines, and so on,

and the government decided that that should be done by the issue of a bond of the railway company which would have to be guaranteed by the government, then the estimates would include that; but if it were merely for renewal of a past obligation, in no way extending the debt of the system, the estimates would not include it.

Mr. FIELDING: No.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I quite agree that it would be better for the estimates only to provide, as in the past, for all moneys to be advanced and all guarantees to be included that go to increase the railway's obligations. Those should be separate, but I think the others should appear, in a different place—all that increases the government's obligations, even for renewals. I am afraid I am not making myself very clear. I think it is right—and I am pretty sure this is what has been found in the past by both governments—that the estimates should show distinctly the entire commitments intended by the country for the railways in so far as those commitments increase the obligations of the system; all the others should be separate in the future as in the past. But I think the estimates should include as well any further obligations the country enters into on behalf of the railways for renewals, because those increase the country's obligations. It would never do, though, to have these included in the estimates in the same body as the rest; if we did that it would present the obligations of the country in too big a form, because while we are increasing the national obligations we are diminishing the obligations of the company that we own. It would never do to include the one with the other; I think they both should be there, but separate.

5 p.m.

Mr. FIELDING: My understanding is that the appropriation each year involves what I may again describe as the current expenditure of the year—not, however, on what might be called capital account. If, for example, a branch line is constructed, I think it would be necessary for the minister to bring in a special appropriation act for the purpose; I do not think we would have an appropriation to cover that. I may say, for example, certain appropriations will be needed in the way of equipment bonds. The railway legislation gives the railway company the power to issue these bonds; no appropriation here will be required. As a matter of convenience it might be well to show in the estimate of each year the maturing obligations. But it is necessary to draw a line between what I might call the current expenditure of the year and obligations which are represented by outstanding securities which can be renewed, as was the case in this matter. This may later be converted into securities, but in the meantime, as it was paid out of the current appropriation, we have to have this supplementary estimate to make it good. The suggestion that these maturing obligations, even in the way of renewals, should be shown in the estimate, is worthy of consideration, and without making any absolute engagement in the matter, I would like to see it considered hereafter.

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. BAXTER: May I ask the Minister of Railways whether there is to be any revision of the boundaries of the eastern region?

Mr. GRAHAM: That is a matter that rests with the Canadian National Railways Board. It is not part of the government's duty to dictate to the board as to how they shall operate and what areas shall constitute the different regions. That is purely an operative question.

Mr. BAXTER: I appreciate the difficulty of the position in which the minister finds himself and in which any minister dealing with this department must find himself in regard to a question of this kind. It is put forward very definitely that this railroad is to be kept out of politics. One might hope that that may be so. I have heard gentlemen in the presence of Sir Henry Thornton declare, however, that it is impossible to keep the railroad out of politics. I do not know just what particular political interference they had in mind, though I have my suspicions. But there is a certain class of politics out of which no government can keep a state-owned railway. The government must lay down a policy for the railroad, which is a very different thing from allowing henchmen to dictate who shall be appointees to particular minor positions. As to the latter, I think we all concur that the railroad should be kept out of politics, but as to necessary action to ensure that all parts of the country through which the railroad runs shall have fair and just treatment and shall receive the co-operation of the national road in the matter of realizing their aspirations as well as meeting their needs —so far as that is concerned, the railroad neither should be nor will be kept out of politics.

We, in the Maritime provinces do not, I trust, complain unduly, but we do come here with a desire to let our needs be known, and if we feel that we are not getting in any respect the treatment that we ought to have, this parliament is the place in which we

should express our views in that respect. It is quite proper that boards of trade in the Maritime provinces should confer with Sir Henry Thornton and his board of directors. I trust that at the conference which is to be held, I believe, on the nineteenth of this month, there will be no directors absent, and I trust there will be no occasion for any director who may be absent to say that a policy has been determined upon at one meeting of the board and reversed at another. Such a thing was said and said openly by one of the directors, and when I ask a question in the House about it I am told that it is not wise in the public interest to give information as to the private transactions of the board. The government in that respect is adoring idols that it burned, because it is not so long since prominent members of the party were declaiming against the previous government because it refused to bring before the House matters of what might be called an internal nature. But I trust the government is going to stand by its policy in that regard. I do not ask them to reveal the details of every contract, but we do say that when an important resolution is taken which affects three provinces, the people of those provinces through their representatives in this House have a right to the information and have a right to get it here instead of going to some meeting place in Montreal or elsewhere, hat in hand, and asking Sir Henry Thornton to be good enough to lay aside his jests for a time and tell them of the inner working of the railway organization. Members should ask in the House and members should get the information here.

Speaking from a New Brunswick standpoint—and I think I can include the Maritime provinces—I may say that there is dissatisfaction to-day. The people who voted there in the last election voted against my right hon. friend and leader because his declaration as to region apparently did not go far enough to please them; and they voted on the basis of what was being said on public platforms by representatives of the party that is now dominant. They trusted to those promises—that if the Liberal party were to come into power there would be a very decisive revolution in railway circles in the Maritime provinces. Prosperity would go on, employment would be ample, freight rates would be reduced and, above all, the management of an important section of the road was to be centralized at Moncton. The people unfortunately believed this. To-day the people see whether those statements were quite worthy of belief or not. The absolutely sound, the absolutely sincere promises which were made by my right hon. leader were rejected by the people, and they took the illusory hallucinations projected from platform after platform by gentlemen who do not seem disposed to carry out one single particle of the obligations which they took during the campaign. What is the result to-day? That we have a railway and we have no national railway policy. Now, you cannot make a success out of an aggregation of rails, and fishplates and sleepers combined with rolling stock.

What I want to know—I am going to ask this House and I am not going to Sir Henry Thornton to ask it—is whether it is the policy of the government that this National road is to serve Canada or whether it is to serve a foreign country? I have asked in this House what the intention of this Railway Board is with regard to some proposed buildings in the vicinity of Providence, Rhode Island. I have not been able to get an answer, my question remains on the order paper. I had an intimation, through a fellow member, the other day that it was considered the answer might be embarrassing. That is not enough for me. I am entitled to know the whole of the details, and if there is a matter that is embarrassing I have a right to be told in confidence why it is embarrassing and to be allowed to use my judgment as to whether the explanation is sufficient or not.

In the Maritime provinces we are confronted, and have been confronted in the past, with a very distinct menace and that is the short route from Montreal to Portland, Maine, and the centralization of the activities of the Grand Trunk railway at that port. I want to know, the people of New Brunswick want to know, the people of the Maritime provinces want to know whether this road—the deficit on which is absolutely draining this country—is to be maintained by Canada, and by taxation upon the Dominion, in order to serve not only Portland, Maine, but Providence, Rhode Island, as well, and it is just about time that we had a clear and categorical answer to the question. We have not so far got it from the Board of Management, we have not got it in this House; all that we know is that there are newspaper items indicating a further expenditure of what is really the money of the people of Canada to carry this road a little farther into a foreign state. Is that a national policy? I cannot say the thing is going to be done because I cannot get an answer, the people of the Maritime provinces cannot get an answer, and the people of Canada are not getting an answer.

I ask hon. members if that is a reasonable attitude for the government to assume in the transaction of public business?

I said that we want a national railway policy. I desire to emphasize that or rather to illustrate it. I can go back to confederation. I can refer to the building of the Intercolonial as a part of the contract of confederation—a road that most unfortunately was weighted down by what I would almost characterize as the stupidity of Downing street where, in their great fear of American invasion, they placed the road in a most difficult position from the standpoint of earning capacity. But placed as it was we got it. It has been of service to the Maritime provinces. For what purpose was it built? Surely to promote traffic between the Upper provinces, as they were then called, and the Maritime provinces. Now, I am not one of those who seeks to read into the bargain of confederation something that is not even plainly expressed in the contract. I do not say that the bargain of confederation contained any special provision by which the Maritime provinces were to have some wonderful rebate in rates, or some wonderful privileges that you cannot find in the written document. No doubt things of that character were said upon the public platform. On the other hand, I find in the compact of confederation. I find in the spirit of confederation, the idea of national unity—the idea that each part of the country would help each other part to bear the mutual burdens and to develop the interests of all as sympathetically and as fully as possible. Can we expect that from the Canadian National under the present policy or want of policy? If that policy is national all right. If that policy is international, then, in my judgment, it is all wrong.

I spoke of the attitude of the Maritime provinces towards Portland, Maine, with the possible addition of Providence, Rhode Island. What is the purpose of this road, considering the Intercolonial as part of it? Why, it simply reaches two points, Halifax and St. John, for the water borne commerce of the country during the period of the year when all the other Atlantic ports of Canada are sealed. If this road is national all the endeavours of its management will be directed towards carrying Canadian trade over that railway and through those ports. And I do not ask for supremacy for either one or the other; let them take their fair chance for the trade they can handle. But we do not find that being done. We get a hint of development—further development—in a foreign country. We have the actual proof by an answer to a question that I put in this House. We have the actual proof that where not one bushel of grain was shipped from Halifax, last year there were, I think, 17,000,000 bushels shipped to Portland, Maine. The system had been united then. Was there no possibility of any divergence of traffic to the Maritime provinces? Are we going to be eternally told that the shippers routed that grain via that particular route? If I were told that I would not believe it. If I were told that I would say "Has the Canadian National no agencies, no canvassers, no ability to see that traffic is diverted to our own ports in our own provinces?" Why, the traffic in grain of the Canadian Pacific Railway, which is not under national control, from St. John practically equalled what the nation was doing through Portland, Maine. It is a nice admission to have to make that the uncontrolled private corporation was doing more for Canada than the incubus which is draining us year by year in taxation and through, I think, misdirection. We got about 2,000,000 bushels of grain through the government road in St. John, none in Halifax, while the bulk was going through the United States. That does not suit me, it does not suit the people of the Maritime provinces, and if the people of the Maritime provinces could drop their politics for five minutes this House would be electrified on that subject.

Now, can we have a national policy which will regard this road as tributary to the ocean ports, which will equip the ports as they need to be equipped, which will, if necessary, put on a differential rate against Portland, Maine, and against Providence, Rhode Island, so that the dream which was so beautifully voiced by that great Canadian, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, may at last be realized, that every pound of Canadian freight shall be carried on Canadian railways and exported through Canadian channels? I am broad enough in my politics to realize a good policy when I hear it enunciated, and the doctrine of Sir Wilfrid Laurier is good enough for me and for every man, woman and child in the Maritime provinces. What we want is action to carry it out, but I am not cheered, and the people of the Maritime provinces are not heartened, when we see items in the press that some other port in the United States is to be developed, and when we are confronted with ministerial silence if we ask a question about it.

There has been some agitation in what I might call the local railway point in the Maritime provinces, the city of Moncton. This agitation has had regard to two things. One of them is what I referred to some time ago as the second deportation of the Acadians. It is not forgotten yet in that locality. I do not think—and I believe the Secretary of State (Mr. Copp) will agree with me—that it will be forgotten for a considerable

time: that is the moving some of the people from one part of the road to another in connection with the audit business. It may have been necessary. I am not familiar enough with the railway business to know whether it was necessary or not. Naturally Moncton, like any other centre striving for population as it is, ambitious and rightly proud of its growing position in the Maritime provinces. does not like to see any lessening of its prestige or of its population. There may be a reason for that movement, but I fail to see it. I would think that the work could be done at Moncton, but I am not going to condemn the action in this regard in unmeasured terms, because I think there might possibly be an explanation. I will say, however, that the people of that locality are yet waiting for an explanation which has never yet been given by anybody, and until they get it they have a right to be dissatisfied.

Then we come to the major question—the question of control. The people have been given nominally the local control at Moncton of the road as it is being run to Montreal. We are told that at another meeting of the board that arrangement was changed, and now it is to be Riviere du Loup, or it may be some other way station on the road, but it makes very little difference where it is. I am not concerned with the particular amount of mileage within that region. It is not the trackage, it is not the number of locomotives, it is not anything of that kind that counts. What we are concerned about in the Maritime provinces is where this board is placing the directing mind. Put a man at Moncton and tell him to take charge of that region, and while one railway man may not be quite as good as another, I have no doubt we can get a very capable man, whose orders will be obeyed by the subordinates, under whose direction trains will be moved regularly, freight will be moved promptly and public convenience will be met.

When we have got all that we have not touched the fringe of the real vital question of interest to the Maritime provinces. You have to put somebody in charge of that road, and you have to put him where he will be in direct contact with those in charge of the different regions, so that, instead of getting his information days too late to act upon it, he will be able to walk across the corridor and say to a man in charge af another region "What about such a class of freight? Why do you not arrange to send that freight through the ports of the Maritime provinces?" That is the vital thing. That is what we want, what we need and what we have a right to if the policy is national instead of international.

I suppose someone will say I have made a plea for moving the headquarters to Montreal. I have done nothing of the kind, but I want to see some one in high authority in charge of operations. The ordinary business of the division or region, or whatever you may call it, can be managed from Moncton, but I want to know that there is somebody high in authority over that region, who will be sitting right at the nerve centre of the railway system, right in the city of Montreal or wherever it is to be, because upon the ability of the manager of that region to impress upon the managers of other regions that they should use all their activities to direct the freight originating in other parts of Canada down to the Maritime provinces, depends the success or the failure of the old Intercolonial railway, and upon that depends whether confederation is a mere dream or whether it shall be a vivid reality to the people of the present day living in those provinces.

I am not a secessionist. I do not think anything could make me a secessionist, but I say there are people and they are largely in the province from which the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) comes, as there are some in my own province, who are beginning to talk of getting out of confederation. We are coming to rather an unfortunate pass when, during this session, I hear from one part of the House an argument put forward that to get grain or goods out of the country by the shortest and cheapest route is the desideratum of a particular district, and that the rest of the country must be ignored, but I find, on going home and looking over the situation, that there is a very real, though I hope not very extensive, movement as yet, for getting out of the union which some people in the Maritime provinces feel is only a delusion to them. I think we come here to make conditions better instead of worse. I think we can help materially to make them better, if we can get a railway policy which the people will realize is intended to help them, to serve them, to develop and stimulate Canadian trade through Canadian territories, and which will, as quickly as possible, get rid of every avenue through the United States which diverts from Canada traffic that ought to be handled in Canada and handled by Canadian roads.

I will go a step further. There is on the statute book to-day, and there has been for many years a provision by which the British preference can be limited to goods arriving directly at a Canadian port. My sympathy is entirely with the British preference. I

think the sympathy of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) has been with it for years; he has expressed and has carried out that view. But I maintain that it is no harm to anyone who wants to import goods from England to be told: "You shall be allowed to import those goods under the terms of the British preference if you will just put them in a British bottom and bring them into a Canadian port. But if you want to tranship them through a foreign country, then you will have to pay the same rate of duty as you do on goods that do not have British origin." An order in council is all that is required to bring this state of affairs about. What would the benefit be? Just this, that where in the winter time we can send out from St. John or Halifax steamships well filled with cargoes, there is always a rather slender cargo coming in, and while I do not say that this would be great enough to revolutionize traffic entirely. it would be a very big and welcome step in the right direction. There would come through Halifax or St. John in the winter time thousands of tons of merchandise that do not come in through them now. The coming in of those hundreds of thousands of tons through ports of a foreign country is enabling freight rates on those steamships on other merchandise to be kept down in that foreign country for the benefit of the foreign ports. Whatever differences we may have on any possible political subject, there is one thing that I believe we agree upon in this chamber. I believe we are national in our aspirations; I do not believe there is anyone who wants to do anything that is not distinctly along the national line. I say therefore, believing that as I do, that this is an opportunity for a national policy which will reconcile the Maritime provinces, which have undoubtedly lost much through confederation, to the difficulties under which they have laboured, to the difficulties of present-day conditions, by feeling that they have, at least, the sympathy of the rest of Canada and that that sympathy is being translated into real action for the purpose of conferring upon them a real benefit.

Mr. FIELDING: I do not rise for the purpose of answering my hon. friend, for I confess as a Maritime man I find myself so largely in sympathy with what he has been saying that I have no desire to break the force of it. But I think, in fairness, I ought to say that he has overlooked a very important point. We had for years two winter ports in Canada, Halifax and St. John. My hon. friend has very fairly said that they have rivalries, and that they must be left to work those out as best they can. I concur in that. But my hon. friend has forgotten that by the action of the government of Canada in acquiring the Grand Trunk railway, we have acquired another Maritime port at Portland, Maine. The question is an ugly one, and this complicates it. We own the Grand Trunk railway, and Portland is the Grand Trunk railway terminus. This is the problem we are giving to Sir Henry Thornton. We are asking him to make these roads reasonably profitable, remunerative, self-sustaining. We give him this road to Portland. Is he to let that road be idle, to let the rails get rusty, or to try to send some traffic over the Portland road in order that it may contribute something towards the cost of the system. I am not discussing the merits of the Grand Trunk system; but I am pointing to the fact that when we acquired the Grand Trunk railway system and opened a line to Portland, we were creating a rival to Halifax and St. John, and there is no use in ignoring the situation that confronts us to-day.

With nearly all that my hon. friend said historically and otherwise, I am entirely in sympathy. I know much of the feeling in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. Many of the things I hear to-day are but an echo of the things I heard sixty years ago. The story is an old one to many of us whose hair is growing gray. I do not want to revive these matters to-day. I sympathize with the desire of my hon. friend that we should look at all these things from the purely national viewpoint. I know that is his desire; I appreciate that, and I would like to co-operate with him. But let us not wink at the fact that since we have acquired the Grand Trunk with the road to Portland, we want that road to make some money, and we must face the fact that we have deliberately set up a rival to St. John and Halifax.

Mr. BAXTER: If we have to let go practically the Grand Trunk from Montreal to Portland, if it does not pay, do we not get the same traffic over our own road to our own ports? May I point this out to my hon. friend? To-day, the Intercolonial, everything from Montreal east, is losing money for want of traffic, so that the Grand Trunk may show a profit from Montreal to Portland. Let the latter be the losing end and let ours be the profitable end. The result will be that—and I say this with all pleasantness—instead of Yankee workmen and trainmen handling our products in the United States, good Canadians shall be handling them at Canadian ports

and through Canadian territory. If the loss must be on either one part of the system or the other, let the loss be to Portland.

Mr. FIELDING: Would it not have been wise if we had considered that before we acquired that Yankee connection down at Portland?

Mr. BAXTER: I did not acquire it, and if it had to be acquired through any effort of mine, it would never have been acquired.

Mr. FIELDING: All right.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It is really refreshing to see how many twists and turns such an adept politician as the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) is, can give to any and every question. One minute we are told that this is an old, old story, sixty years old; it is getting hoary; it is getting gray with everybody who is gray-headed in the Maritime provinces, and they are feeling very sad about it. It is the same thing, the same chicken, the same trouble. There is no difference. We get that one minute, and the next we are told that the whole reason of this is because the late government bought the Grand Trunk railway.

Mr. FIELDING: I did not say that.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Perhaps my hon. friend would tell me what he said.

Mr. FIELDING: The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Baxter) was referring generally to the discontent in Nova Scotia as regards confederation, and I said that that was an old story we had heard all these sixty years ago. The reference to the railway is quite recent. His particular grievance is that we are sending business to Portland. My point was that the government of Canada made Portland one of our terminal points, and we have to face and recognize that fact.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Yes, we stand just where we were. The talk was on this railway question; the talk was that this railway question to-day was inflaming the people who had troubles regarding confederation, and my hon. friend knows very well that for many years the Grand Trunk has been operating to Portland. Why, the trouble was just the same before. There is just this real difference that before the government owned the Grand Trunk, the government could not do anything; but through the Grand Trunk the government are now in a position to feed, if they want to feed. That is the only difference. My hon. friend says that the late government created Portland. We did not add one cent to Portland's facilities or anything else. I do not know whether my hon. friend is anticipating doing so. I see from the papers apparently his board is considering adding to the American facilities. It is quite true that if this question of ownership is to be made a reason by my hon. friend for multiplying American facilities and increasing American trade at the expense of Canadian trade, there is something in the suggestion of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding). These are aids they could not give if they did not own the line. But they are not compelled to do it; the action was their action. Certainly the acquisition of the Grand Trunk, instead of making it hard for the government to see that the Maritime provinces get their share of the business, makes it easy. Why, before they had no control whatever over that business; it was going Grand Trunk via Portland, to as great an extent as it is now going. They shipped everything down that way. This is no new story; it is something which did not commence with the acquisition of the Grand Trunk, and my hon. friends know that. They know that the Portland cry as against Halifax and St. John is an old cry, and yet my hon. friend says that we created this situation when we bought the Grand Trunk. I think my hon. friend on further consideration will really do himself the justice in this House of acknowledging that the Grand Trunk sent all its business to Portland; he will acknowledge that all their grain was sent that way and that he himself in this very chamber in opposition, if my recollection is correct, pointed out the evils of that situation. If he did not, at any rate he vociferously applauded that position taken by gentlemen from his own province when in opposition at that time. I do not see why it should be necessary to try to drag a political issue into a matter of this kind, particularly when it is so perfectly obvious that the business was sent through Portland before and when the only change made is that the government, if they so desire, are put just in a little better position than they ever were before to see to it that the Maritime provinces get whatever measure of justice they are entitled to. Before, they had not the power to do it; they have now.

Mr. FIELDING: Let the rails rust.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend says, let the rails rust. Well, perhaps he will distribute the rust a little bit. Let the rails rust! I am not asking to let any rails rust. But does my hon. friend object more to letting the rails rust on the Grand Trunk Portland line than he objects to their rusting on the line to St. John? Why, to-day the Min-

ister of Railways is in a position in which he can control the traffic; he is in a position in which he can work up the traffic and see that it goes in this direction or that direction, through the large organization that is now right at his hand. Yet he says, let the rails rust. Well, I ask, is all the rust to be allowed to occur on the Canadian rails and none on the American? Or does not my hon. friend think that a little reciprocity there might be a good thing and that St. John might be allowed to have some of the business?

Mr. GRAHAM: If I did not know something about this matter I might be impressed. But this is like a comedy.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think it is.

Mr. GRAHAM: Really it is a comedy. My hon. friend the ex-Minister of Finance was running the Grand Trunk for quite a long time.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: No.

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes, it came under a board, with which he was connected, like the Canadian National Board. But that is not the question at all. The government bought a property, part of which is in the United States. Now, I was not a member of the House at the time but I did take occasion in two or three articles I had the privilege of writing to point out that difficulties might arise when the Canadian government became the owner of railway lines in the United States. Here is one of them presented to-day. It must not be forgotten that what is good at one end of the line is good at the other and the road to Portland is just as much the property of the people of Canada as is the road to Halifax. We have our money invested in it. But there is another feature of the matter, we must consider. Cut off the traffic going to the Grand Trunk from Chicago and vicinity, and there will be a lot that goes to Portland which will not go over the Grand Trunk at all. We cannot take the position of wanting to keep one end of the Grand Trunk in the United States and run it for our own benefit bringing traffic to Canadian ports, unless we are prepared to make a somewhat fair division and give some of the traffic that we get in Canada to the United States portion of the railway. The Grand Trunk owned by the people of Canada runs for a portion of its length under the control of the various states of the United States and of the federal authority as well.

Mr. BAXTER: In the statistics that I referred to, it is Canadian wheat that is handled down there now.

[Sir Henry Drayton.]

Mr. GRAHAM: Well, my hon. friend must remember that in the statistics given this year at the port of Montreal the charge was made that we were handling United States wheat to the detriment of facilities for handling Canadian wheat. We are living beside a great nation, and when we have launched into the experiment of owning railways, a portion of which is in the country beside us, we must be a little bit reciprocal in our arrangements or we shall find that they can ruin us more quickly that we can ruin them. Now, my hon. friend (Sir Henry Drayton) in so far as his Canadian citizenship is concerned, is the owner of every foot of the line in the United States just as much as he is the owner of the system in Canada; and while it is better in so far as we can to have Canadian traffic handled at Canadian ports, we must bear in mind that the Canadian ports if they are to be made successful, must reciprocate and handle traffic from the United States and in order to do that we must be somewhat careful. I agree with my hon. friend that in so far as it is possible at all we ought to develop our own Canadian ports, but we must go about it in a manner that will not absolutely ruin our investment or reduce the efficiency of the railways to any great extent as a result of retaliatory measures from the United States. It makes no difference, particularly now, who bought the Grand Trunk. The fact is that we have it. The situation to which my hon. friend referred as to further development at Portland is one which I thought he thoroughly understood. But if it had been fully explained to him I think perhaps he would not ask the question he has asked. On some other occasion I shall be at liberty to discuss the matter fully; but when I tell him, who has been a member of a government, that certain conditions sometimes arise in which it is not in the public interest to answer certain questions, I think he will fully understand that the government cannot at all times give a "yes" or a "no" in reply to some direct questions when they believe that the answer might be detrimental to the whole interests of the country.

Now, the Canadian National system is not the system it was a few years ago. It was a difficult task that Mr. Hanna had when he had control of the Canadian Northern and its ramifications and when he was managing for years the Intercolonial railway. It is no new story that the Intercolonial Railway is being managed by the Canadian National Railways. What was called the Canadian National Railway Board has managed the Intercolonial for years past, and it is nothing new. The hon. gentleman's friends were cognizant of that, and

if we are to have the whole Canadian National system it cannot be otherwise.

But great as the problem was at that time it is much greater at present, and my hon. friend has clearly pointed out the reason. Heretofore the Canadian people owned the Canadian Northern and the ramifications of that company as well as the Intercolonial, Transcontinental and the Grand Trunk Pacific. These railways were for the most part in the Dominion and the difficulty of handling them was not nearly so great as it is at the present time. We have added now all the lines of that great company, the Grand Trunk, which has its best feeder from the west and its chief port on the Atlantic in United States territory. This cannot be changed all in a moment, but I can assure my hon. friend that while the difficulty which confronts Sir Henry Thornton and his board is very great —greater than almost can be imagined from the outside—yet he has in mind to give the Canadian ports the advantage in every case wherever it is possible to do so. I cannot go any further than that. The time will come when I shall be able to make a few remarks to my hon. friend with reference to some of the things he has referred to which I know will be eminently satisfactory to him. But at the present time I must say again that it would not be in the interests of the Canadian people, it would not be in the interests of Canadian ports, if I were to undertake to answer in the manner that they are asked several questions concerning the extension of the line in the United States.

Mr. CHURCH: I think everybody will sympathize with the minister in his desire to put the National Railways on a business basis. Notwithstanding the pessimism which was voiced in the House during the immigration debates—I think the minister deserves some credit for the fine statement which he delivered to the House the other night as to the year's showing of the Canadian National Railways.

Now, the case of the Maritime provinces was considered last session by the special committee of which the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) was chairman. It was contended that by agreement at confederation the Maritime provinces were promised special treatment in railway rates and service. If such a policy of fixing rates by localities is to be followed we might as well wind up the National Railways, because the question of rates is a question of operating costs, it is not a question of east and west, or north and south. Rates and service are determined by operating costs, and that is the only economic factor which fixes railway rates. Last session we had the western representatives asking for preferential rates to the head of the lakes for their basic products, grain and so on. If the principle of preferential rates were once recognized, we might as well abolish the Railway Commission.

Mr. BAXTER: No one is discussing rates to-day.

Mr. CHURCH: Parliament has interfered every session with the question of rates until to-day the Railway Commission is not fulfilling its functions as a rate controlling board. The question of rates is an economic, a business, a commercial question that affects every business man in the country, and if the Railway Commission was left to fix railway rates it would be far better for all concerned.

In 1917 a royal commission was appointed to go into the question of railways and transportation in this country. That commission was composed of Mr. A. H. Smith, President of the New York Central Railway, Sir Henry Drayton, then Chairman of the Railway Commission, and Mr. W. M. Acworth, an eminent British railway engineer. What did Mr. Smith say about advancing loans and making extensions promiscuously without the consent of the Railway Commission? He said:

> Amend the regulating policy so that the Railway Commission may have jurisdiction over all railroads in the matter of maximum and minimum rates, the issuance of securities, the building of new railways, or the extension of lines, and other matters properly within the scope of governmental supervision.

Has that recommendation been carried out? No. Neither has any of the recommendations made by the other members of that commission. Parliament has gone over the head of the Railway Commission, and only recently this House decided to continue construction of the Hudson Bay railway, although that undertaking has been condemned by this royal commission on the ground that it is impracticable and will never pay interest on the capital outlay. All this will be found set out at page 62 of the report. Now other extensions are coming up. The whole question of rates has been interfered with by the duplication of our railways. We have three transcontinental systems where one would have been sufficient for many years to come. The proper regulation of railways by the Railway Commission is ignored to-day. For all the use the commission now is or for all it has to do its members might as well go over to Luxor and accidentally enter the tomb and become embalmed with King Tutankhamen.

Mr. GOULD: In reference to the Railway Commission having control of rates, would this affect the proposed importation of Alberta coal into Ontario?

Mr. CHURCH: If this parliament is going to interfere in the way it did last session with the rates on grain to the head of the lakes it might just as well go into the coal business too, because coal is a necessity as well as grain. What I contend is that parliament should not interfere with the functions of the Railway Commission in regulating freight rates, passing on loans, extensions and so on. The question of this loan should first be submitted to the Railway Commission to see if they recommend it. If you are going to give the National Railways a chance, do so, but to say that certain localities shall have preferential treatment is wrong in principle. You cannot have efficient administration of our national lines except under the Railway Act and by the Railway Commission.

Mr. MacLAREN: I had proposed, Mr. Chairman, to speak on this subject, but I did not anticipate that the particular phase of it to which I wish to address myself would be introduced this afternoon. I presume this vote will not be passed to-day, and that I shall have an opportunity of speaking when the subject is again taken up?

Mr. GRAHAM: This is merely an item for refunding. We have yet to take up the whole railway estimates. The discussion to-day is really a little premature.

Mr. MacLAREN: That is quite true, but now that the House has the matter before it I submit it is a more favourable time to continue this phase of it rather than bring it up in a detached form in a week's time.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I entirely agree with the manner in which my hon. friend, the Minister of Railways—or the Minister of National Defence and Acting Minister of Railways—(Mr. Graham) approached the question. He is not throwing the blame for the Grand Trunk business on the late government. I appreciate that there are difficulties in connection with the matter. I appreciate also that he says he is going to do the best he can, and I hope he will, in connection with Canadian business. Of course, he is in a position now to do it, but he would not have been if the Grand Trunk had not been taken over. The proposed extensions at Providence, Rhode Island, have been under consideration for some time. I remember looking into the subject some years ago, and in what I am about to say my hon. friend will correct me if my recollection is wrong. My recollection is that the Grand Trunk spent some $6,000,000 or $7,000,000 in connection with that branch and the question was whether we could save that six or seven millions by making further commitments—some $5,000,000 more, I think. But the result of the information I then got was that having regard to traffic, having regard to business and general railway conditions, we would be simply losing another $5,000,000 if we spent it on that work. My hon. friend may have more up-to-date information on the subject. The state authorities were very anxious that the work should go on; they were going to extend the time for its completion in order that it might proceed. There was also some suggestion as to what they were prepared to do, if we went ahead with this thing, with a view to helping out what looked like an impossible situation from the investor's standpoint. I would like the minister to inform the committee as to how matters stand now with respect to the Providence situation. If the work is to go on, how much will it cost, and what changes have taken place in the matter of traffic?

Mr. GRAHAM: The situation is about as my hon. friend has described it. The Grand Trunk Railway, under the late Mr. Hays, expended some $7,000,000 over there, under a charter from two states. Hon. members will recall that there was some legal difficulty over the construction or the want of construction of that road. That expenditure has remained ever since without any effort to carry out the original idea of constructing a line to the port. Before this line can be constructed the two states in question have to renew the charters. One of these has already been renewed; in the case of the other the matter is now before the legislature and it is expected that the renewal will be granted in a few days, when the government will be able to announce its policy. My hon. friend will understand that I prefer not to discuss the matter at great length until we get the information on which we can base our opinion.

Mr. MacLAREN: I suggest that this item be allowed to stand.

Item stands.

Progress reported.

At six o'clock the House adjourned, without question being put, pursuant to rule.

Thursday, April 12, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

VACANCY—CAPE BRETON NORTH AND VICTORIA

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received notification of a vacancy having occurred in the representation of the electoral district of Cape Breton North and Victoria consequent upon the acceptance of an office of emolument under the Crown by Hon. D. D. McKenzie, the sitting member therefor, I have accordingly issued my warrant to the Chief Electoral Officer to make out a new writ for the election of a member to the said electoral district.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST READING

Bill No. 105, An Act respecting the Canadian Order of the Woodmen of the World—Mr. Gordon.

MARINE AND FISHERIES COMMITTEE

Mr. DUFF moved, that the recommendation contained in the second report of the select standing committee on Marine and Fisheries be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

WRECK OF STEAMSHIP TRADER

Mr. LADNER:

1. Has the government received a report with respect to the wreck of the SS. Trader in March, on the rocks dumped off the end of the jetty on the north arm of the Fraser river, British Columbia, built by the government?

2. If so, was the wreck due to the failure of the department to provide a proper light at the end of this jetty, and is the vessel a total loss?

3. Is it a fact that the said jetty has been without any light for three months or any other lesser period and that there is no mark or communication at the end of the said jetty to show the entrance to the channel of the north arm of the Fraser river.

4. Has the government a report on the wrecking or grounding on or about Thursday, March 15, of three tugs with booms of logs at a point on Sea Island about one mile east of the said jetty?

5. Has the government taken steps to provide a proper and sufficient light at the end of the said jetty and to otherwise properly protect the entrance to the said channel for navigation?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. The Department of Marine and Fisheries has received a report of the wreck of the Trader.

2. The vessel was stranded 300 yards west of the jetty at noon on March 16th during what the captain in charge described as a furious W.S.W. gale. Consequently the wreck was not due to the absence of a light.

3. The edge of the channel is 400 feet from the jetty. The department has maintained since 1905 range lights to mark this channel. The outer light was carried away on January 21st last by the tug Gleeful, the report of which did not reach the department until January 31st. Instructions to rebuild were wired February 2nd.

4. No.

5. Yes.

WRECK OF STEAMSHIP ALASKAN

Mr. LADNER:

1. Has the government received a report regarding the wreck of the SS. Alaskan with the loss of all its crew, near Pachena Point on the Pacific coast, in January last?

2. Has the government, on acount of economy or otherwise, reduced by 50 per cent or any other amount, the strength of the unwatched lights on that coast or any part of it and thereby reduced the visibility of the said lights?

3. If such or any other reduction has been made, were the changes published to master mariners, so that they would not be fooled by the changed lights?

4. Does the government pay to the Pacific Salvage Company $30,000 per year or any other amount to keep up steam on board the SS. Algerine?

5. Is the SS. Algerine a seaworthy vessel, suitable for the purpose for which it is employed by the government?

6. Did the United States SS. Snohomish rescue the crew of the SS. Tuscan Prince which ran on to the coast of British Columbia?

7. Is it the intention of the government to provide proper and efficient coast protection for British Columbia by having an ocean-going tug similar to the said SS. Snohomish, or by having any other suitable class of tug, for assisting the mercantile marine in storms or times of peril on the sea?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. Yes.

2. No.

3. Answered by No. 2.

4. The government pays the Pacific Salvage Co. Ltd. the sum of $10,000 per annum to maintain a wrecking plant at Victoria, B.C., for service on the B.C. coast.

5. Yes.

6. No. The crew of the Tuscan Prince were rescued by the crew of the government life boat, stationed at Bamfield creek.

7. See statement by Minister of Marine and Fisheries on Pages 1725 and 1726 Unrevised Hansard.

GRAIN COMMISSION

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. MILLAR: Can the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Robb) inform us

when we may expect the announcement of the appointment of the proposed grain commission and whether the trade will be represented on that commission.

Mr. ROBB: The matter is now under consideration, and all interested in the production and sale of grain will be represented.

Hon. E. M. MACDONALD

MINISTER OF THE CROWN WITHOUT PORTFOLIO

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have been waiting expecting an announcement by the Prime Minister, in view of the press statements this morning, of changes in the government—subtractions and possible additions.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I have much pleasure in informing the House that the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) was sworn in this afternoon as a member of the Privy Council of Canada, without portfolio.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Has the Prime Minister no announcement as to any one leaving the government, which he can make also with pleasure?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It would be with deep regret that I would make any such announcement.

SHORTAGE IN SHIPMENTS OF GRAIN

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. COOTE: I would like to draw the attention of the government to a report which has appeared in the press recently to the effect that complaints have been made in England, by importers of grain shipped from the port of Montreal, that the shipments were short in weight, and that a commission is likely to be appointed by the government here to inquire into this matter, and to ask the government whether they have received this complaint, and if so, will a commissioner be appointed to conduct an inquiry?

Mr. LAPOINTE: The attention of the department was called in December last to a complaint which had been made by the directors of the Liverpool Corn Trade Association respecting a shortage of grain shipped from the port of Montreal. The matter was taken up with the Harbour Commission of Montreal, and an officer of the department was entrusted with the task of making an investigation. We are convinced that if there is any shortage, no blame can be laid on the port of Montreal. We sent the report of the investigation to the High Commissioner of Canada in London, who transmitted it to the Liverpool Corn Trade Association. The latter are not quite satisfied because that investigation was made by a department of the government. They want a more impartial investigation, so to speak, and that is what the High Commissioner has stated in a letter written to the Department of Marine and Fisheries. We have answered that we regret that this investigation has not satisfied them; but as the matter is very important, we are going to see that another investigation is made under the Inquiries Act. I am actually considering this question in conjunction with the Minister of Trade and Commerce. Let me add that the harbour commissioners of Montreal invite the investigation; they will be only too pleased that it should be made, and, indeed, they were prepared to carry it out themselves. They contend that if anything is wrong, it is not on their end of the transportation process. An announcement will be made shortly.

SUPPLY

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the chair:

Railways and Canals—Chargeable to income—To increase the amount of loan authorized by Vote No. 136 Main Estimates, 1922-23—Additional amount required $13,099,493.34.

Mr. MacLAREN: Mr. Chairman,—

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Acting Minister of Railways and Canals): Might I be allowed just a word? I believe my hon. friend who has just risen to his feet, desires to discuss this item. I would suggest to the committee that after he makes his remarks, we allow the item to stand, as several other hon. gentlemen have told me that they wish to make some observations on it, but they are not prepared to do so to-day.

Mr. MacLAREN: I am fortunate in having this early opportunity, before speaking directly on the question before the committee, of congratulating the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald). I do so with great satisfaction, because I am aware of the capabilities of the new Minister of the Crown and especially his capacity for work. He has—and this has a direct bearing on the appropriation which we are now considering—an intimate knowledge of the railway question. He knows, in an unusually thorough manner, many of the difficulties which exist in connection with railways. His presence therefore, in the cabinet is additionally satisfactory, because I think he will bring to this question a well-founded knowledge and a sympathetic attitude, which I believe

are not evident in the cabinet at the present time. During the debate on this appropriation, some discussion as regards the question of railway policy and transportation has been raised. The importance of the discussion was increased by the statements of two members of the government. Their statements were of importance, and at the same time their remarks were, I thought, of a dubious nature and of a disquieting character.

I wish to review, to some extent, the situation as regards the railway system and the railway policy. A few weeks ago the Acting Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham), in the general summary which he presented to parliament, made some very important statements. He informed us that there were 22,646 miles of National railways. He also told us that the value of these 22,646 miles as appearing on the books of the various companies, amounted to $1,892,577,750, and further that the total earnings in the year 1921 amounted to $233,789,000. These are a few of the outstanding features of the very large organization which the country now possesses. This property was handed over to the Canadian National Railway Company by order in council of the 20th of January of this year, and that order in council entrusts the National Railways of Canada with the keeping of the Canadian National Railway Company for its management and operation. The only limitation in this connection is the proviso that it shall be during the pleasure of the Governor in Council. Up to yesterday no further copies of orders in council had been tabled showing that any subsequent instructions have been issued by the government to the Canadian National Railway Company. In other words, the government has passed over to the company the railways for operation and management without any instructions or any indication of what is to be done, or any general outline to be followed. Nothing of this kind has been done at all. There appears to me to be a striking lack of policy on the part of the government when it hands over this stupendous system of 22,000 miles to the company for operation and management without some guidance or anything to indicate in a broad way what the views of the government are. I ask, would anyone, in any other form of business outside of government control, contemplate handing over a property of this enormous importance and of such huge wealth to a company's management informing that company simply to go ahead and operate the business, without at the same time laying down some policy that shall be followed? Can anyone think of such a thing in connection with a matter that affects the financial condition of the country to such a large extent?

The property was entrusted to the company under a statute entitled "An act to incorporate the Canadian National Railway Company, and respecting Canadian National Railways." The company took over the railway more especially under section 11, and I shall read this to the House:

> . . . . the management and operation of any lines or railways or parts thereof, and any property or works of whatsoever description, or interests therein, and any powers, rights or privileges over or with respect to any railways, properties or works, or interests therein, which may be from time to time vested in or owned, controlled or occupied by His Majesty, or such parts or part thereof, or rights or interests therein, as may be designated in any order in council, upon such terms and subject to such regulations and conditions as the Governor in Council may from time to time decide; such management and operation to continue during the pleasure of the Governor in Council and to be subject to termination or variation, from time to time in whole or in part by the Governor in Council.

The authority, then is given to the government to invoke such regulations and conditions as they think proper in entrusting the railways to the company. Where are these regulations and conditions? So far as can be ascertained from the orders in council no regulations or conditions have been laid down and passed on from the government to the company. The government have taken no such position in this matter. But while the government have not seen fit to give any general directions to the company in the way of guidance, certain commitments have been made on behalf of the country, and there are conditions which have existed for some time that bind the government to lay down certain broad and definite principles which the company shall follow. Among these commitments, I might refer first of all to the Intercolonial Railway, which is a matter that is often mentioned in the House. It is mentioned, frequently I think, without any very definite idea of what the British North America Act says on the point, and I therefore propose to read the section of that act, which is not long. Section 145 of the British North America Act says:

> Inasmuch as the provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, have joined in a declaration that the construction of the Intercolonial railway is essential to the consolidation of the Union of British North America, and to the assent thereto of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and have consequently agreed that provision should be made for its immediate construction by the government of Canada: Therefore, in order to give effect to that agreement, it shall be the duty of the government and parliament of Canada to provide for the commencement, within six months after the union, of a railway connecting the river St. Lawrence with the city of Halifax in Nova Scotia, and for the construction thereof without intermission, and the completion thereof with all practicable speed.

We are quite aware that different views are held regarding the construction which this section entails, and without taking anything more than a moderate view of the section and what it calls for, I believe that it is fair to assume that it does show that this was to be a public undertaking essentially and that it was not necessarily a financial or commercial enterprise. I would suggest therefore that on the face of it this is a government railway and stands in a different relationship from other railways in the country; and I contend that it is not open to this government or parliament to dispose of it to any private corporation if that were proposed. The other fair deduction, I think, is that the conditions attaching to this railway are such that it is incumbent upon the government to see that trade between the Maritime provinces and the rest of Canada shall move freely and without any undue hindrance. But during the last few years this has not been the case, and this fact has been one of the grievances which have been complained of. So much then for the Intercolonial.

Now, how does the country stand in connection with the Canadian Northern railway and the Grand Trunk Pacific? This House and the country generally were given to understand when the measures were before Parliament that these two railroads would be used for the encouragement of Canadian trade from east to west and from west to east. As emphasizing this understanding I shall quote section 13 of the act of 1911 respecting aid towards the construction of the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway. By this section it is declared:

> That the aid herein provided for is granted by the government for the express purpose of encouraging the transportation of goods through Canadian channels. Before such aid is granted the Governor in Council shall require the Canadian Northern Railway Company and the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company to enter into an agreement undertaking that all freight originating on the line of the Canadian Northern Railway Company or its branches, or on the line of the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company or its branches, not specifically routed otherwise by the shipper, shall, when destined to points in Canada be carried over the Canadian Northern Railway, or the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway, or the connections of either of them or over any railway within Canadian territory; and that the through rate on export traffic from the point of origin to the point of destination shall at no time be greater via Canadian ports than via United States ports, and that all such traffic, not specifically routed otherwise by the shipper, shall be carried to Canadian ocean ports; and that the Canadian Northern Railway Company and the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company shall not in any matter within their powers directly or indirectly advise or encourage the transportation of such freight by routes other than those above provided, but shall, in all respects, in good faith, use their utmost endeavours to fulfil the conditions upon which public aid is granted, namely, the development of trade through Canadian channels and Canadian ocean ports.

As further emphasizing this understanding I shall now read three paragraphs—42, 43 and 45—from the act of 1903 respecting the Grand Trunk Pacific. This act will be found as chapter 71 of the statutes of that year, and it is interesting to note that it was signed on behalf of the government by the present Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding). Paragraph 42 is in these words:

> It is hereby declared and agreed between the parties to this agreement that the aid herein provided for is granted by the government of Canada for the express purpose of encouraging the development of Canadian trade and the transportation of goods through Canadian channels. The company accepts the aid on these conditions, and agrees that all freight originating on the line of the railway, or its branches, not specifically routed otherwise by the shipper, shall, when destined for poilnts in Canada, be carried entirely on Canadian territory, or between Canadian inland ports, and that the through rate on export traffic from the point of origin to the point of destination shall at no time be greater via Canadian ports than via United States ports, and that all such traffic, not specifically routed otherwise by the shipper, shall be carried to Canadian ocean ports.

Now paragraph 43:

> The company further agrees that it shall not, in any matter within its power, directly or indirectly advise or encourage the transportation of such freight by routes other than those above provided, but shall, in all respects, in good faith, use its utmost endeavours to fulfil the conditions upon which public aid is granted, namely,—the development of trade through Canadian channels and Canadian ocean ports.

Then the last paragraph bearing on the point is additional to what I have read in reference to the Canadian Northern. I refer to paragraph 45:

> The company shall arrange for and provide, either by purchase, charter or otherwise, shipping connections upon both the Atlantic and Pacific oceans sufficient in tonnage and in number of sailings to take care of and transport all its traffic both inward and outward, at such ocean ports within Canada upon the said line of railway, or upon the line of the Intercolonial railway as may be agreed upon from time to time, and the company shall not divert, or so far as it can lawfully prevent permit to be diverted to ports outside of Canada any traffic which it can lawfully influence or control upon the ground that there is not a sufficient amount of shipping to transport such traffic from or to such Canadian ocean ports.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it may be said that while there is no evidence of the government having drawn these commitments to the attention of the railway board, still the latter are supposed to be aware of the legislation. Personally I do not think this suggestion is satisfactory. The property is too large and valuable and of too much importance to the country for us to depend on mere supposition. The existence of these commitments should be made clear to the country generally and

to the railway board in particular, and that, I conceive, can only be done by order in council.

I need hardly say that these undertakings or agreements were known generally by the public at the time the legislation confirming them was enacted. Indeed, the country was not content to grant such generous aid to these railway companies unless, in return, the railway companies gave these undertakings so that the whole Dominion would be benefited, for the real object of building these railways was, through the encouragement of trade within the country, to ensure national prosperity. These are the commitments, and they must be lived up to. I am not saying that the government do not look upon them as commitments, but we would like to hear something more specific in the matter. In any case, those conditions are there, and as a matter of right, as a matter of good faith, they should be fulfilled.

I wish now to refer to the question of the transportation of Canadian products through United States ports and the transportation of American products through Canadian ports. It has frequently been stated that a large amount of Canadian grain is transported through United States ports, and when you look at the figures furnished by the Bureau of Statistics you cannot help being doubly impressed with the truth of that statement. In the year ending March 31, 1921, there were exported through the United States 58,839,270 bushels of Canadian wheat and principal grains, as compared with 48,401,141 bushels of Canadian grain exported through Canadian ports. In the year ending March 31, 1922, the amount exported through United States ports was 99,301,421 bushels, and through Canadian ports, 69,239,823 bushels. For the period ending January 31, 1923—the March figures are not yet available—the amount exported through United States ports was 160,250,892 bushels as compared with 88,232,899 bushels through Canadian ports.

Mr. CLARK: How much through the port of Montreal?

Mr. MacLAREN: I think I have the figures for Montreal and for Vancouver as well, but I would like to follow up this general line for the moment. While the respective amounts exported through American and Canadian ports vary somewhat, the figures show that 65 per cent, or even more, of our Canadian grain is exported to countries beyond the seas through the United States. That, I say, is a very impressive statement, and one that is not calculated, I think, to satisfy the ambitions of Canadians.

I would like to refer briefly to the matter of flour. The amount of Canadian flour exported through United States ports for the year ending March 31, 1921, was 1,546,714 barrels as against 3,282,568 barrels exported through Canadian ports. In 1922 there were exported through United States ports 2,864,699 barrels of Canadian flour, and through Canadian ports, 3,979,016 barrels. For the period ending January 31, 1923, the amount exported through American ports was 3,696,144 barrels, as against 5,496,963 barrels exported through Canadian ports. So that so far as flour goes, while a vast amount is exported from Canada through United States ports, the proportion is less unfavourable than it is in the matter of wheat and grains.

I have heard it stated in this House that while an undue amount of Canadian grain is being exported through American ports, that export is offset by the amount of grain that goes from the United States through Canadian ports. Well, these are the figures: For the year ending March 31, 1922, the amount of Canadian wheat and principal grains exported through United States ports amounted to 99,300,186 bushels as compared with 79,693,438 bushels going from the United States through Canadian ports. This shows a considerable preponderance in grain exported from Canada through United States ports over the amount that is exported from the United States through Canadian ports. It therefore cannot be said to be an offset. It is a partial offset, but it is far from being a complete offset.

I have other figures here. For the nine months ending December 31, 1922—the figures for the last three months are not available—Canadian grains passing through United States ports amounted to 146,210,694 bushels, as compared with 91,838,301 bushels of United States grains passing through Canadian ports, showing a very large preponderance for nine months in favour of the American ports.

For the year ending March 31, 1922, there were 2,864,699 barrels of Canadian wheat flour exported through American ports, as compared with 104,385 barrels of American flour exported through Canadian ports, or something like twenty times more Canadian flour was sent through American ports than American flour through Canadian ports. I have a similar statement for the nine months ending December 31, 1922. For that period there were 2,307,676 barrels of Canadian flour sent through American ports as compared with 12,046 barrels of American flour sent through Canadian ports. Those figures, I think, are very striking. It is hardly

necessary to emphasize the point that one of the most important articles of production in this country is grain, and that this is very largely exported to a foreign country. These figures show that this country is not sharing in one of our important industries, namely, transportation, to the extent it should. This question of transportation is of the greatest possible importance, not only for the government to consider but the Railway Board as well. It concerns both the government and the railway company and must be considered not only from the general point of view of the transportation of Canadian business over Canadian railways and through Canadian ports, but regard must also be had to the formal agreements that have already been made governing a considerable portion of the railway.

In answer to my hon. friend from Burrard, the amount of Canadian wheat exported via Montreal for the year ending March 31, 1921, was 28,298,040 bushels.

Mr. CLARK: Was that all wheat?

Mr. MacLAREN: The figures I have given are headed "Quantity of Canadian Flaxseed, Barley, Oats, Rye, Wheat exported to Overseas countries via Canadian seaports direct." It states that the total of wheat and other grains exported for the year 1921 was 37,008,373 bushels: for the year 1922, 52,320,740 bushels, and for the year 1923, 60,098,995 bushels. Those are the figures given to me by the Statistics Bureau. I have given this information simply in answer to a question and it does not bear quite on the point I was bringing up.

Now we come to that part of the railway question of which we heard a good deal yesterday, and that is that portion of the Grand Trunk which runs from Montreal to Portland, Maine, and as regards the business that is now being done by the Dominion government through the port of Portland, Maine. At the present time the difference in distance between Port Arthur and Portland, and Port Arthur and St. John, New Brunswick, is 253 miles in favour of the Portland route, that is, if the route is taken from the short cut at Long lake and the freight carried from McGivney Junction through Fredericton to St. John. One offset to this 253 miles, and there are several offsets, is the difference in grade in favour of the Canadian route. The grade of the Grand Trunk from Montreal to Portland, Maine, is one and one-fourth per cent. The grade from Port Arthur to St. John over the largest portion of the road is four-tenths per cent; I am advised that that is the case for all except twenty-seven miles, and that is an important offset. It means that a full freight train can be carried from Port Arthur to St. John continuously, whereas if the freight was taken from Port Arthur to Portland, Maine, the freight would have to be divided in Montreal and sent on in two trains. That is an important offset. There is this other factor, and that is that when the wheat goes through St. John or Halifax the money is spent in this country, and surely that is an important offset. The business is there. The railways can do the business. They are not so congested that they cannot carry on until the traffic is forced out via the Grand Trunk to Portland, Maine. Therefore, it is a question with the railway companies and with the government whether they think it advisable to raise a certain amount of money by dividing their business between Portland, Maine and Canadian ports, or concentrate on having the main revenue derived from our own Canadian ports. Difficulties are arising, no doubt, in the situation, but are they sufficient to deter us from making the best arrangement we can, rather than accepting the easier course of least resistance? While one does not wish to appear in any sense as a railway expert, in all railway matters, as in everything else in life, there is a tendency to follow the path of least resistance, the rut so to speak, the custom of doing certain things, is apt to be followed, and it takes a vast amount of determination to follow a newer and a better method.

Some figures were given, in answer to a question not long ago, regarding the business done in Canadian grain through the port of Portland and through the port of St. John, and I wish to have these figures incorporated in Hansard. The amount of Canadian grain carried to Portland, Maine, since October 1, 1922, by the Canadian Government railways, was 14,756,808 bushels. The amount of grain that was carried through St. John by the Canadian Government railways during the same period was 1,706,376—fourteen millions and three quarters to Portland as against one million and three quarters to St. John. The amount of United States grain that was brought to St. John during the same period was 367,282 bushels—a comparatively small amount. The Canadian Pacific railway brought 11,047,981 bushels of Canadian grain and 2,202,121 of United States grain to St. John. The amount taken to Halifax was reported as nil. A certain amount of grain is brought from the United States to St. John but the amount is small in comparison with

these amounts, particularly the amount sent to Portland, Maine, over the Canadian National. Here is a fact that I think the House might well consider: That at the present time the Canadian National Railways are taking to Portland, Maine, over 14,000,000 bushels as compared with one million and three quarter bushels to St. John.

I need hardly say that that matter is not entirely satisfactory to people who live in the Maritime provinces. They are showing very great concern and very much dissatisfaction with the conditions that now exist, and I would impress on the government that it is most desirable, not only in the interest of the prosperity of the country, but also in the interest of the contentment and happiness of the people, that this unsatisfactory condition should be changed. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) made a statement yesterday in reference to the situation. To my mind his remarks were very disturbing. He said in part—

> My hon. friend has forgotten that by the action of the government of Canada in acquiring the Grand Trunk railway, we have acquired another Maritime port at Portland, Maine.

Let me see if that be the case. The late government was more successful than were the commissioners in the drawing up of the Ashburton Treaty. They never succeeded in acquiring Portland, Maine—far from it—and yet the Minister of Finance says that the late government acquired another Maritime port in Portland, Maine. I think it is a most important thing. Mr. Chairman, not to confuse the issue. Having a railroad from Montreal to Portland, Maine, does not constitute having a port at Portland, Maine. It is confusing ideas. But the Minister of Finance is not given to confusion of ideas. He is remarkably clear, I do not think he has taken a dispassionate view of the situation or he would hardly advance that proposition.

Mr. PUTNAM: Is it not correct to say that the late government acquired a railroad to Portland, Maine?

Mr. MacLAREN: That is what I am saying. My hon. friend is quite right. I said acquiring a railroad was not acquiring a port at the same time—especially a foreign port.

Mr. PUTNAM: Acquiring a railroad in this case implied acquiring a terminus of a railroad, which was Portland.

Mr. MacLAREN: I think what I said was quite clear and what the Minister of Finance said is also clear. He said a port.

Mr. PUTNAM: I say that too.

Mr. MacLAREN: And I say that is a confusion of ideas and a confusion of the issue. It is not acquiring a port, and I am pleased to have the opportunity of refuting that statement.

Mr. PUTNAM: Instead of "acquiring," what is the proper word?

Mr. MacLAREN: I will answer the question of my hon. friend if he will remain quiescent for a little while. The minister stated as reported in Hansard:

> We have acquired another Maritime port at Portland, Maine.

Acquiring a railway from Montreal to Portland is, in my judgment, a long way off from acquiring a port; it is also a long way off from compelling the government to make use of that port whether they have a terminus there or whether they have not. There is in the act nothing laid down that I know of compelling the government to maintain that port, or to see that traffic goes through Portland, Maine. The minister went on to say:

> The question is an ugly one, and this complicates it. We own the Grank Trunk railway, and Portland is the Grand Trunk railway terminus. This is the problem we are giving to Sir Henry Thornton. We are asking him to make these roads reasonably profitable, remunerative, self-sustaining.

Where is the official record of this request that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) states has been made to the railway board? He stated:

> We are asking him to make these roads reasonably profitable, remunerative, self-sustaining.

I have pointed out already that there is no order in council giving any instructions whatever to the railway board, beyond entrusting them with the property and empowering them to operate and manage it. If Sir Henry Thornton has been asked to carry on this road, as the minister stated yesterday, so as to make it reasonably profitable, remunerative, self-sustaining, I should like to have the record. The minister went on to say:

> We give him this road to Portland. Is he to let that road be idle, to let the rails get rusty, or to try to send some traffic over the Portland road in order that it may contribute something towards the cost of the system?

That seems to me a method of conducting an argument that is not convincing, that is not satisfactory to this committee. What is the use of talking about rusty rails? I am afraid we have enough of them in this country already, and I do not know that the minister is exercised about that. But we know there is trade originating in Chicago, and it is carried to Portland, Maine, over the Grand Trunk. Nobody raises

any dispute over that. Nobody says: "Do not do that." On the contrary, we agree that it is right and proper to carry that on. There is passenger traffic going on between Montreal and Portland, Maine. Does anyone wish to represent that nothing but wheat is going over that road? We know to the contrary. Wheat, of course, is not going there in the summer. That is not a method of conducting an argument that we might have expected; but in any case, if the railway is there and if the terminus is there, outside of all that I have mentioned, is that any reason why a government or a railway board should wish to keep up a foreign port at the expense of our own port? The business can be done as well, as cheaply, and I believe with more financial benefit to the country by sending the traffic through Canadian ports.

When this matter was discussed prior to the last election, a tremendous hubbub was raised about the taking over of the Grand Trunk. I do not know that anybody was particularly anxious to take over the Grand Trunk; but something had to be done; you could not give it away; it had to be disposed of in some way or another, and in my view, at any rate, the best thing to do in the interest of the country was to take it over. I saw no alternative. I am in favour of government ownership of railways, and when I say so, I do not want to say it in that drawback sort of tone or way, that I hear from many hon. members in this House and especially members on the other side. I believe in public ownership, and that it is not too much to expect of a railway board to feel hopeful that it can make a success of this project with the greatest benefit to our people. That being the case, why put this view forward that we must export through Portland, Maine? As I stated prior to the last election there was a tremendous disturbance over this question that another port had been originated in Portland, Maine, and that this was to be all corrected—mark you! On the other hand, another view was put forward that a favourable feature of the taking over of the Grand Trunk was that the administration and operation of the road then came within the power of the government, and they were at liberty to favour, or to limit, or to do away with all this business through Portland, Maine. The government are now in the position of saying whether they want this or do not want it. They are in the position of saying: "We will do this", or "we will not do it." It may be a part of the duties of the railway board, I grant you—they may do this and I hope they will—but I believe it is the duty of the government to come out in a general way and say: "We want this business for our country."

The Acting Minister of Railways also spoke on this subject yesterday, and there are two phases to his remarks. He gave some vague hopes at the end. I hope they will all be realized. I trust that what he hints at will please the House. In that case it must be something pretty substantial; but he does hint that something is coming of a favourable character. Before he made that statement, he referred in several instances to the railway situation in somewhat similar terms to the remarks made by the Minister of Finance. He said, for instance:

> It must not be forgotten that what is good at one end of the line is good at the other—

I do not know what that means.

> —and the road to Portland is just as much the property of the people of Canada as is the road to Halifax.

Very well. I would ask the people of Canada if they wish the port of Portland, Maine, to be developed and used as a Canadian port at the expense of our own ports? If the government wish to ask that question, I should be only too delighted; but I do not think that any question like that is going to be addressed by the government to the people. The minister went on to say:

> But there is another feature of the matter we must consider. Cut off the traffic going to the Grand Trunk from Chicago and vicinity, etc.

Nobody is objecting to the business that is developed from Chicago and its neighbourhood proceeding to Portland, Maine, over the Grand Trunk. Far from it.

I wish to refer for a moment to something in that connection so far as the Atlantic division is concerned. This is a matter that has been discussed to a considerable extent by the public in the last few months. I recognize that the apportionment of the country into divisions, western, eastern and Atlantic, in accordance with the act, comes within the purview of the railway board. I believe that everyone is content to leave this to the railway board, and if the board makes an error then I presume later on it will be subject to correction and advice. I am in accord with the view that the railway board and the management should be entirely free from politics; and, when I say that, I have reference to the personnel, the general management, general regulations and everything else connected with the board; I believe that in regard to all this the railway board should have a free hand and be quite untrammelled. But when it came to the assignment of these divisions, the general belief is that the limita-

tion of the Atlantic division was fixed in a certain place west of Montreal but that political pressure moved it back to Montreal. What happened? That did not seem to be quite enough, and still further political pressure is reported to have forced it back again to Rivière du Loup. So that the western terminus of the Atlantic division is regarded by many people in the country to have been removed, by political pressure, and shifted twice, finally being fixed in the wilderness at Rivière du Loup.

Now, that sort of thing is not what we contemplate as administration without politics, and I trust we shall be able to carry on the railways without such interference. When, however, such a thing is done an hon. member can only rise in this House and bring up the point. As was stated yesterday, I believe that the only proper thing to do is to discuss these railway matters in the House. Hon. members are sent here to represent their constituencies and the country at large, and it is here that we must criticize in a fair way the acts of the railway board and any extra-railway board pressure that has been brought to bear. I can only state many men believe that these are the facts of the case as I have stated them. The ultimate settlement of the Atlantic division limitation at Rivière du Loup has given rise to dissatisfaction generally on the part of business men of the Maritime provinces. I have here a copy of a resolution that was passed at a joint meeting of a number of the boards of trade of the Maritime provinces held a few weeks ago at Amherst in which there was expressed strong disapproval of the western limitation being fixed at Rivière du Loup. They say that Montreal was the limit previously of the Intercolonial railway, and they contend that Montreal is the point where trade originates. They say that it is the point at which traffic coming in may be passed on to the Maritime rails rather than to Portland, Maine. These arguments do not apply to Rivière du Loup, which is a quite unimportant station near New Brunswick. That is the position of affairs, and I believe that it has been arranged for representatives of the boards of trade of the Maritime provinces to meet Sir Henry Thornton next week, so great has been the dissatisfaction that has been engendered in connection with this question. As the House is aware, there is one representative of the railway board on the Atlantic division. I asked a question some weeks ago as to whether an additional representative on the board was to be appointed for New Brunswick, and this is the answer I received:

> After consultation with the president of the Canadian National railways it was decided to begin operations with a comparatively small board representative of districts rather than of provinces. Should experience indicate the necessity for further additions within the limits of the act the government will not hesitate to make these additions.

The statement has appeared in the press on several occasions, and it has not been contradicted, that the representative of the Atlantic division has said that at one meeting of the board the western terminus of the Atlantic division was to be Montreal and that at a subsequent meeting at which he was not present the second push-back to Rivière du Loup took place. Now, the government have assured me that they would not hesitate to make additions if experience should indicate the necessity therefor. Well, I would ask the government whether there does not appear to be a necessity for further additions to the board in view of the fact that in the absence of the one representative for the Atlantic division the terminus of that division is interfered with. Is that not an experience which would indicate the necessity for a further addition? One can easily figure it out. If there were two members on the board representing that division then the chances of the division being entirely without representation at any meeting would be reduced one-half, or it would be quite possible for them to arrange matters so that if they were not always both present they could attend meetings alternately, so that there would be no fear of the Atlantic division being shoved further back. I suggest that to the government as being a reason that must appeal to them, in view of their assurance to me, why another man should be appointed on the board.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I should like to say a word in reference particularly to the future of the Maritime provinces. The satisfactory accomplishment of a suitable railway policy will ensure the future of the Maritime provinces. Some very prominent business men, men whose opinions are well worth careful consideration by this committee, have told me from time to time that in their view the future of the Maritime provinces lies in the development of industries within their borders and the building up of an export business beyond the seas. That is not an imaginary condition. These are practical business men, not men who talk about secession, and they tell me that the prosperity of the Maritime provinces lies in export business beyond the seas rather than domestic business over Canadian rails under present transportation conditions. Therefore I submit that the railway position is one of outstanding importance.

There is another factor that might help very materially, and it is directly bound up with the railway situation—that is preferential trade with Great Britain. It is very easy for that preference to be limited to goods coming through Canadian ports. It affects Vancouver, Victoria and Prince Rupert, and it affects our Atlantic coast ports. There does not seem to be any difficulty about the adoption of such a limitation, and, with others, I again press on the government their careful consideration of this principle as one of the means of bringing back prosperity to the whole country. I must acknowledge with thankfulness that in the recent French treaty the principle has been recognized and acted upon, that treaty containing a provision that French goods entering Canada must come direct to Canadian ports to benefit from the preference. That is a beginning. It is a very small matter compared with the British preference, but it is a principle which the government has accepted. If the government will go a step further and apply this principle to the British and all other preferential tariffs, the country will be the better. Curiously enough, I do not see such a provision in the Italian treaty. Presumably this treaty in any case would be of much less importance. Be that as it may, I think that not only the French treaty, but also the Italian, the British and all other such treaties should contain this clause. It is a clause which is fair in every way, for no one is going to suffer but a great many will benefit from its inclusion in our trade treaties.

Item stands.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

National Defence—Militia Services—Amount required to pay Cost of Living Bonus to employees of the Dominion Arsenal and others at Quebec, discharged without receiving bonus for certain periods for which it was later granted to those similarly employed and not discharged, $26,000.

Hon GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of National Defence): This is the item we discussed yesterday.

Mr. MANION: Mr. Chairman, when I left the House a few minutes ago the committee were dealing with the railway situation and I did not know that this vote would be taken up so soon. I wish to mention a matter relative to this item which we should all be interested in,—the employment of returned men in the various departments of the government, and particularly in the Militia department. When the boys went overseas we, as citizens, all promised to do everything we could for them when they returned, and I submit that in a general way, so far as the country is concerned, from the standpoint of pensions and ordinary re-establishment we have done very fairly by them. At the same time I do not think that our people generally have given to the boys all that they deserve, and I certainly do not think that some of the departments of the government have.

The reason I mention this is that to-day about noon I was waited upon by a young man whom I have known quite well since coming to Ottawa. He was in the Civil Service for a long time, first of all working in this building and lately in the Militia department. I have formed a very high opinion of him. He won a distinguished conduct medal at the front and is in every way worthy of one's esteem. With a number of others he had been in the Militia department for some time, I think about a year and a half, but recently when the department found it necessary to lessen its staff he, among others, was laid off. I am not criticizing the cutting down of the staff at all. But he claims—and I am basing my remarks on his claim because I only got his statement signed a few minutes ago and have not had time to investigate it; I have sent a messenger to my room for it and shall lay it before the minister for consideration—he claims that he and, so far as I recollect, something like forty other returned men have been discharged, although in the department there are a number of women retained who do not require to work for a living at all. For example, on the list he, as one of a committee appointed by the men handed me is the name of a lady—of course, I would not think of mentioning it here—who they state rides to her work daily in her automobile. This may or may not be true. But supposing it is true, then certainly, even if she is a permanent employee, to my mind, with all due respect to her, she should be laid off in favour of one of these returned men who risked their lives for their country overseas. I am sure the minister will agree with me in this. On the list are also included a number of young women, some married and some unmarried, and if the facts are as stated, I think they should be replaced by these returned men.

That in brief is the statement which I wish to make, because I believe it is only just to the returned men that so far as the government is able, and particularly the department over which my hon. friend, the Minister of Defence, presides, it is certainly their duty to look after these returned men and especially to see that the affairs of the Militia department be handled by those who have served overseas and are capable of handling this work.

I do not say that it would be advisable to put into a responsible position any young man who would not be capable of filling it; but mention is made, for example, of a number of girls doing such work as filing, which practically any intelligent returned man can do. I suggested to this young gentleman that perhaps these women were working at lower wages than any returned man would be willing to accept, and he said that was possible. But in any case I suggest that the government in all its departments should make a strong effort to give positions to these returned men. I well remember having pointed out to me, even when the late government was in power, cases where the daughters of well-to-do-men, men earning $5,000 or $6,000 a year, were working in certain government departments. It is possible that returned men could not be found to fill these positions, but I am sure I have the support of every member of the House when I say that positions in the government service filled by young women who do not require to work for a living, whose parents are willing and able to support them, should be given to the boys who served at the front. I am quite certain that that would be the view of the greater proportion of the people of this country. Where a young woman has been for many years in the government service and requires to work for her living, the returned soldier would be the last to suggest that she be replaced by any returned soldier; and the same would apply, perhaps, to a woman who is married and has a family to support. But if there are such cases as are mentioned in this statement, then I ask the minister, on behalf of the returned soldiers represented here, to make a personal investigation of the matter and to see that justice is done.

Mr. GRAHAM: I agree wholly with what my hon. friend says; in fact, just what he suggests has been done. The history of every person whose name was submitted in connection with the reduction of staff was given. The instructions were that returned soldiers with families were to be first kept; second, returned soldiers without families; next, those with dependents to support. That principle has been carried out, and the returned soldier has had the benefit of the doubt in every case. I do not know who this young man is; he has not been in the service long, I imagine. But I ask my hon. friend this; if he had charge of a department in which an expert was employed, a woman with a family to support and whose husband had been killed overseas, would he give her position to a returned soldier?

Mr. MANION: I answered that question, I think, before the minister asked it.

Mr. GRAHAM: These things have all been taken into consideration—how to protect the returned soldier in the weeding out of the staff of the department. In fact, I have given more thought to the matter, perhaps, than I have any other phase of the work of the department. Where the services of women have been retained in the department, it has been due to their special qualifications; none have been kept who have not been in the service for many years. There are some branches in which the returned soldier does not fit; that work has to be done, and we must keep some persons on the staff to do it. It must be remembered that about a thousand have gone out of the department within the last year, and it was inevitable that some of these would be returned soldiers. They went out, however, in the order that I have mentioned. Of those who have been retained, an examination of the list will show that there are not five who have not given the assurance that they have a father, a mother, a sister or other dependent to support; and in many cases their sons or husbands were killed overseas. In the last few weeks, owing to the reclassification, some 193 were listed to go, and I spent days and nights in an effort to determine upon the ones that ought to be kept. After it was decided who should go, and they had practically received their notice, I recalled a large number of returned soldiers with families and told them to go on and work a while longer, because, the session being on, there was pressure for questions and that kind of thing involving extra work. Of course, anyone who is let out feels that he has a grievance, and I do not blame him. It is not a pleasure to me to reduce the staff; personally I would rather increase it. I have in mind the case of a very clever young man, a returned soldier, who is putting himself through college. He is in his last year, now, I believe; he is studying theology, if I remember correctly. He is very efficient; he starts to college next autumn, and he will have plenty of opportunity to work all the summer at more remunerative employment than he can get in the Militia department. Now, it was a case of choosing between him and the returned man with a family or with a disability, who could not earn anything anywhere else. So that if my hon. friend will look into the matter closely he will find that the utmost care has been taken in the matter. It is inevitable, of course, that in dealing with a large staff of that kind some errors should be made. I will look into this particular case.

Mr. MANION: I do not question for a moment the sincerity of the minister, but this statement does not agree with the result to which he refers. I have torn a page from the statement and I am going to take the liberty of sending it across to the minister so that he may examine it—I will not send over the part on which the signature of the young man appears as that would be hardly fair to him. But the page I have torn out gives a list of 12 girls and 6 men. The 6 men have not had military service, but that is beside the question for the moment. In the case of the 12 girls, he gives reasons why the committee considered they have not the right to the positions which they hold. Among these 12 is the young lady whom I have mentioned. If the facts are correctly stated—and I am only giving them as represented to me—I hope the minister will have the matter looked into again with a view to doing justice. I know the question involves difficulties; I have been up against the same thing to a certain extent in Fort William ever since I have been a member. We have a large grain staff there. When the boys went overseas a number went from that staff, and on coming back they asked to be reinstated in their positions. But the men who have occupied the positions in question have learned more about the work, and the question becomes a very difficult one. I admit that where a person is more or less of an expert and an expert is needed, it might not be wise to replace him by someone who is not an expert. I do find this, and in Fort William, that there is a tendency among many of those in charge—I am not speaking of the heads of the department but the sub-heads so to speak—not to give quite justice in some cases. I know that in a number of cases I have looked into I had alterations made by the late government. We even went so far on a number of occasions—perhaps it is questionable if we were right—as to keep on a number of men who were put on temporarily, and who otherwise would have been dropped out of their positions in the middle of winter without any work for them to get. We kept them on up to the last year or two, but of course they could not be kept on indefinitely and their services have been discontinued. I think the minister will find on looking into it, even though he may have a report that he feels is correct that in some cases favouritism may be shown and some returned men not be given notice. I am going to send this over to the minister with the request that he look into the list with reference to the facts as therein stated.

[Mr. Graham.]

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes. I will put it in my pocket in the meantime.

Item agreed to.

Air Services—Purchase of new flying equipment—$250,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: This item was allowed to stand yesterday. The hon. member for Victoria (Alta.) (Mr. Lucas) had made some comments on it, and it was thought wise that there should be some explanation before the item was passed. If hon. gentlemen will look at Hansard they will find that criticism was made by one of the staff of the air force of men being brought from Vancouver to Camp Borden, and it was suggested in his utterances that there was extravagance and that the men's time was being lost by bringing them over a long distance in order to have repairs made.

The situation is this. Until such time as repair shops can be provided in many more centres, this centralization for purposes of repair work will have to be continued. Camp Borden at the present time is the place best fitted for the performance of this work. The reorganization the flying force comes under military control rather than civil, although both kinds of flying are done. Those who were civil employees have not, of course, had the training that they are now required to have even in the matter of repairs and other work incidental to aviation. These men at the present time when extensive repairs are to be made have to go to Camp Borden, and that practice will have to be continued until such time as we are prepared to vote sufficient money to establish repair shops in other parts of Canada. An item has been placed in the estimates to establish such a shop, with hangars and so forth in Winnipeg. That will reduce the cause for criticism which my hon. friend made yesterday.

5 p.m.

Another point is this. These men who come in to the centre at Camp Borden are also given a training which they could not otherwise get. In addition to making the repairs to the machine, they are given a certain schooling in aviation which they are required to have in order to qualify under the militia regulations. The department believes that the results are going to be good. True, the military rules are a little more stringent than the civil, and it will take a little time for the men to adjust themselves and feel that they are being given a fair chance, but when the machinery gets working and these men feel they are a part of the militia unit as they are now, it will really be all the better

for them. They will be better men for their training in aviation, better at making repairs and all that kind of thing. I repeat, that until such time as we are ready to establish repair centres in different parts of Canada at a cost of a great many hundreds of thousands of dollars, this practice will have to be continued, but the situation will be relieved to some extent next year, I hope, when the centre is established at Winnipeg. That was the explanation, I think, my hon. friend wanted.

Mr. MANION: Who is the officer in charge at Camp Borden?

Mr. GRAHAM: Colonel Barker.

Mr. MANION: How many men are there at Camp Borden at the present time?

Mr. GRAHAM: One wing commander, two squadron leaders, nine flight lieutenants, eight flying officers, seven pilot officers, one warrant officer, ten flight sergeants, twenty-one sergeants, nineteen corporals, and eighty-five air craft men.

Mr. MANION: About one hundred and fifty altogether?

Mr. GRAHAM: About that.

Mr. MANION: I presume there is only one medical officer in charge at Camp Borden?

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes.

Mr. MANION: Would the minister mind telling me if there has been any special amount of sickness there in the past six months?

Mr. GRAHAM: There has been none reported.

Mr. MANION: Has there been any severe epidemic of flu?

Mr. GRAHAM: We have not heard anything about it.

Mr. MANION: What hospital accommodation is there for the men of the camp?

Mr. GRAHAM: I am informed there is a small hospital for the men at Camp Borden with about eight or ten beds.

Mr. MANION: That was my information, but I understood that there was a rather severe epidemic of illness for some time during the flu outbreak in this country, and that the hospital accommodation was anything but adequate. That, of course, might easily occur. but I was going to suggest to the minister in view of that fact, if the statements made to me are correct, that perhaps it might be well to consider using another hospital building which I believe exists within about a mile of the camp. I was told at the time of the epidemic the hospital at Camp Borden was crowded, and there were mixed cases in the hospital. That, of course, might easily occur. I do not offer it as a criticism at all, but I suggest that it might be well to look into that condition and see if it could not be arranged to use the other hospital within a mile of the camp under circumstances of that kind in future. The other building is empty at the present time, I understand.

Mr. GRAHAM: I think that is a very proper suggestion.

Mr. MANION: Has the hon. minister any information as to the number of machines at Camp Borden and their general condition of repair in regard to flying uses?

Mr. MacLEAN: (Prince, P.E.I.): I was wondering whether this air service warrants the expenditure being made on it. Have the aeroplanes been used successfully in carrying mails or in mail service? In Prince Edward Island we were more or less isolated for a time and a request was made for an aeroplane service. We were informed that the machines were mostly tied up or frozen in, that there were none available, that it would take some months before they could be released and put in shape to work and that the expense would be beyond all reason. Therefore, we could not reasonably ask for the expenditure. In view of these conditions, and if the aeroplane cannot be utilized for commercial purposes but can only be used for war, I was wondering whether we were justified in passing the items which are now under consideration.

Mr. GRAHAM: As I pointed out yesterday, we have only performed commercial flying, outside of the forests, to the extent of some $770. With reference to the mail service, there is no doubt in the world that, as flying develops, Canada will do as other countries are doing, and adopt the aviation service for carrying mails, particularly the through mails. Up to date we have not done that. A request has been made from Prince Edward Island to have an aeroplane sent down there, but it means a lot more than simply sending the aeroplane. You must have your landing place and everything in connection with it. My department figured out the cost and, as my hon. friend stated, it was found that it would be out of all proportion to the necessities. Therefore we hustled up and got the other route opened.

My hon. friend from Port Arthur (Mr. Manion) asks how many aeroplanes are at Camp Borden. The number is about seventy.

Mr. MANION: Are they in a good state of repair?

Mr. GRAHAM: Practically all will be ready for use in a few weeks.

Mr. MANION: I notice this item is for the purpose of supplying equipment. Is that $250,000 to be used at Camp Borden or in other sections of the country?

Mr. GRAHAM: To be used mostly for forestry and survey work. We have not machines suitable, in many instances, for this work. I pointed out one case yesterday. These are amphibian machines. Some of the machines have been used for forestry protection work, and if they drop into a lake or into a forest, they have trouble getting out. We had difficulty with one or two. In addition to that, the flying equipment will be provided for the remote sections. We wish to have the service equipped with wireless, in order that the occupant of the machine can be in constant communication with the ground, so that in case of trouble he can communicate at once. That service and the other equipment will cost about $50,000.

Mr. MANION: In regard to the forestry work being done by the air department, is there co-operation between the department of the hon. minister and, say, some of these private corporations, which are now doing a certain amount of patrol work as well? The Spanish River Pulp and Paper Company do a certain amount of patrol work in the province of Ontario. In Quebec they also perform patrol work. Is co-operation between the government and these corporations carried on?

Mr. GRAHAM: I would not say there was practical co-operation, but there is co-operation and the department is helping them with any information we can give them and everything of that kind. So far as I am concerned—but perhaps I would not have the sympathy of the House on this proposition—I am in favour of commercial aviation being in private hands, as a matter of business, rather than that we should do it, but we are glad to teach them and help them in any way we can.

Speaking of the different provinces, Ontario paid us this year $38,000 for the protection of her forests, and they think it is the best kind of protection they can have. British Columbia paid us a certain amount last year and the Minister of Lands from that province informed me yesterday they were prepared to pay us $20,000 this year. The provinces are working together. We look after forest protection for the Interior department and we do topographical work. We surveyed the St. Lawrence for the International Joint Commission. We made inspections of the forests with a view to their protection from insects and all that kind of thing. The work this year has been very heavy, and yet we were not able to meet the demands.

Mr. MANION: I presume my hon. friend is as familiar as I am with the work of Frank Barnjum, who, at his own expense, is undertaking to educate the people and make them understand that we have not the forest reserves we thought we had. He is trying to impress us with the fact that the illimitable forest reserves which we used to speak of do not now exist to the extent we formerly believed they did and that the forest wealth still remaining constitutes one of the greatest assets of the country. We exported last year forestry products, paper and pulp, to the value of about $200,000,000. I happened to be looking up the figures recently, and I found our exports of forest products, including paper and pulp, amounted to almost as much as all the wheat exported from the prairie provinces. That is rather a startling fact, but it is true that these forest products nearly equal the wheat products. So that, even if there is a certain amount of overlapping going on by the department of the minister taking in work which probably could be done by private corporations, I think it is a very good investment for the country at the present time to expend a reasonable amount of money to assist in that work until the private corporations are in a position to do it themselves, because if a fire took place on the limits of private corporations, if it were confined to the property of that corporation, it might not matter, but if it should overleap the bounds of those limits and burn up a few thousand square miles of pulpwood or timber belonging to Ontario, British Columbia, Quebec, or to the Dominion itself, that would be a loss to the country which the expenditure of a few thousand dollars might obviate.

I wish to take up another matter. What is the course of training given to the men at Camp Borden in regard to their work there? Is it a course of some months, or is it a course of a short period each year for a number of years? What are the terms upon which these young men are engaged?

Mr. GRAHAM: The old scheme of instruction was for rather a limited period, and I might point out to my hon. friend that we are introducing something new this year, of which I think he will approve. We are providing for the training of thirty young students from the different universities. We give them a

training all through the summer at a nominal cost. I believe in that way we shall have added to the flying forces of the country, perhaps, the most intelligent men we can get. That is a new method; but the universities seem to be pleased with it; I have no doubt we shall have the full thirty, and we could have more than thirty if we so desired. They will be given the regular instruction on aviation, together with military training, the first year and then progress, because likely the same men will come back another year. We look to evolve a force of very intelligent flying men in that way.

Mr. BOYS: Owing to the fact that I reside near Camp Borden and have a personal knowledge of the matters under discussion, it would not be amiss if I were to take up just a few moments in referring to this subject. The hon. member for Fort William and Rainy River (Mr. Manion) asked the minister regarding an outbreak of flu. I, of course, have not been at home since the House opened; but I think I can safely say that had there been anything of a serious nature there, I would have heard of it, and I can only say that I have not heard of it. There were formerly two medical men there; but the numbers at the camp were greatly reduced, and as far as I know there is only one medical man there at the present time. I have made it my business on many trips to Camp Borden to inquire into various things that I felt I should know and that naturally I was interested in, and I have never heard complaints that there has not been sufficient hospital accommodation. If, however, owing to an outbreak, the building now used for that purpose was found to be insufficient, I should like to say to the members of this committee that one of the features of Camp Borden is that at a very nominal cost the department secured these buildings which were originally constructed by the Imperial authorities when the Royal Air Force was in occupation. There are any number of suitable buildings which could be used in case of an outbreak of that kind, and these buildings would hardly require a dollar spent on them. They are well constructed, and are all together, and there could be no serious trouble resulting from insufficient hospital accommodation. I doubt very much whether there is anything in the suggestion that there was a serious outbreak at Camp Borden. If there was, the officers there could easily take the matter in hand, and within a stone's throw, I venture to say, they could find a suitable building of ample accommodation, to which building they could move.

Another feature in connection with the equipment that has been referred to is this. If the figures we were given in my home town, Barrie, were correct, between eight and ten million dollars worth of equipment was presented to this country by the Imperial authorities after the war. This equipment came to Camp Borden in carload lots, and it did not cost this country a cent of money, except possibly some transportation charges. Hence, the plant is undoubtedly extensive there and also up-to-date, I am led to believe. Apart from assembling, transportation charges and the percentage that was paid by Canada for these extensive buildings constructed by the Imperial authorities, we are getting all this for nothing. I would think, before the department seriously considers establishing new plants, they would make very sure that they are going to save money by so doing, because there is no question there is ample room for expansion at Camp Borden.

If possible, I would like the minister to verify the figures I have given regarding the equipment which came out from England and which was presented to Canada, and, if it is not amiss, I should be glad to know what was paid. I have heard different figures mentioned. I heard it suggested first that the buildings at Camp Borden were offered to the Canadian Department of Militia at fifty cents on the dollar. I heard later that the figure was reduced to 25 cents on the dollar and that is, as a matter of fact, what was paid. I do not know whether this information is private. If it is, I do not want to pry into it. But if it is not, it might interest the members of this committee to know that these buildings were secured at this small figure. In any event, I am quite certain they were secured at a substantial reduction. When the hon. member for East Hamilton (Mr. Mewburn) was minister, the matter was then under consideration, and I cannot say whether it was under his regime or that of the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) that the actual deal was made. If it is proper to get the information, I should be glad to get it now.

I can only say, in conclusion, that if any members of this House have an opportunity of visiting Camp Borden, they should do so. They will find there one of the finest camps in existence. I have heard that from men who have seen the finest camps in the world. There is everything there. The property was acquired by this country at twelve dollars an acre, and I doubt very much if any deal was ever put through by the government of Canada where property was ac-

quired at so low a rate as was Camp Borden. You have abundance of opportunity for artillery practice. You have the buildings for anything you want to go into. You have no end of cement pavements. You have a wonderful sewage system. You have the finest water you can get anywhere in this country. Two or three artesian wells, eight inches in diameter, supply this water. There is practically everything that could be wanted at that camp. The only thing I could criticize is the matter I mentioned to the minister yesterday. The approaches there are not what they should be; they are not fair either to the men or to the public who are interested in the camp and who have a right to visit it. The cost of this improvement would be only a nominal matter; these approaches should be made right, and if that is done, we have at Camp Borden as complete a camp as could be wanted by anybody.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am speaking from memory now. Those buildings were acquired at a comparatively small cost to the country. It might be said that they are temporary and that to keep them in a state of repair would cost a good deal of money. The estimated value of the equipment sent across is, I am informed, considerably nearer $5,000,000 than $10,000,000. It must, however, be remembered that one of the difficulties in assembling the machines and engines is that one part may have to be taken from one machine and another from another, and we have reached almost the limit in connection with that.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): How much of Canada's forest area is patrolled by the air force?

Mr. GRAHAM: About 300,000 square miles.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): How many different stations are there in Canada that are doing this kind of work, and where are they located?

Mr. GRAHAM: Vancouver, High River, Camp Borden. There are three in Manitoba: Victoria Beach, Norway House and The Pas. In Ontario there are stations at Parry Sound, Whitby and Camp Borden. There is a station at Roberval in Quebec, and one at Dartmouth in Nova Scotia.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): Is there any possibility of extending this work to northern Alberta? There is an immense quantity of forest area in northern Alberta as compared with southern Alberta. I do not know whether it is possible or not to patrol the northern area from High River; but in any case I would like to know if it is possible to extend this work.

Mr. GRAHAM: The department would be delighted to do this, and as I pointed out yesterday, more money will have to be expended in this branch as it develops. We have been thinking of two or three matters, one of them the very question submitted by my hon. friend. We are hoping that another year we shall be in a position to ask with confidence for a good deal more money so that we can extend the service. Our service has now reached the limit of its capacity.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): What work does this air force do? Does it merely discover fires, or has it some means of fighting them after they are located?

Mr. GRAHAM: In Alberta the service is one of fire detection.

Item agreed to

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Post Office—mail service, $14,740,000.

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Acting Postmaster-General): This is for the outside service. It will be seen that in this estimate all told there is an apparent increase of $778,641.50. But from that amount there must be deducted $399,932. I will explain this. Last year an item of $485,000 was not included in the Post Office estimates as the Postmaster General understood that the Department of Trade and Commerce carried this service. However, it has been discovered this year that this is not the case, and the Postal department carried the service last year, paying that amount out of the railway vote, the cost of the railway transportation of mails being reduced approximately by that amount. This year the amount is included, but the railway item is not in. So that the real increase is not $778,000 odd but $408,000 practically.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What service is the minister speaking about? There is shown here an increase of some $308,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: We are discussing the ocean mail service.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It is not here.

Mr. GRAHAM: It is called "steamboat service".

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I cannot find it.

Mr. GRAHAM: It appears on page 65, "mail service".

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Does the minister say that the amount he has referred to was not in last year?

Mr. GRAHAM: The sum of $485,000 was dropped last year and we are including it in the estimates this year. It was dropped because the Postmaster General was under the impression that the service for which the money is needed was carried on by the Department of Trade and Commerce.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: But where is it to be found now? Looking at the mail service at page 65 I do not find any item of $485,000. Probably I am not reading the item properly.

Mr. GRAHAM: That amount is included in the item, and I was explaining the difference between the item as it appears this year and as it was in the estimates last year. This amount I have mentioned is only a part of the item. There is an increase in the item "mail service by steamboat" of $508,-847.50 this year, and of that increase $485,-000, as I have explained, is an amount that was not included in the estimates last year and for which we are asking this year.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Was it in the estimates of 1922?

Mr. GRAHAM: It was in the estimates of 1921-22 but was dropped in 1922-23 and therefore there was a proportionate decrease last year.

Mr. CHURCH: This is one of the departments of the public service upon which I think the country can congratulate itself. This is the only opportunity afforded hon. members to offer some constructive suggestions in regard to the present postal service, especially the outside service, and I shall take occasion now to refer briefly to some matters which I consider important. In England, in the United States, and in Australia the governments have restored the pre-war postage with the result that there has been a large increase in business. I do not think that there is anything that retards the growth of a country and hinders its trade and commerce more than the imposition of high postal rates. The report of the Postmaster General of Canada discloses the fact that the Canadian people are being taxed through the postal service and that the surplus revenue over expenditure for 1920 was over $3,000,000. The postal rate in Canada was three cents prior to 1897 when deficits were being rolled up every year in the Post Office Department. Sir William Mulock then introduced the two-cent rate, and although the deficit was not converted into a surplus at once, nevertheless in 1902 a surplus was secured which has increased year by year, unbroken even by the war. I may remark, also, that in the United States the war tax on postage has been dropped and a great increase in the postal service of that country has resulted. The boards of trade and chambers of commerce encouraged the government, and while it was thought that the reduced rate would not be satisfactory there was a huge surplus last year; and I observe from the bulletin of the National City Bank, an important corporation, that this reduction has done more than anything else in the United States to restore confidence in business not only of the retail men but of the wholesalers and of the farming community as well. The same thing has been the experience of the Mother Country. A tax on the postal service of a country is a great discouragement to trade and commerce and the British Postmaster General has brought down an elaborate statement this year in which he reckons upon a surplus of over $46,000,000 for the current year, of which $37,500,000 will be devoted to a reduction of post office charges including postal rates overseas as well as domestic postage particularly. With that surplus they are not only giving the staff higher salaries but they are reducing the postal rates to other parts of the Empire.

In regard to postal receipts, I need not refer to the city which I have the honour to represent, for its pre-eminence in volume of postal and customs business is well known. Yet although the postal receipts reach the huge total of over $5,000,000 we cannot get a new post office. I would commend to the government the example of Sir William Mulock, who with his courage and foresight reduced postal rates and made the Post Office Department a paying institution, converting its recurring deficits into surpluses year after year. It must be remembered that this is a department of government in which the people are very closely interested for they are directly benefited by low rates of postage. It may be said that to reduce our postage rates to the pre-war basis will mean a loss of revenue, but, Mr. Chairman, I predict that as in the United States and England such a great volume of increased business will follow lower rates of postage that still greater surpluses will result.

To-day the Post Office Department is doing splendid work and its officials throughout the country have the confidence of everyone and by their devotion to duty notwithstanding the comparatively small salaries they receive they have given us a demonstration of the success of public ownership. I would urge the gov-

ernment to go further and, like the British Postmaster General, extend the scope of the operations of the post office. For example, in England the Postmaster General is utilizing some of the surplus on the installation of radio equipment, better rural mail delivery and the reduction of the rates on all kinds of postal matter including drop letters. Undoubtedly the time has come when we too should reduce the rate on such letters.

I have before me a statement of the postal receipts by cities for the past twenty years, and in view of the large receipts from the city of Toronto I would ask the hon. minister if something cannot be done now towards providing a new post office building which is so badly needed. True, we have a post office in the new union station, but a new central postal building is immediately necessary.

By a courageous and foresighted policy on the part of the Post Office Department, such as the reduction of postal rates to the pre-war basis, business will be encouraged and stimulated, better wages will be possible for the post office employees, and the Dominion generally will be benefited. Such a policy I am confident will command itself to the wisdom and judgment not only of the three parties in this House but of the country at large.

Mr. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, taxes are unwelcome anywhere. In the realm of finance I would not care to trespass without having consultation with the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), and I am not sure that he would, without a good deal of consideration, consent to our dropping this form of taxation—because that is what it is, taxation on behalf of war expenditures. It is quite true, as my hon. friend says, that what was done some years ago led to an increase rather than to a decrease in the revenue of the Post Office Department, but whether a similar course should be adopted now is a matter for consideration.

I can assure my hon. friend that the Postmaster General (Mr. Murphy) has been talking very frankly on many occasions to the Minister of Public Works (Mr. King) to the end of securing further postal buildings in the city of Toronto. Not being Postmaster General, perhaps I can talk more freely on this subject. It does seem to me that a big centre like the city of Toronto in which such a large volume of postal and customs business is conducted should have facilities of the very best for the carrying on of such business. However, that is a matter for discussion. I can assure my hon. friend that I will report what he has said to the Minister of Public Works and the government for consideration.

My hon. friend referred to the salaries of, I imagine, our letter-carriers and so forth. In this connection he will be interested to learn that the Post Office Department has inaugurated a new system which will be of some benefit to the department itself and will give permanent employment to men who heretofore have had but temporary employment. For instance, taking the city of Toronto, during what I might term rush seasons, or when the permanent employees were absent, quite a number of men were employed to fill their places temporarily, their services of course being dispensed with when the regular employees returned to duty. Under the new system instead of having the employees take their holidays within a limited period they will now be extended over ten months of the year, so that temporary employees who are looking after the duties of those absent will have constant employment. That is one reason for the increase in the estimates this year.

Mr. BOYS: I should like to take this opportunity of saying a word in behalf of, in my opinion, the most underpaid branch of any service of the government, namely, our rural mail carriers. For perhaps four or five years there has been an agitation conducted on behalf of these men. Something has been accomplished for them, but very little. I well remember in 1919 a change was made, and at that time I interested myself to the best of my ability in their behalf, believing that they were absolutely entitled to consideration. At that time it is true that prices were rising, and as many of these men had entered into their contracts when the prices of oats, horseshoeing and other things incidental to their work were not so high, they found themselves in a very awkward position, being bound by contracts on which they were losing money and from which there was no escape for four years. They pressed for improved conditions, and I should like now to put upon Hansard a letter which I then wrote on their behalf and which, while not altogether appropriate at the moment, is so in the main. I still express the hope that the amendment I then urged upon the Postmaster General may still be introduced, together with another change in the system to which I shall refer later. My letter to the Postmaster General bears date the 11th September 1919 and is as follows:

Dear Sir,—Pursuant to our conversation I am writing you on behalf of a number of rural mail carriers who made complaint to me that they cannot make a living on the remuneration they receive, and in my opinion their contention is unanswerable.

Many of them receive from $500 to $700 a year, and for this they have to keep up either one or two horses, buggy, cutter and harness, or motor, and while not working all day are nevertheless on the road every day but Sunday, rain or shine. I have asked the Superintendent to authorize a reasonable increase but he tells me he cannot; and I understand nothing can be done except cancel the contracts and call for new tenders.

I would like to suggest that the act be amended giving the Postmaster General power to grant a reasonable increase in proper cases. The amendment might provide that no contract should be reconsidered which has not been in force for at least one year. It might further provide that no increase exceeding say $100 or $150 a year, at the outside, should be made without new tenders. In my opinion such an amendment would save the department a large sum of money each year so long as prices continue upward.

It may be argued that the carrier is treated fairly if the contract, which he finds onerous, is cancelled, but that is not so in many cases, for he has his equipment which involves an outlay of from $250 to $500,—

These figures are very moderate; perhaps they should have been a great deal higher.

—and rather than sacrifice it he plugs on dissatisfied and disgruntled, and pours out his woes to all on his route, and they join the shout, knowing beyond question that he has in many cases, just cause to complain.

When one stops to reflect what a street car conductor or city postman receives,—

I would like the minister to understand that I am not offering any criticism of what they do receive; I merely refer to their case for the purposes of comparison.

—or when a comparison is made with the salary or wages paid in almost any line of business, the rural mail carrier is found to be in a class by himself.

I mentioned that the amendment asked for would save the department a large annual outlay. This will be explained by reference to many cases with which the superintendent is familiar, where a reasonable increase of say $75 to $150 has been asked and refused for want of authority, and in the end the new contract price has involved an increase far exceeding the amount which the carrier asked, and the expense of advertising has to be added as well.

I am not directing attention to recent contracts but to those made 18 months or more ago.

I sincerely trust something may be done at this session.

Sincerely yours,
(Sgd.) W. A. Boys.

What I suggest to the minister, and what I press upon him for consideration, is an amendment to give the Postmaster General the power to make increases in the remuneration of rural mail carriers of from $100 to $150, putting upon it whatever limit the minister thinks proper. Let us just consider the question for a moment. We find there is a contract in existence. The carrier has satisfied those on the route. He has his equipment; he has been doing the work for four years; nobody wants a change. So far as I know, the department is willing to renew the contract if the carrier will continue at the same rate, but if he is able to show that he should have some increase, even only to the extent of $25, the minister now has no power to award the contract on that basis to the man who has been doing the work satisfactorily and who has the equipment for properly carrying it out. It must be readvertised at considerable cost, and I venture to say that in most cases the lowest of the new tenders received far exceeds the old rate plus the small increase that the carrier asked for. It may be objected that to give the minister that power would place upon him or upon his superintendent a responsibility that he should not undertake. If the suggestion involved $500 or $600 per contract, I could give way to that thought, but when it is limited to $100 or $150 it seems to me that that objection is not sufficient to stand in the way.

At the time that letter was written, as I have said, a change was made; the contract was cancelled at the request of a man who claimed he was losing money, and he was let out. That was the extent of the relief he got.

Now, time has not improved matters. The work of the carrier has been increased. He now has to handle registered letters; he has to sell stamps; he has to take care of the parcel post. His responsibility is greater. The public enjoy this service; I believe it is the best thing that was ever done for the farming community and even if an improved system did cost a little more the farmers are entitled to it and should have it. They appreciate it, but as they use it more constantly they naturally become a little more exacting and look for greater efficiency. The demands made upon every carrier are therefore greater, but the remuneration remains practically the same. Let us make a comparison or two. What is the system in vogue in the United States? There they adopt the uniform system of $75 a mile, and the position is a permanent one so long as the work is properly performed. Why should not some such system be adopted here? The only objection I have heard to it is that there is a variation in the routes; one route is harder than another, and for that reason such a basis of remuneration might not work out fairly. Well, it must work out fairly in the United States or they would not have adopted it there. It is true that upon some routes the roads are better than upon others, but as a rule where you have these better roads you have a more congested population and more work for the carrier to do. From there you go to the routes where the roads are not as good and where the carrier has less work to do, so that one condition would counterbalance the other. I suggest, therefore, the consideration of a rate per mile for this service. I am not saying what it

should be; that is a matter for the department itself.

Again, comparing what the rural mail carrier gets, with what the city carrier gets I understand that the salary of the city carrier runs from $1,335 and upwards per year. They receive clothes; they get three weeks' holidays; they get ten legal holidays, and they get bonuses. The rural mail carrier works six days in the week, every week in the year, rain or shine. He has to provide himself, I venture to say, with two horses on every route that runs over 15 or 16 miles, and the average length of route, I am told, is 20 miles. I do not think any carrier can cover a route of 20 miles every day in the week except Sunday unless he has two horses; in the summer time, as a rule, he has a motor. He does not get a single holiday. He does not get the three weeks that the city carrier does, or the legal holidays, or the clothes, and no bonus or help of any kind. The average pay of the rural carrier in Ontario is $816 a year, or $2.60 per day; the average in the Dominion is $750, or $2.39 per day. So far as I know, the lowest wage of a labouring man, who is even provided with a shovel, is from $3 to $4 per day. But the mail carriers have to provide their own equipment and perform the service from day to day without holidays; and they cannot get people to relieve them. Surely they are entitled to consideration.

It may be said in reply that if any mail carrier wants to quit or if his contract expires and the position is advertised, you can find somebody who is ready to take his place. I ask: Is there a single office in the gift of the government—and I make no exceptions—in respect to which, upon its being vacated and the position advertised, the place of the occupant of that office could not be filled for less money than he is getting? But after all, is that the proper test? I admit that when these contracts are re-advertised, in some cases—by no means in all—you can find men who are ready and willing to perform the service for the same money, in some cases even for less. When they undertake it, they do not know what they are up against; they take a chance on it and as a result the public suffers. I think that in this service as in all other branches of the government departments we want to secure efficiency, if possible, and the reasons given, I think, answer the tender and contract suggestion. I urge, therefore, in all sincerity, that some change should be made.

Mr. CHURCH: Make it the union rate of wages.

[Mr. Boys.]

Mr. BOYS: My hon. friend makes a suggestion about the union rate of wages. Well, we find that method creeping in everywhere. I am not making an appeal on that ground at all. I am making it on the ground of merit, and the gross underpay which, if continued must lead to inefficiency. Why should the work of these men and their responsibilities be increased from year to year and no extra renumeration be given? How can you get men to do the work properly and satisfactorily if they feel they are underpaid, if they feel that another man performing the same service a few miles away from them is getting more? A man may take a contract at forty or fifty dollars for four years supplying bondsmen. He may have taken it too cheap. Perhaps a month or so afterwards he finds a carrier about ten miles distant is getting sixty or seventy dollars. These are not dreams. I know carriers in my own riding where there is a great difference in the renumeration of the men, but no difference in the work they perform, no difference in the routes they travel. Now to satisfy these men I would suggest that they be put upon a par. If the country cannot stand what is being paid in the United States, $75 a mile, perhaps it should be made less. I do not know for certain what the carriers themselves are urging upon the government, but I have heard it placed at $70. It seems to me that that can be gone into, and when it is gone into a reasonable allowance can be made.

I see it is nearly six o'clock and I do not feel that anything can be gained by asking that the House should now rise, because I think I have said concisely all, at all events that I can think of. It does seem to me that the reasons I have advanced are reasons which should commend themselves to the sympathetic consideration of the department. I am glad to know that the matter is in the hands of the Acting Postmaster General, the Minister of Militia. I believe him to be a reasonable man, a man always open to persuasion so long as your arguments are good. How can anyone suggest for a moment that these men should go on doing this work for $2.50 or $2.60 a day when carriers in the city whose hours are no longer, I think, get practically double the pay and do not have a horse or motor to keep up, and in addition are provided with clothes and get the holidays I have referred to? How can you expect efficiency from rural carriers under such circumstances? They have to go out in the morning and break their own roads in the winter quite frequently, and they are criticized if they do not manage to get

through, because the people who are expecting their mail are dissatisfied if the carrier does not arrive on time with the mail. I have no doubt the minister's office is full of letters of criticism when as a matter of fact the carrier could not get through on account of bad roads. Nevertheless some of those living upon the route are dissatisfied and make their complaints.

In conclusion, I would most earnestly urge these matters upon the attention of the department. I know they have been pressed by the carriers themselves, but like everything else I suppose it requires a little extra pressure to make the change. I think the time is now ripe for the consideration of a change which will give these men a rate of pay commensurate with the importance of the work they are doing and with the responsibilities they have to assume.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): How much of the amount voted last year under the heading "Mail service by railway, $7,899" was earned and paid to the Canadian National system and the Canadian Pacific Railway respectively?

Mr. GRAHAM: I am sorry I have not that information for my hon. friend. I will give the House the general policy of the Post Office Department. As Acting Minister of Railways, I would like to carry all the mails on the Canadian National; as Acting Postmaster General I may say the policy is to use as far as possible the Canadian National lines, but the general policy is to use the most expeditious means of transportation, the getting of the mails to their destination promptly being the chief characteristic of this service.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): Does the minister know of territory in Canada which is served by both systems where the service is practically the same and where the privately owned railway gets the mail contract?

Mr. GRAHAM: I would not go so far as to say that, but where the Canadian Pacific steamer brings the mail across the ocean, it expedites the service of the Canadian Pacific steamer to give its own mail train that is waiting there on its own track the carrying of the mail, and this mail would be carried to all parts of Canada on the Canadian Pacific railway.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Has the Canadian Pacific Railway the contract, or is there any contract between the railways and the Post Office Department for the carrying of the mail?

Mr. GRAHAM: There is no contract. The Post Office Department pays the railways for the space used.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): And they can select the trains for them?

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes.

Mr. ELLIOTT (Waterloo): Just before the recess I was pleased to hear the remarks of the hon. member on my right (Mr. Boys) with regard to the position of the rural mail service carriers in the Dominion of Canada. I think the remarks which he made fit the situation absolutely. In my constituency I have had numerous complaints from rural mail carriers as to the payments they receive and with regard to other matters, especially dealing with the contract system. That system, as it is carried on is, to my mind, a very vicious one. It gives us a class of public servants that are very poorly paid. In fact it works out very much like this; that the cheap men, or the men who will work for a low wage, irrespective of their ability to do the work, are the men who get the contracts. We find that the average mileage which the rural mail carriers cover in the Dominion is about 19½ miles, for which service they receive in the neighbourhood of $42 per mile. I think no one here will argue that that is adequate pay for the work they do. They have great expense to bear. For instance, they have to provide a suitable rig for the purpose, they have to maintain that rig, and we all know that it is a very difficult and costly matter to maintain a rig which is on the road during the summer months and travelling on all kinds of roads. That amounts to a very considerable portion of their work. Then they have a horse to maintain. They have to get blacksmithing done, furnish their harness, and pay for the feed of the horse and it amounts to a very large sum, so that these men do not get a living wage. Making a comparison of the wages of the two classes, the position of the rural mail carriers is very much worse than the position of the city letter carriers. The average wage for the city letter carrier is $1,335 per year. I do not wish to be understood as saying that these men are getting too much; in fact, I think they are not, but when you compare the compensation, the comparison is not favourable to the rural mail carrier. I think the government should take

this question into consideration. I am satisfied that the poorest paid body of men in the whole government employ are the rural mail carriers. I think the time has arrived when we should improve the postal service of the Dominion. I understand the postal department had quite a surplus last year—the only department in the government that showed a surplus—and I think it is up to the postal department to improve the postal facilities as soon as possible. We find there has been practically no money spent for a good many years, owing to the war and other causes on the post offices throughout the Dominion. In view of the fact that we have a surplus on hand at the present time, the government owes it to the public to take steps immediately to introduce a better system of post offices that will meet the needs of the people of Canada in this regard.

Is it the intention of the government to continue the bonus to the letter carriers during the coming year?

Mr. GRAHAM: I think the Prime Minister or the Minister of Finance has an estimate now before the House for the continuation of the bonus as it was last year or approximately so. All classes that were covered in the former year will be covered this year.

As regards the wages of the mail carriers in the country, of course they are not paid wages. These are not men working by the day or the month; they are contractors; they are given the rate which they tender for themselves. I am not a great lover of the tender system in many ways. Of course I would probably stand almost alone if I were to get up in this House and state that we should do away with the tender system. I would not go that far because this system is a protection; but in some of our services at least, I know money is not made by adhering rigidly to the tender system. It, however, seems to ensure more than any other system the protection of the public. These men are contractors, and while some of them are pretty poorly paid, that is to a large extent their own fault, because they tender for these services and they sign a contract. Moreover, a contractor has to give a bond to ensure that he will do his work, and if he does not do his work properly, the bond is forfeited. The question is worthy of discussion; but we do not want to get mixed up in our minds mail carriers in the cities and towns with mail carriers in the country. In the cities mail carriers devote all their time to this work, and they are paid so much as civil servants. In the country many of them are not occupying all their time in this work; they do other work as well, and they are doing this work at a price fixed by themselves and not by the department at all.

I have a great deal of sympathy in regard to the small rate at which many of these men perform their work; but supposing we took the view of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Boys). At the present time, as the law stands, any contract, the amount of which is over $200, can be renewed at that figure; but if it be increased, new tenders must be asked. Supposing it were left to the minister to increase a tender, would not hon. gentlemen detect quite a line of patronage in that? Would not the minister, whoever was in power, be accused of exercising patronage? Bill Smith says: "I will do this work for $700." The minister's friend is carrying the mail, and the minister would have power, if we were to change the act, to give the contract to Tom Jones for $100 more. Thus the question is surrounded with difficulties. This would afford the minister an opportunity to exercise patronage for his friends, and perhaps the House, when it came to consider the matter, would not think it wise to give him that power. How else would you fix this? The hon. member for Simcoe says: "Pay so much a mile." The system in the United States is different from ours, because to begin with they are far advanced over us on the question of good roads, and a mile is a mile in a large portion of the United States because their roads are practically all good. Supposing we took nineteen or twenty miles of road that is clay, and we have a mileage rate of so much for the mail carrier. The man on the clay road will get the worst of the deal, when he has to traverse the route in the fall or spring. Then there are sections of Canada where horses are not used in the winter. In sections that are comparatively small automobiles are used. In the riding that I represent, the mail carriers for the most part use automobiles; the roads are good, and mileage in the greater portion of my riding would be on an equal basis. But where our roads are as they are in the Dominion, some good, some bad, the latter predominating, it would be most difficult to fix a mileage rate that would be applicable to all parts of Canada.

Personally I would like to see the mail carriers better paid; but will somebody tell me just how that can be worked out without giving the government of the day patronage that perhaps hon. gentlemen would not think they ought to have? Of course at the present time this would be perfectly safe; but there might come a time when it would not be as safe,

and I want to protect the country for the future, even if it does not need protection for the present. Is there a better way of working this out than the system of asking for tenders? We might make some variation in the act; but any such variation allowing the minister more latitude than he has at present would, as I said before, place in his hands a weapon of patronage. The matter is worth considering; but working it out in detail to the satisfaction of parliament, much less the people, would not, I am afraid, be an easy task.

Mr. EVANS: Is anything proposed to be done regarding facilities in the city that I represent, namely, Saskatoon? Some years ago work was begun upon the construction of a new building, but that was abandoned. The building they are using at the present time has never been finished. Three years ago an order was given out for that to be completed, two more storeys to be added, and this would have given adequate room for the time. Nothing, however, has yet been done, and it is time that some better facilities were provided for that city. They are trying to find room in other offices throughout the city, while they might get the accommodation in our building if it were completed.

Mr. GRAHAM: We must not forget that these public buildings are all in the hands of the Public Works department. While the fault is not that of the Post Office Department, and I will not say it is that of the Public Works department, the Post Office Department is anxious to have all these buildings completed and in the best shape possible. Owing to financial conditions the Public Works department is frozen up, and we have not been able to get everything done that we would like to have done. The Post Office department, of course, will keep urging all these improvements, and finally, I think, we shall get some of them made. In my riding I have a corner lot in one of the most beautiful towns of the country, and this corner lot, which is owned by the government, is simply asking for a new building. There seems, however, to be no response from the Public Works department. As Acting Postmaster General I have been urging that department to acquiesce in my request, both as the acting minister and as the member, to put a long-expected building on that corner. But, to be frank, I must say I have so far failed.

Mr. BOYS: I listened with considerable interest to the answer of the minister to the suggestions that have been made and I noted his reference to patronage. I hope he will not object to the proffered confidence which I was willing to repose in him and his department in this connection. I do not think it would be misplaced; at least, I trust not. Now, I do not think his argument will bear investigation, although to a very slight extent perhaps he is right. I would ask him to bear in mind that in the first instance the contract is let by tender, so that the situation we would have to deal with would arise when the contract expired at the end of the four-year period. The minister or his superintendent would then be confronted with a request on behalf of the particular carrier for an increase, and I have suggested that the increase should be limited. I would say that it should not exceed at the outset $150, or perhaps $100. But with that very slight increase a carrier could be satisfied. It would not be patronage, because he got his contract in the first instance by competition in which he was the successful tenderer. For my part I would be perfectly willing to trust either the acting minister or any minister or superintendent to do what is fair to the extent I mention, and that would obviate the necessity of advertising. The carrier would have to show reasons why there should be an increase and I am satisfied that the country would save money if that course were followed. The only argument advanced by the minister against an even rate per mile for the service as between the United States and Canada is that in the United States the roads are more uniform and are better than in Canada. I do not agree with him there. Perhaps he has seen more of the roads in the United States than I have, but I may observe that I have travelled over a number of them. I am ready to admit that the state roads in many of the states are superior to any rural roads we have, but these routes do not go over the state roads only, they form a very limited part of the mileage of the United States; and on the side roads I want to tell the minister that from the limited experience I have had in travelling in the United States, the side roads there are worse than they are in Canada.

Mr. GRAHAM: I keep off the side roads when I am across the line.

Mr. BOYS: That may be, but unfortunately we have a lot of farmers living on the side roads in Canada and it is on their behalf that I appeal, because they must be served. I had the pleasure of spending a little time in Florida last January and travelled over a good many roads there, and I can say that the roads in my hon. friend's county and in my own are vastly superior to the roads I travelled in that state. There are many roads

in other states, too, in which I have been that certainly are not superior to the country roads in Canada, at least so far as I know. Of course, as I say, I am excluding the state roads, which are of cement and are therefore first class. Now, the answer the minister makes in this connection is the only one he offers, and I do not think it will hold water. The minister makes the old suggestion that this work should be done by tender, but that should not be the final test. Suppose a mail carrier in the city should be unable to continue. If you are to adopt that policy, why not advertise for someone to take his place? You would be flooded with applications from men who would do the work fairly well for a great deal less than the man is getting now. The figure quoted is $1,335 with clothes and the holidays referred to, and it would be the simplest matter to find a number of people to do this work, I venture to say for two-thirds of this amount. But that is not the only consideration. Efficiency must enter into the question; and if you want efficiency in the rural service you must offer the men more money. As I said before, the farming community are entitled to this service; and indeed they are delighted with it; it is the best thing that has been done. I want to urge the minister therefore to keep up the standard of the service. Do not let it be depreciated by some of the methods that have been followed. We know what those methods are. Now, I am not criticizing the minister at all in saying this, because the idea is to get things done as reasonably as possible. At the same time, I do not approve of the methods. Tenders are called for; they are received and are considered too high. An inspector then goes to the locality and he not only goes to those who have tendered and does his best to bring them down, but having the benefit of the information the tenders disclose, he scours the country to find someone who will do the work for less. Finally he gets some man who really does not realize what is before him, and perhaps in a moment when he is pressed for work he undertakes the service. The carrier who has been doing it before and doing it properly, being fully equipped, and whose son perhaps has been helping him, finds all his equipment left on his hands. If you get down to an even basis per mile you will overcome that trouble, because a man will get the work at a fair price and he understands that he can retain the job if he does his work properly, but not otherwise. Surely under these conditions you would get better results. If what I say about the American roads is right, that answers the argument advanced by the minister; and they must find that system satisfactory in the United States or they would not continue it there. If therefore it is satisfactory in the United States I do not see why it should not be satisfactory in Canada.

Mr. GRAHAM: They have a deficit of $60,000,000 there.

Mr. BOYS: Well, the United States is a large country. I was going to ask the minister another question but I will not do so now because I do not want to detain an hon. gentleman who I see desires to speak. I will put the question, and perhaps in the meantime the information could be looked up. I wanted to find out what proportion of the item under consideration is required for rural mail service. The item as it appears in the estimate is "for mail service by ordinary land conveyance, including rural mail delivery." I should like if possible to have these items separated and to ascertain, for the last three or four years at all events, what the rural mail service has cost the country, to what extent the cost is increasing, and whether it is increasing because of higher contract prices or because of the establishment of more routes.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): I asked the minister a little while ago about the contracts given to the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canadian National and he said he had not the information. Can he give that information now?

Mr. GRAHAM: I am not in a position to give that information at the moment. It would require research into all the mail carrying accounts of the department. The accounts for the last three months are not in yet.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): With regard to the other question, the minister said that the Canadian Pacific Railway had some of the mail contracts—I refer to the steamship lines—and that they gave the mail to their own railway in Canada. Why is that necessary? I do not think a private company owning the Canadian National railways and having mail to carry all over the country would hand the business over to a competing concern, and I do not see why the country should do it.

Mr. GRAHAM: This is a very large question. I might say that the Canadian Pacific Railway is perhaps the biggest taxpayer in Canada, and it is possible to my mind that we could make it embarrassing for the Canadian Pacific if we started out on certain lines. These two great roads are necessary for the building up of the country. Speaking frankly,

we want to treat our Canadian National Railways as a business concern which will get business on its merits from the public of Canada. My hon. friend asks me a question. The Canadian Pacific Railway has its own ships, docks and sidings to its own docks. Its trains back up to its own docks and take cargo from its own ships. That is natural. To transfer that cargo to the Canadian National Railways somewhere else would take time, and if that were done in the case of mails my hon. friend would not perhaps get his mail until forty-eight hours after the time he gets it now, or twenty-four hours to put it at the lowest. While, as Acting Minister of Railways, I should like to get everything for the Canadian National Railways, at the same time we have to deal with the question of mails from the point of view of the interest of all the people of Canada, and with a view to expediting business as well as of endeavouring to get freight for the Canadian National Railways.

Mr. STANSELL: I should like to add a word to what has been said on behalf of our rural mail carriers. It is not sufficient to say that this is an old question that crops up every year, or that we have a system of contract which must be the best simply because we have it. The fact that these complaints recur periodically show that the system is not what it should be. And undoubtedly these complaints will continue until the system is put on a better and fairer basis than obtains at the present time.

I represent a rural district and am familiar with the conditions under which these mail carriers work. I have taken considerable pains to go over their rounds with them and to estimate approximately what they are getting for the work performed. In two or three cases a few years ago, with the help of the department here, some of these men were released from their contracts under which they were unable to make a living, and allowed to tender again on a somewhat improved basis. But since the conclusion of the war this practice has not been continued.

I entirely agree with what has been said by the two hon. members who have so ably dealt with this subject, but I want to add my view of why the contract system does not work out satisfactorily as applied to the carrying of our rural mail. This is another case where theory is very beautiful but fails to work out in practice. The reason is that ordinarily any government work done under the contract system appeals to a class of business men who know exactly the conditions under which they are tendering. But our rural mail service is a comparatively new service and appeals only to a very limited class of people in the country districts owing to the low rate of wages allowed under the contract, and these men, because of lack of education and business training, have no adequate idea of what is involved when they sign the contract. In addition to that, just as has been already stated, departmental officials who are paid a living wage spend their time in many cases drumming up people in the country districts to tender at an extremely low rate in order to save the department the difference between this and a fair rate, although the wages of these officials is costing the country enough to pay the mail carriers a living wage. So it is really not economy to induce men to sign such contracts.

Another unsatisfactory feature is that under this system men are engaged to deliver our rural mails at the lowest possible remuneration without any regard whatever to their ability to discharge the duties required of them. I am not sure that I would entirely condemn the system of handling our rural mails providing the tenderers were required to pass an examination to prove that they possessed the necessary education to enable them distribute the mail. Under the present system we find rural mail carriers who are scarcely able to read, with the result that mistakes are constantly made by them, important mail is delivered to the wrong address, and in some cases serious financial loss occurs. Certainly we should have efficiency. To my mind it is folly to talk of investigating conditions of unemployment and underpaid workmen while the Dominion government in its system of rural mail contracts conducts one of the worst sweatshops in the country. If these carriers had to show certain qualifications, those qualifications in themselves would enable them to determine a fair rate of remuneration under their contract.

If the contract system is so good, why do we not apply it throughout every department of government. I think if we had our cabinet ministers and all others engaged in the government service paid under contract the evils of the system would be impressed on the people in a very decided manner.

Then again if a rural mail carrier has rendered good service under his contract it should be renewed as it expires and so encourage him to continue to render the most satisfactory service possible. I think it has been stated by at least two hon. members that under the present system a man can retain his contract at the same rate of pay. I do not know what the arrangement is, but I can point out what

has actually happened, which is much more important. On one particular route of about twenty-two miles the contract recently expired. On the last occasion of its renewal, when prices of everything were rather high, the contractor secured the contract at $1,100, which is at the rate of $50 per mile, or $25 a mile less than the American government pay its rural mail carriers. This man is one of the most efficient carriers in the service. He has a wife and family to support and devoted his whole time to his route. His work was eminently satisfactory, being almost entirely free from mistakes. One would think that such an efficient public servant would be retained in the service. When the time came for renewal of his contract he was so fair-minded that he allowed for some reduction of living expenses and actually offered to continue the contract at a reduction of $100, although he had to keep two horses and the necessary equipment to carry out his work; but for some reason or other the contract was advertised and was awarded to another man who may not possess the excellent qualifications of his predecessor. The new man secured the job at $800. This instance I think clearly indicates that the practice referred to of allowing the tenderer to continue his contract does not always obtain; and I may say that I know of other cases of a similar nature. Why could not an arrangement be made to continue satisfactory men in the service instead of going to the expense of advertising for fresh tenders. I have no doubt that the man who has contracted to deliver the mail at $800 will be a dissatisfied servant and similar cases are what give rise to the continual complaints which we receive with respect to the rural mail service. Surely the government can devise a system under which efficient service can be secured by paying at least a living wage.

This is what it means, that on the average, each rural mail carrier has a twenty-mile route which he has to cover six days in the week, and to do this work it is absolutely necessary for him to keep two horses and the necessary equipment. On the most conservative estimate this cannot be done for less than $300 a year. Assuming the average carrier gets $750 under his contract, this leaves him only $450 to support his wife and family—$450 for working six days in the week throughout the entire year. Can anyone say that this is a credit to the country? And it is only possible to get men to enter into such contracts because they are not sufficiently conversant with business principles to know what rate they should tender at in order to ensure to themselves a fair wage. They only find out their mistake by bitter experience. I am convinced that if tenderers were required to pass an examination to test their efficiency the undesirable element would be eliminated and those who passed would be able to command a living wage. If you provide in some way that the man who proves his efficiency is not in danger of losing his job for the sake of a paltry $25 by being underbid by a man who may not be able to show that same efficiency, then you have done away with a good deal of the cause for complaint. As to the flat rate per mile, I am fairly well acquainted with most of our Ontario roads, and after careful consideration I have come to the conclusion that a flat rate would be very fair to all concerned. In almost all cases the better roads have the heavier class of service; there are as many complaints from the mail carriers with regard to obstruction of traffic on the really good roads as there are respecting the back concessions where the roads are not so good. So that the one balances the other, and the adoption of a flat rate for this service would not be a very serious injustice to anyone. It would, I believe, be entirely satisfactory to the men themselves.

Mr. GRAHAM: Would you give that flat rate without any tender?

Mr. STANSELL: Well, I am not suggesting that; I am pointing out what is wrong. I say we should either retain the contract system and provide for some examination, or adopt some plan whereby a man who proves himself efficient will not lose his job if he is getting a reasonable rate of pay, say, not less than $50 or $60 a mile. If his contract is not for more than that, surely he is entitled, in view of his good service, to keep his job. The people cannot be contented in the rural districts when they learn that other men working for the same government in the cities are treated differently, in that they receive a bonus—the continuance of which appears to be necessary—are given the benefit of pension provisions, are supplied with clothes, etc. On the other hand, the poor fellow in the country is working at starvation wages and has to provide everything, including the upkeep of two horses, and has left for himself not more than $450. That a man should have to work under those conditions and attempt to support a family should surely appeal to right thinking persons as an injustice that is no credit to this country or to the government, and that ought to be remedied without delay. The present government, I believe, is especially sympathetic to the workingman—or at least, they

were prior to the last election. Possibly owing to the pressure of business their plans in this respect have been mislaid. But I do hope they can now be utilized on behalf of the rural mail-carriers of Canada.

Mr. McBRIDE: As one who represents the largest rural constituency in Canada, I would say that I have no sympathy with any person who will tender for a job and then, after he has got the work, start in to whine and ask for a raise in salary. I believe in the contract system. It is the only fair system, it is the only way the taxpayers of Canada will get a square deal. If you put it in the hands of the Postmaster General to the extent of $150, it will simply mean this: A person may tender for a small contract at $150 less than he really wants to get; then he can go to the member representing that section of the country and pester him until he gets the Postmaster General to make that increase of $150. A good deal has been said about starvation wages and cutting the rates to the rural mail carriers. I can call to mind one instance out in my district. During the war a man had a contract for carrying the mail at $1,850. He said he could not make it pay at that rate, and he tried to hold the government up for $2,500. The government called for tenders—that was in 1915—and one man tendered at $1,175. He got the job; he is still carrying on the work and is perfectly satisfied. If tenders had not been called on that occasion the taxpayers of Canada would have been held up for $2,500. It is urged that some of these contracts are very small. Well, I know of one instance where a man had a contract to carry the mail twice a week a distance of six miles, at the rate of $3 a week. That did not look very much, but what did it mean? A little girl of his got on a cayuse in the morning before going to school and went down and brought the mail up. It was simply pocket money for her. If anybody else had tried to get that contract from him, why, there would have been a regular row over it. On the other hand, if it were left to somebody to put a value on the delivery of that mail and somebody came in from outside to deliver it, the cost would probably be $25 a week, and even at that the amount would not be considered too much. As for keeping up a plant to carry this mail, in the rural districts they do not maintain very much of a plant. It is generally carried with a surrey in the summer and an old sleigh in the winter; it is the ordinary plant that they had before they took the contract. I believe in calling for tenders, and I believe that if those who tender have not brains enough to put in a proper price for a job then they should go under and let their bondsmen go good for the default. That is the only way the taxpayers of this country will ever get a square deal.

Mr. WOODS: I am of the opinion that no real injustice is done to the rural mail carriers through the contract system. I agree with my hon. friend (Mr. McBride) that if a man wants to make a contract at a low price there should be nothing to prevent him from doing so. On the other hand, a great many of the rural mail carriers are none too well paid—many of them are underpaid—but they are rendering good service. I do not agree with the suggestion presented by one hon. gentleman in regard to holding an examination for the position of rural mail carrier. The position is not one that requires any very high standard of education. It does not require many of the qualifications that other occupations require; nor does it require the upkeep of pure-bred horses. But it does require men of sterling qualities who are not afraid to face storms and bad roads and all that kind of thing. I do not know that there is anything seriously wrong with the contract system, unless, as I have heard it stated, it is that when a man puts in a tender at a figure which is sufficiently low, some of the authorities persistently endeavour to get someone else to take the contract at an even lower price. I do not think that is proper. If a tender is honestly made and the price is not exhorbitant, the contract should be given to the lowest tenderer provided he is able to furnish the necessary securities. But there is another phase of the question that is of great importance; that is, the legal holidays. I think these men should get the legal holidays. As one who is served by the rural mail carriers I think I am safe in saying that the farmers and the rural population generally will not suffer if these men have a holiday now and then. To give them that concession would ease their minds and make them feel that they were getting what other men are getting elsewhere in similar positions. It is hardly fair to ask them to go over all kinds of roads in all kinds of weather every day in the year except Sunday. The government should take that matter into serious consideration. In fact, I have been taking the matter up with the department with a view to bringing about that change. I wrote to the previous Postmaster General on more than one occasion, but the Post Office Department take the ground that a contract is a contract. Truly a contract is a contract, yet I believe these men should be granted the legal holidays or the major portion of them at least, so that they could have a little rest

from their daily routine of driving over these hard roads, as many are, in all kinds of weather. I think that would help the situation and make it easier to secure contractors for this work, for the lack of holidays has been a very serious complaint among all the rural mail carriers with whom I have come in contact.

Mr. GARDINER: Which of the railway companies has the contract for carrying the mail from Saskatoon to Edmonton?

Mr. GRAHAM: No railway company has a contract. They are paid according to the space the mail occupies, and whichever line is the most expeditious and most convenient gets the mail. I can imagine circumstances under which one line would have it at one time, and another line at another. They are paid for the work they do, and are not under contract.

Mr. MILLAR: Can the minister give the committee any information as to the prospects of extending rural mail delivery to the prairie provinces? During the last year I have had several petitions from those who would like to have a rural mail delivery, but up to the present this has been denied. I was thinking as I listened to the discussion and the great anxiety that some have about the small pay the mail carriers are getting, that those of us who come from the prairie provinces or a large part of it, at all events, have not yet reached the stage where we have any mail carriers to worry about. Our anxiety is to get some mail carriers, so that when another session comes round we may be in the position of those here to-day who have been worrying about finding some means to protect these mail carriers from themselves. I have found that some of the carriers that have been spoken of who cannot write their own names know how to charge just as well as those who can write. Their lack of penmanship does not seem an impediment in knowing how to charge. I know the minister is only acting minister of this department and may not have the information that the Postmaster General would have, but he might possibly be able to give us some idea as to when rural mail delivery will be extended to the prairie provinces.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is a question that has been engaging the attention of the department. While I am not in a position to make any statement I can say that the department has been seriously considering what ways and means it could use to extend the service. The amount that is being asked for here is for services already under contract. The service in some cases may have been extended a mile or half a mile or something of that kind, but this vote is not for opening up any new territory. The condition in the prairie provinces cannot however, exist very long, and I can readily understand, although it would probably mean quite a deficit, that possibly a portion of the discontent of which we have heard might be allayed if the people of the West
9 p.m. had a rural mail delivery to bring them closer together, and give them closer connection with the outside and with the centres. I am not in a position to make any promises. The department has been giving this matter consideration, and I think the members from the prairie provinces can live not as those without hope. It would mean a very large expenditure of money, but I am inclined to think that before very long the situation will have to be faced, because there is always this to be remembered: railways, roads, and rural mail delivery not only accommodate the people of a community, but they make that community so pleasant to live in that other people outside are attracted to it.

Mr. FORKE: I think I might interject a few words right here. I have had several applications for the establishment of rural mail routes, and the reply I got from the department in some cases was that tenders would be asked for and if the amount was sufficiently low the route would be established. I do not know what we are going to do if we are now going to raise the price of carrying the mail along the different routes. I have listened with close attention to the remarks made by hon. members who have spoken in favour of larger pay being given to the mail carriers, and with all due respect to those speakers I must say that I have so far seen no solution of the problem. If you are not going to have the tender and contract system appointments will have to be made, and who is going to make those appointments? Will it be the minister or someone else? Then the charge of favoritism will creep in. Really, Mr. Chairman, I cannot see any solution except to tell these people to be careful and contract for a price at which they can afford to carry the mail

Mr. LUCAS: The minister told us a moment ago that there was no contract given to the railways for carrying the mail. And we to believe that the railways simply go out and grab the mail whenever they can and are paid according to space? Surely there must be some arrangement made with the railways for carrying the mail, and I should like to know what those arrangements are, and particularly

the arrangement for carrying the mail from Saskatoon to Edmonton in which territory there are competing railways running.

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend should not have got that wrong idea. The Post Office Department is responsible for the mails being transferred from the boat to the train, and the Post Office employees handle all the mails and put them on the train. The railways do not go out and grab the mail at all. They take what is given them, and carry it at so much per car, so much for a part car, so much per square foot, and so on.

Mr. GARDINER: Could the minister be more specific as to the cost of carrying the mail between Saskatoon and Edmonton? We in western Canada are very interested to know just what that space is costing the Post Office Department.

Mr. GRAHAM: We have a postal car and a baggage car service and the rates effective June 1, 1922, were as follows:

Postal car				Baggage car				
Full	Apartment	Under 30 ft.	Side Passage	Full 60 ft.	Part 30 ft.	15 ft.	7 ft .	3 ft.
35s.	20c.	7/10c. per linear foot	20c. for 270 sq. feet	36c.	20c.	13c.	6.5c.	4c.

Mr. GARDINER: Perhaps the minister could tell us which railway company carried most of the mail from Saskatoon to Edmonton during the last year.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am not in a position to give that information because I have not got it. I would have to look over the various accounts of the railways during the different years in order to locate how much was given to each railway.

Mr. GARDINER: Can the minister give us any information as to how much the Canadian National received from the Post Office last year, how much the Canadian Pacific received and the amount received by any other railroad that may have carried the mails in Canada?

Mr. GRAHAM: I have not that information. The last three months of the year are not made up yet, and the accounts are not in. I could get the information by putting the accountants at work.

Mr. GARDINER: Will the minister give us the information he has?

Mr. GRAHAM: I have given my hon. friend all the information I have.

Mr. GARDINER: And that is not very much.

Mr. GRAHAM: Not along that line.

Mr. GARDINER: I think this a very important question, and I would like to have the information given to the House because I am well satisfied that the people of Canada want to know just exactly what is being done along these lines, and if the minister can obtain that information before this item is carried, I am satisfied the House will be very much obliged to him.

Mr. WARNER: Going back to the rural routes, I desire to say a few words. In quite a number of localities in my constituency the people want rural routes established. I have tried to obtain some information. I was very glad to hear the minister say to-night that it was likely that we would not have to wait very much longer for the establishment of these routes. It is very unsatisfactory to those people living in well settled communities to see the mail deliveries in the towns and other communities, when they cannot have the same privilege. When I go to the department I am always told that they are not establishing any new routes in any district. I have taken that as an answer, and have always advised the community interested that no more routes were being established at the present time. Previously we had the compensation voluntarily increased to people who had contracted to carry the mail for a certain price. I think it would look more reasonable if someone else were allowed to take this money, intead of raising the salaries of those who are already carrying the mail. It would look better if the department would allow more routes to be established at rates at which people are willing to carry the mail, rather than to raise the wages of those who have contracted to carry the mail at a certain price. I would not be in favour of raising the remuneration above the amount for which these people are willing to carry the mail, but I am anxious to see more routes established in localities where there is no service now. The cities have the delivery now, and it is not so much trouble for any one living in the city to go to the post office and get his mail, as the families living in the country have to do. I think it would be well for the department to consider the establishment of new mail routes in places where there are sufficient settlers to justify such an expenditure. However, I believe that we must all be tolerant. I believe that we are using too much money in the service not in the Post Office Department alone so much as on all lines of Government service in every way throughout the whole country,

and that we are spending more than we are justified in spending or can afford. However, when others are receiving these services it seems hard on communities who are not able to get them, and, therefore, there is considerable dissatisfaction. As the minister has said, country life would be more tolerable, and I believe it is worth while in Canada to undertake to make the farmers feel that they are getting consideration and service for the part of the taxes they are paying. I think the government is justified in giving all the service to the people however, that we can pay for. It struck me that it would not look well in the eyes of the people in these communities I have been referring to if the wages of the mail carriers were raised above the figure for which the carriers were willing to carry the mail.

Mr. ROSS (Simcoe): Speaking of the rural mail service, I am not particularly objecting to the contract system. I practically agree in the presentation that my hon. friend and neighbour from South Simcoe (Mr. Boys) made to the House this afternoon and to-night. At the same time the chief objection I make to this contract system has reference to what is often done in connection with it by officials of the department. This feature was illustrated by my hon. friend and I know what he said to be the fact because the practice complained of has been resorted to more than once in my own immediate neighbourhood. I take strong exception to that kind of thing being done by government officials. I refer to the practice of a government official going out after the contract has been sent in, and beating down this one and that one, in order to get the wages to the level at which the contract is finally awarded.

I would like to see the rural mail carriers given the statutory holidays, at least. They should have those holidays, especially Christmas, to themselves. I am willing to do without my Christmas mail, in order that the men who have been carrying my mail to my door for 313 days each year may have a holiday, and I think the people in the rural districts generally would also be willing to dispense with the Christmas mail. I suggest that that matter be taken into account when tenders are being asked for by the department, either for the renewing of old contracts or for making new contracts.

I am not going to argue to-night in regard to the question of raising the price paid to the rural carrier, but I would like to see a little more equality than we have at the present time in the delivery of mail, whether letters or other articles, in rural and city districts. Some time ago an answer was given to a question asked by the hon. member for South Waterloo (Mr. Elliott) in regard to the salaries paid to the rural carriers and those paid to the city letter carriers. There is a great difference between those salaries, and I took the trouble to figure it out on a per hour basis, because of the answer that was given. The answer was that in the one case it was for service which varies as to time occupied daily, semi-weekly, etc., and in the other case it was for full time service. I recognize that there is a consideration there. On the other hand, we ought to consider that, while the rural carrier perhaps does not give all day to the service, his day is broken into, and the balance of the day does not amount a great deal to him in the matter of earning. Take our own case; the train comes in some time about ten o'clock and the mail carrier starts out. His forenoon is broken up. He cannot go out and do a half day's work He gets back at five o'clock in the afternoon and his afternoon is gone. It is not fair to put it on that basis. If we figure this out on the per hour basis, we find that what they get per hour is about 35 cents. The city mail carrier gets about 60 cents per hour, and I understand he gets, at least, two uniforms a year. A man who is carrying mail in the rural districts, if you figure out the amount he gets on the same basis, receives a reward, or a salary, or a wage, if you like to call it that, of 38 cents per hour, while he is actually in the service of the government or in our employ. For that 38 cents per hour he also furnishes a horse and rig which are absolutely necessary. Some system should be evolved whereby that inequality could be overcome.

I do not know just why the one should be on the contract system and the other in the Civil Service with the contract system eliminated. The latter is a permanent official, and his salary is, I understand, based on the cost of living. In the other case, the salary is fixed on the basis of what some other fellow who, perhaps, does not know what he is undertaking, says that he is willing to perform the service for. I know very well that a bond has to be signed or bondsmen procured that the contract will be fulfilled. It is not fair to put the rural mail carriers on that basis. We talk about the merit system in our Civil Service, and this eliminates the merit system. Let me put the question in this way. A man who has filled a four-year contract satisfactorily has an opportunity of renewing that contract, if he so wishes, at the same price. I think that is generally the rule, although an hon. member to my right seems to find that this rule is not always carried out. At the same time, however, there is no recognition of

the faithful service that the man has given. These are some of the disadvantages which we have at present under this system. I am not too sure whether I am prepared to subscribe to the mileage basis or not. There are some very good features in it; but there are other features which I do not think would be in the interest of economy in the service. There is one feature to which I strongly object, namely, that of government officials going out, after tenders are sent in, and beating down, as it were, persons who are offering to do the service. I hope that practice will be discontinued.

There is one little matter that I resent. In talking over this situation with some of those who are interested, I might go so far as to say, with some who are officials of the Post Office Department, I was told that the trouble is that in rural districts too much service is given. As one of those living in rural districts, I thoroughly resent that statement. We get a mail service once a day in our district, and that is quite sufficient for us. The mail service in Ottawa, is, I believe, twice a day, and I am not prepared to accept the statement that we are getting too much service at the present time, particularly when such a statement comes from the department itself.

Mr. PRITCHARD: I have for some years watched the rural mail carriers on the one hand and the city mail carriers on the other, and I have wondered if some fairer adjustment could not be made regarding the remuneration of these two classes of public servants. I happen to live in the country on a back road where we have had to shovel the mail carrier out time and again. People living along that route will expect that man to deliver the mail, and they will raise a row because he does not deliver it on days when it is impossible for the people themselves to get along the road. That condition is common in the winter season in that section of the country. When I come to Ottawa, what do I find? I find a man receiving $500 a year more for delivering mail on city streets where he does not do as much work in a day as the rural mail carrier does. The trouble seems to be that in the one case the government can fix the price, but in the other, it must be let by contract.

I happened to have some difficulty last session and I have also had it this session in connection with rural mail carriers in my constituency. The report which I get from these men does not correspond exactly with the statement of the minister to-night. They tell me—and I am almost forced to believe there is a great deal of truth in what they state—that even where a man who has been doing his work satisfactorily, puts in his tender, the department are not satisfied, but they send out men to beat the price down to a lower figure by almost any means possible. Why cannot the department cut somewhere else and give the rural mail carrier a fair show in the way of remuneration for his services in comparison with what men in the Post Office Department are getting? Why should he be discriminated against, when men in other branches of the Post Office Department are getting something more nearly approximating what they ought to receive? I do not say that any of these gentlemen are getting any more than they ought to get; but the mail carrier in the rural sections is certainly not getting what he ought to get. In these estimates I see a whole column of increases. I do not understand what these increases mean. Why should the salaries of these Post Office officials be increased? Why cannot some of the money be given to the men who carry the mail in rural Ontario, the western prairies, and, perhaps, in the eastern provinces, and let these Post Office officials do with a little less pay, because even if the salaries of the latter are cut down, men can be got who will do the work efficiently?

We were speaking about immigration in this House for several days. We expect a rural mail carrier to carry mail for one-half—or a little less, I think it is by the report this afternoon—of what men are getting across the line for carrying the mail there Does the government expect to keep men in the rural sections and prevent them from going to the cities and towns, when men in the urban centres are receiving $500 a year more than they do in the country? These are some of the things I cannot understand, and I feel sure, if the department get busy, they can give these rural mail carriers a little more money to which they are entitled and also the advantages that were asked for by other hon. gentlemen this afternoon. I meet these men every day; I have to go home and report to them, and I cannot sit quiet in this House while this debate is going an without expressing my opinion on the matter. These men ought to get fairer treatment from the department than they are getting.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Undoubtedly the rural mail carriers should receive more than they do. We all know the work these men are doing for a small salary. However, it does not seem to me that we should cut down the salaries of any of the mail carriers, whether of the city or the country; rather there should be a decided increase in the salaries

of all this class of government employees. I wish we could have some assurance from the government tonight that some step could be taken to see that salaries generally would be revised. If I am rightly informed, the Prime Minister gave assurances to the postal employees last year that this would be done. Apparently no action has been taken and so far there has been no intimation that action will be taken. I should like to quote a paragraph from a memorandum sent to me recently by the Winnipeg Local Council of the Canadian Federation of Postal Employees, which comprises railway mail clerks, postal clerks, letter carriers, transfer agents and postal porters. After referring to what they claim was the promise of the Prime Minister, that there would be a general revision of salaries, they plead for the following standard:

Minimum and maximum salaries as requested from the government:

Railway Mail Clerks	$1,200 to $1,920
Letter Carriers	1,260 to 1,760
Postal Clerks	1,200 to 1,800
Transfer Agents	1,260 to 1,740

By comparison of the above with the figures as issued by the government in the Labour Gazette, it will be plainly seen that a revision of salaries is very necessary if this large body of public servants are to receive a living wage.

It has often been said that the government should be the model employer, but the remuneration granted to postal employees, has never been adequate to maintain the standard of living which is necessary to good citizenship.

A few months ago we had here in Ottawa a convention of all the postmasters, at which the Postmaster General (Mr. Murphy) paid a most eloquent tribute to the work of the postal carriers. I took from the paper at the time an extract of what he said, and it seems to me that he was only doing justice to the men whose services we all require and appreciate. May I read a paragraph:

Of all those engaged in bringing the postal service into the lives and homes of the Canadian people none fills so large a place as that familiar figure—the letter carrier.

There is something stirring and wonderful about the relation of that faithful figure to the daily lives of millions of our people. He is a part of a vast business which can be tabulated in terms of annual turnover, and number of employees, and curves of profit and loss, like any other business, but which is, nevertheless, the strangest, most human and most romantic business in which men were ever engaged.

Now, we all realize the great service performed by these men and yet I think we must confess that there is a very slight chance of definite promotion for a large number of them. Very early in life they reach the maximum of their earning capacity. In a great many other walks of life men can proceed to higher salaries and better positions in every way, but that is impossible for the great majority of the letter carriers. Now that there is a surplus reported in this department of the government service, I think it would be only reasonable for us to increase the salaries of the postal employees all along the line until they are comparable with the salaries paid in other lines of business. As I think I said a year ago, in my own city of Winnipeg last year there were people in the receipt of relief from the city of itself who were receiving more than the employees of the government who were carrying on a very important part of the public service. Again, may I ask that we have some sort of assurance that in the not distant future there shall be a general revision upward of the whole of the salaries of the postal employees?

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend makes a statement but he qualifies it at the end. It was not the same at the end as it was at the the beginning.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Possibly at the end I stated where I stood in the matter and what my hopes were.

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend said that the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) had stated that in the near future there would be a revision of salaries, but in his remarks he slipped in the word "upward", which might materially alter the meaning of the Prime Minister.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I did not suggest that the Prime Minister had promised a revision of salaries upwards. I was merely expressing the hope that in any revision that might take place these salaries would be increased.

Mr. GRAHAM: I think it not altogether out of the realm of probability that there will come a time very shortly when the bonus system shall disappear. That being so, I suppose that the revision of salaries on a permanent basis will be made when that system is discontinued.

Mr. HANSON: This government has been in power now some fifteen or sixteen months. During that period we have had no direct declaration from the government with respect to the question of the repeal of the Civil Service Act, and I presume that they are waiting upon the report of the special committee which is now investigating the matter. But while they are waiting I make the statement deliberately that in so far as the Post Office Department is concerned they are violating the spirit of the Civil Service Act if not the letter on every occasion that presents itself. On

more than one occasion during this session information has come to me of the creeping of the patronage system into the government service, especially in connection with the Post Office Department; and reports that reach me from different parts of the country are to the effect that the Postmaster General (Mr. Murphy) is the chief sinner among all the sinners in the government ranks in this direction.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Too bad.

Mr. HANSON: When we were soliciting men to go to the front the people were told that there was nothing too good to do for these men. A few years ago parliament laid down the rule that, all other things being equal, returned men would have the preference in appointments to the public service, but this rule has not been lived up to, at least in connection with the Post Office Department. Only the other day I put a question to the Postmaster General with regard to a vacancy at St. Peters, Nova Scotia. I asked:

Has the Civil Service Commission been instructed to advertise for applicants for the position?

And the answer I received was:

The position has been advertised.

The next question I had in reference to this matter was:

If so, will preference be given to a returned soldier?

The answer was:

The vacancy will be filled in the best interests of the public service and consistent with the provisions of the Civil Service Act.

Which answer, of course, entirely ignored the question. Now, I have a case under my hand which I think is a very glaring one and which I desire to bring to the attention of the Acting Postmaster General (Mr. Graham) because I believe that he personally is in sympathy with the policy that in filling any official positions in the public service preference shall be given to returned men. I would call his attention to the fact that about a year ago the office of postmaster at Clementsport in the province of Nova Scotia, which I understand is in the county of Annapolis, or at all events just on the border between Annapolis and Digby, became vacant. When the Civil Service Commission was requested to fill this position in accordance with the law, the acting Superintendent of Postal Service, Mr. W. E. McLellan, was communicated with and asked to report upon three applicants for the position, namely, Mr. Howard G. Potter, Mr. Rawding and Miss Anna E. Robertson. I have a statement from which I read:

In April 1922 the acting district superintendent reported that Mr. Rawding had been the former postmaster, and was dismissed on purely political grounds (which Mr. Rawding stated was without just cause and without any investigation). The superintendent strongly recommended that he be reinstated.

Presume that he was a friend of the present government. The district superintendent made no report on Mr. Potter at all, and I am instructed that he was communicated with by wire by the Civil Service Commission on the 27th April, 1922. On the 10th May following the superintendent reported to the commission that there seemed to be nothing against Mr. Potter's character or his fitness for the position, and being a returned soldier, under the circumstances the commission felt there was no alternative but to give him the appointment. The certificate for his appointment was issued on the 30th May, 1922, but it appears that the Post Office Department has failed to transfer the office to him—for what reason is unknown.

As I have stated, a certificate was issued by the Civil Service Commission appointing Mr. Potter postmaster at Clementsport, but the department has entirely failed to act on that certificate, although there is no good reason I venture to say why they should not have done so. There is, of course, a political reason, to which I have already adverted, that is, that the acting postmaster at that point was the former postmaster but was dismissed for political activity by, I presume, a former government.

Now, I addressed a question in regard to this to the Postmaster General on the 19th March, when I asked:

1. Did the postmaster at Clementsport, Nova Scotia, resign, as such, in or about the year 1922?

The answer is, yes.

2. If so, did the Civil Service Commission nominate Mr. Howard G. Potter as a fit and suitable person to fill the said position?

The answer is in the affirmative.

3. Was Mr. Potter notified of his appointment by the commission?

Here again the answer is, yes.

4. Is the government aware that Mr. Potter is a wounded returned soldier?

This question is also answered in the affirmative.

5. Why has Mr. Potter's nomination not been confirmed and why is he not postmaster of Clementsport, Nova Scotia, to-day?

The answer is:

(a) A temporary appointment was necessary on resignation of former postmaster, and an applicant with previous post office experience was placed in charge.

That is, a temporary appointment was made. Now I call the minister's attention to answer (b):

(b) Mr. Potter was not resident in Clementsport at the time the vacancy occurred.

That presumably is the meritorious reason given for the non-installation of Mr. Potter as postmaster at Clementsport. The answer to question 5 continues:

(c) Acting district superintendent, Halifax, reporting on various applicants, did not recommend Mr. Potter.

I call the minister's attention to the fact that when the acting district superintendent was asked by wire by the commission he said that there was nothing against Mr. Potter and there was no reason why he should not be appointed. Continuing the answer to question 5:

(d) Department's duty is to give public service, and while a difference of opinion exists service is being satisfactorily performed by the present temporary incumbent.

That is to say, a difference of opinion between the Civil Service Commission, acting on the second recommendation of the district superintendent, and some official, presumably in the department, who personally cannot know anything about the matter. The concluding paragraph of the answer is:

(e) When the position is definitely filled it will be filled strictly in accordance with the Civil Service Act.

Now, I call the attention of the minister to paragraph (b) of the answer to question 5, and make the statement on the authority of Mr. Potter that that is not a true answer. It says: "Mr. Potter was not resident in Clementsport at the time the vacancy occurred." Feeling that possibly the department was right and my previous information wrong, I wrote to Mr. Potter and on the 24th March he replied to me as follows:

Your letter of the 23rd to hand, and I thank you very kindly for taking this matter up.

I have always been a resident of this place except while overseas, and I have always voted and paid my taxes here and am a natural born British subject. I was living here at the time this post office was made vacant, also previous to that time and I can give you a certified certificate to that effect if you want one.

I should like to know who said I was not a resident here. It looks rather crooked to me.

Again thanking you very kindly, I remain.

Your humble servant,

HOWARD G. POTTER.

These are the salient features of this case. I say the Post Office Department is deliberately defying not only the letter but the spirit of the Civil Service Act in withholding the installation of Mr. Potter as the postmaster at Clementsport. I say further that it is violating both the spirit and the letter of the act in order to cater to a local partisan spirit and put into office the former postmaster who was dismissed for political activity by, I presume, a former government. That is to say, the law is being violated in order to perform an act of partisanship. I would call the attention of the minister to the fact that there is absolutely no reason in the world why this man Potter should not receive the position to which he has been appointed by the Civil Service Commission. Moreover, he is a wounded returned soldier. If he does not receive this appointment I intend to call the attention of the veterans to the case, and they will go right after the government.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. HANSON: I want to tell hon. members opposite that we cannot trifle with the returned soldiers. They are entitled to these positions if they are competent to fill them. ,

Mr. GRAHAM: In my riding our predecessors put in a very strong party man when a returned soldier was anxious for the position.

Mr. HANSON: Then I hope the veterans will go after it again. They did not do it very successfully at that time, but there will be opportunities later. I do not wish to approach this matter in too partisan a spirit, but I do suggest that the minister, as the acting head of the Post Office Department, is not doing justice in this case. But I know I have only to appeal to him and justice will be done. Therefore I confidently appeal to him to appoint this man to the position to which he is entitled in all honour and under the law of this country.

Mr. LOVETT: Perhaps I may be allowed to make a few corrections in the remarks of my hon. friend for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson). It is true that the postmastership at Clementsport became vacant through the resignation of Mr. Ritchie. He resigned quite suddenly and notified the post office inspector by wire. Thereupon, in order that the service might not be interrupted, Mr. Rawding was appointed as acting postmaster. Mr. Howard Potter had been a resident of New Brunswick for some time, being employed I believe with Mr. Powers, a contractor. When my hon. friend says that Mr. Potter always voted in Clementsport he is not quite correct; in the last election he voted in New Brunswick.

Mr. HANSON: He says he voted there; I did not.

Mr. LOVETT: He voted in New Brunswick.

Mr. JACOBS: Perhaps he voted twice.

Mr. LOVETT: The Post Office inspector, Mr. McLellan, recommended the appointment, and the Civil Service Commission approved the permanent appointment of Mr.

Rawding. This man, Mr. Potter, was brought home at the instigation of a few of his friends to oust Mr. Rawding from office. Mr. Potter had a satisfactory job at suitable pay, but he threw it to one side and came to Clementsport to dislodge Mr. Rawding. My information is that Mr. Potter was not a resident of the district at the time the vacancy occurred and consequently was not eligible for the position.

Mr. MEIGHEN: From whom did the hon. gentleman get that information?

Mr. LOVETT: I do not know that it is necessary to say from whom I got the information. I said I had the information.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Would not the man himself be the best judge of where he lived?

Mr. GRAHAM: He was an interested party.

Mr. HANSON: Does that disqualify him as a witness? Not in this country, I hope.

Mr. LOVETT: It would not necessarily disqualify him. But he was not a resident of the village.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Where did he live?

Mr. LOVETT: He lived in New Brunswick and his family lived there. He voted there in the last election. As I say, the Post Office inspector voluntarily made the recommendation. The hon. member has alluded to the dismissal of Mr. Rawding in 1911. I may say that he was dismissed without just cause or reason, and without any investigation whatever, as many others were. My hon. friend is very much concerned now with the returned soldier; it was not so previous to the election of 1921. Under the former administration the returned soldier was promised many things that he did not get, and men who had never been overseas were placed in office. I could give instances in my own constituency.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will my hon. friend give one instance of the Civil Service Commission appointing a returned soldier and the late government not confirming the appointment?

Mr. LOVETT: I think I could give some instances, but I do not know that I could do it offhand.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I defy the hon. gentleman to do it, and to bring a case this session.

Mr. LOVETT: I will endeavour to look one up.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman just got through saying he knew of some.

Mr. LOVETT: I have some in mind. I do not wish to make any rash statements—

Mr. MEIGHEN: Where is the hon. gentleman's mind? If he has several "in mind", why does he not give them?

Mr. LOVETT: I do not like to make a statement unless I can back it up.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman has just made one.

Mr. LOVETT: I like to be sure of what I am doing. These things are known to almost everybody. I could point to specific cases—

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is the main thing.

Mr. LOVETT: That can be done.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Now is the time to do it.

Mr. LOVETT: My right hon. friend need not worry about that. Mr. Rawling is now filling the office to the satisfaction of the people generally in that village.

Mr. HANSON: My hon. friend entirely ignores the gravamen of the charge, which is that the government are setting at defiance the laws of this country. The Civil Service Commission have given their certificate for the appointment of this man, and no good reason has been urged why the appointment should not be made. The hon. gentleman's information is based entirely upon hearsay. I produce the evidence of the man himself, who says his home has always been in Clementsport. I must take the first-hand evidence rather than the hearsay evidence of the member for Annapolis. If this sort of thing is to go on; if appointments made by the Civil Service Commission are to be ignored, where is the end to be? The government, and especially the Post Office Department, are in many instances setting at defiance the principle underlying the Civil Service Act, and the country might as well know now just where the administration stands in that respect. This is only one case in a great many. I submit that under the law there is nothing for the department to do but to transfer the office to Mr. Potter. I would point out also that the acting district superintendent in his first report made no suggestion pro or con with respect to Mr. Potter; he reported in favour of the previous official whom the government had put in charge, acting, no doubt, in accordance with the suggestions of my hon. friend—a political ap-

pointment pure and simple. The policy was laid down previous to the last election—and I say it on the authority of my right hon. leader—that every appointment of a returned soldier by the Civil Service Commission was confirmed. That is not being done to-day, and that is the serious part of this thing. It is a breach of faith with the returned men, especially with wounded men.

Mr. GRAHAM: This question seems to hang largely on whether or not Mr. Potter was resident in the locality concerned. The commission may not have had the knowledge that this man was not a resident. In any case, under the act, they are supposed not to appoint a non-resident.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is the clause of the act?

Mr. GRAHAM: It is section 43, chapter 10 of the Acts of 1919, dealing with appointments to the civil service—subsection 3:

Except as to appointments to positions in the headquarters of the several departments and other portions of the civil service at Ottawa, the appointments to any local positions in any province shall, so far as practicable, be made from bona fide residents of such locality.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But there is another clause which says that the priority of returned soldiers shall be absolute.

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not think it overrides that, but I am not going to argue the question. The information given to me by the department was that this man was not resident in the locality.

Mr. MARTELL: Is it not a fact that the Department of Justice has ruled that the question of geographical residence must override even the returned soldier preference? I have been so advised by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not know whether the Department of Justice has so ruled, but I am inclined to think that is the law.

Mr. JACOBS: In spite of what the Department of Justice says.

Mr. GRAHAM: I think it is quite plainly the law. If the information that comes to me is correct—that this gentleman was not resident and that some friends got him back to that place so that he could qualify after the vacancy occurred—then there is good ground for the acceptance by the department of the recommendation of its own officer that the other man should have the appointment.

[Mr. Hanson.]

Mr. HANSON: But the district superintendent made a second recommendation when his attention was called to the omission to make any reference to Mr. Potter.

Mr. GRAHAM: Well, read it.

Mr. HANSON (reading):

As the Acting District Superintendent did not report upon the qualifications of Mr. Howard G. Potter, returned soldier—

Did not make any report upon him in the first place.

—he was communicated with by wire under date of 27th of April. On the 10th of May, 1922, the superintendent reported to the commission that there seemed to be nothing against Mr. Potter's character or his fitness for the position.

Mark those words "or his fitness for the position." Would that not include the personal residence?

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. HANSON: Certainly it would. It continues:

Mr. Potter being a returned soldier, under the circumstances the commission felt that there was no alternative but to give him the appointment.

And the certificate was issued on the 30th of May. He is still waiting, while the department endeavours to find some method to evade the law.

Mr. GRAHAM: No. I would not go that far. I would say that if the information as communicated to the department be correct, the department is adhering to the spirit at least of the law. My hon. friend reading what the superintendent said, I think could clearly draw the inference that he was very careful only to say that if Mr. Potter got the job he could fill it. His fitness has not anything to do with his residence. A man in Timbuctoo might be fit to fill the position so far as his qualifications were concerned, if he happened also to reside in the constituency. But if it be true that Mr. Potter was not a resident of that constituency at the time the vacancy occurred, then according to the spirit of the law he was not eligible to make application for that position.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It seems really hard to credit that the government could have this idea of its duty under the Civil Service Act. These directions in the act are directions for the Civil Service Commission. The government has absolutely no power to appoint. The Civil Service Commission alone has that. The Civil Service Commission in exercise of this power is directed by the act to give priority to returned soldiers; that is absolute. The Civil Service Commission is also directed in the case

of a local appointment, that, "if it is practicable," in the words of the act, it shall go to a resident. Now does the government pretend to say that after the Civil Service Commission reviewing the question of whether he is a resident or not, reviewing the question of whether he is a returned soldier, decides that he is and appoints him, that the government can take the word of the member for the constituency that the commission was wrong and refuse to install the man in office? If the government has information that he is not a resident and believes the law therefore debars him, the government can bring that to the attention of the Civil Service Commission. Has it done it? No. The government pretends to sit in review and appeal over the Civil Service Commission, and the minister stands here and pretends to express the opinion to the House that that is the law of the land. The Civil Service Commission, let me repeat, has the sole power of appointment. Those are regulations to govern the Civil Service Commission. Does the government pretend to be in appeal over the Civil Service Commission? The government has a perfect right to lay any facts in its possession before that commission, but to sit there and say: No, the member tells us someone else is qualified, and he justifies keeping him there on the ground that he is told by someone whom he does not name that Mr. Potter was not a resident; therefore, we will not follow the act, and we will keep a man there in defiance of the act. That is what the government is doing, and it is doing it not only in the Clementsport case. The whole country is full of such cases. My mail is full every morning of letters from men who have been dismissed and who have been denied even a statement of why they were dismissed, not only denied an investigation, but denied the privilege of being told why they have been dismissed, and of cases, too, where the commission followed the act and named the appointee and the government refused to install him and placed their partisan appointee there instead. They have done it in Ontario. There will be in the mind of the minister now cases in western Ontario where this has been the regular practice of the administration. That is the method they are adopting day in and day out to evade the act until, forsooth, they succeed if they can by the circuitous method they have adopted this session in getting the act repealed or in some way impaired by legislation.

In the Clementsport case Potter is entitled to the position. If the government can convince the Civil Service Commission that he is not a resident and that that debars him notwithstanding the fact that he is a returned soldier, if they can convince the Civil Service Commission, all well and good, but that is the court to which they must go. They are not in appeal over the Civil Service Commission, they are not there to see that the commission is carrying out the law in each individual case. If they were, there might as well be no Civil Service Commission. If the government has the power to listen to one of its supporters who says that the Civil Service Commission did not do right because Potter was not a resident, and therefore can put another man in office, that is only another way of repealing the act, and let me repeat, they are repealing it in the Clementsport case, and they are doing it in numerous cases in Ontario. They are spreading patronage all over this country and doing it very frequently in defiance of the prior rights of the returned soldiers.

10 p.m.

Mr. MORRISON: My experience is very different from that of hon. gentlemen to my right. Since I have been elected a member of this House I have been asked several times by the government to nominate someone for a postmastership where the remuneration would be under $200, and in every notice I got to that effect I was asked to give returned soldiers the preference. I got notice of one postmastership being vacant the appointment for which really came under the commission, and I was a little perplexed to know why I had been notified. The vacancy was at a point fifty miles from where I reside and I only knew one man there. I forwarded the notice to him and told him that evidently the government wanted someone nominated, and for him to choose a fit and proper person. He wrote back and told me that on the very day he got my letter an agent of the Civil Service Commission came to that town and asked him to nominate someone, and a party was chosen who was afterwards appointed. I have had I think, seven vacancies for the position of postmaster in my riding, and as I said before, in every case the Civil Service Commission asked that a returned soldier be given the preference. So far as I could see, everything was done fair and above board.

But I know that when the late government was in office a Liberal who was keeping a post office where the income was over $1,000 took a very active part in an election campaign, and he expected to get his walking papers, and he did. In the West, so far as I know, things have been done pretty straight in connection with the post office service.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I just wish to say a word as to what my hon. friend says. He says he

has been asked to nominate postmasters where the remuneration is under $200. I do not doubt that that is correct although I must say I have not received any favours of that kind myself. Evidently hon. friends to my left have a degree of affinity that I do not possess with the government of the day.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Hear, hear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What I want to call attention to is this. That does not in the least affect the classes of cases we are speaking of here at all. The Civil Service Commission has nothing to do with that class of case.

Mr. MORRISON: I quoted one case where it had.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Was a returned soldier recommended?

Mr. MORRISON: The notice said that a returned soldier should get the preference.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is the act. The Civil Service Commission was doing its duty, and it did the same in the Clementsport case. But the government stands in the way and refuses to let the law take effect. Undoubtedly the commission always does that, and let me say further, in western Canada I do not think there is very serious complaint, and I think I know the reason. In western Canada there is not, and has not been for some time, the same patronage spirit as to office that there is in other parts of Canada. Western Canada has been in favour of the Civil Service Act and this system for years, and it is in favour of it to-day, and that applies, I think, to members of all parties in western Canada. It does not apply to individuals by any means, but western Canada almost unanimously is against patronage, and the government will get no support and no encouragement whatever in that country for anything in the way of an invasion of the Civil Service Act. But it is wholly different in Ontario. It is wholly different in the eastern provinces. In those provinces in the case of positions of some value to the returned man, the government has time and again consistently made it the practice and policy to evade and even defy the Civil Service Commission. I do not know what value a $50 position or even a $150 position is to a returned man.

Mr. JACOBS: The right hon. leader of the Opposition asked the hon. member for Digby and Annapolis (Mr. Lovett) to mention names.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. JACOBS: Will the right hon. gentlemen give us some names.

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, I will give you the case of the Wingham post office.

Mr. JACOBS: Let us have the details of it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The details have been published. I will give the hon. gentleman the references. If he will read the press of western Ontario in September last, or the Veteran of that month, he will get the Wingham and the Brussels cases and a great many more, that will harrow his soul, if he has any respect for the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. MARLER: I have listened with considerable interest to the remarks of my right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) with reference to the government evading the Civil Service Act and sitting in judgment on the Civil Service Commission. He has referred to matters occurring in western Canada. I do not know so much about western Canada, but I come from eastern Canada, where the post office authorities employ very many men indeed, and I found, to my sorrow, on many occasions that it was utterly impossible to get the government to evade the Civil Service Commission in any way.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Why is the hon. member so sorry?

Mr. MARLER: Well, I will leave it to my hon. friend himself to make up his mind. He will know why as well as I do.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member wants a government that is a law breaker?

Mr. MARLER: Not entirely. I am only refuting what my right hon. friend said a few minutes ago, and I refute his statement absolutely as regards the city of Montreal. I will also say that the returned soldier, in my experience and to my knowledge, is invariably given the preference when he has an opportunity of filling the position. I have never come across a single case in which I have made application to the Postmaster General, or to any of the authorities in Ottawa, that I have not been referred to the Civil Service Commission, and I have always referred applicants to the Civil Service Commission. I have found it perfectly useless to do anything in any of the departments of the government, excepting through the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. FORKE: I have been reading the Mirror, and I am pretty well posted now. However, I only want to say a word with regard to western Canada. I have seen no

signs of any of those deeds in regard to which accusation has been made to-night, as far as patronage in western Canada is concerned. I have listened to the remarks made by the right hon. leader of the Opposition. I would be very sorry, indeed, if they were true, and I think the members on this side of the House anyway would like a little more definite and accurate information that the Civil Service Commission has been set aside by any action of the government. I hold no brief for any one, as far as that is concerned, but I would be very sorry indeed if the Civil Service Commission were being ignored by the government in making appointments. I have no knowledge whatever of anything of that sort having taken place, but at the same time I would not condone any offence along that line.

Mr. IRVINE: An hon. member of the Progressive group has just made a confession that he has been consulted with regard to the appointment of certain postmasters. That, to my mind, is being privileged to handle a certain portion of patronage. I hope that is not a general practice on the part of all the Progressives. If it is, the onus is on them to say so now, or forever be silent. Personally, I have not had any opportunity, nor am I desirous, of handling any such patronage, and I respectfully hope that all the Progressives are not handling patronage in that way.

Mr. ROSS (Simcoe): Perhaps I may come in the class of those who are privileged, but I want to make it clear that I am not here in any way to screen our government. On the other hand a little reference was made to me in my own constituency, where I was asked to recommend a man to take charge of one of those post offices, to come in under the $200 class, and I recommended a man who was a returned soldier. If the committee want to get the actual facts, the man I recommended had originally been, and perhaps was then, as far as I know, a Conservative, but I recommended him to the Postmaster General at that time, and he was appointed postmaster, and is postmaster now.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What was his salary?

Mr. ROSS (Simcoe): He was under $200. But I want to be fair to the government, and I say that in that case they did what was right by the returned man, although he was a Conservative.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What does the poor man do for a living, with a job in which the salary is under $200?

Mr. ROSS (Simcoe): He is a blacksmith and has a good trade.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He would need it.

Mr. GARDINER: I am going to enter a very emphatic protest. It seems to me, so far as the present government are concerned, they are discriminating against me, because I have never been asked to make any recommendation for postmaster or anything else.

Mr. LAPOINTE: No vacancies.

Mr. GARDINER: Yes, lots of vacancies. I would like to get back to the question we have been dealing with, with regard to the transportation of the mails on the railroads. I have before me the report of 1922, and I notice the daily mileage of postal cars in March 1922 was something like 71,928. Now can the minister give us information as to the number of postal car miles for the different railways in Canada?

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend is asking me for some detailed information as to the postal car miles which I am unable to give him. They have never been asked for in the House on any occasion. I never dreamed that any such question as that would enter into the discussion. It is a detail that really has not very much bearing on the question that he is trying to get at. I can readily see that that would be followed by another question. I have not that information. It has never been given in the details in the postal estimates. I sent out for information after the hon. member had spoken. I do not want my statement to be taken as absolutely accurate, but, as far as the official could estimate, he believed the mail carrying was divided between the two great systems in the proportion of about 45 per cent to each, and the other systems about 10 per cent. That is what my hon. friend is trying to get at directly, I think.

Mr. GARDINER: Yes, that is quite true. I suppose the minister will bring that information down in order that we may perhaps have some more accurate statement. Could the minister give us any information with regard to the number of rural free mail deliveries in the various provinces of Canada?

Mr. GRAHAM: They are not divided by provinces, but the rural mail routes in number and operation are 3,742, and the number of boxes erected 200,027. The hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Boys) was asking those questions. The approximate cost per year is $2,771,203.54. We do not have them divided

by provinces. I think my hon. friend can take it for granted that the rural mail routes are largely in the East and not in the prairie provinces.

Mr. SPENCER: Do I understand the minister to say that the rural mail delivery routes are mostly in the East and not in the prairie provinces?

Mr. GRAHAM: I said I thought the larger number of them were in the East and not in the prairie provinces.

Mr. SPENCER: I do not know about other constituencies; but I take it that the situation in them is the same as it is in mine. During the last year we have had many requests for rural mail delivery routes, and in every single case, so far as I know, the request has been turned down by the government. Is it the intention of the government next year to let up as regards this matter, and to give the rural people some opportunity of getting their mail delivered?

Mr. GRAHAM: I dealt at quite some length with this matter earlier in the evening, when my hon. friend was probably not in his seat. To be frank, I may say that there is in this estimate nothing to provide for any new routes. Expressing my own opinion, I believe the time must arrive before very long when the rural mail system will have to be extended. I am speaking particularly of the West and expressing my view in the absence of the Postmaster General (Mr. Murphy), who would be in a better position than I am to discuss this. As I said an hour or so ago, rural mail delivery, rural telephones and roads —all this kind of thing helps to make a contented people in a rural district by bringing them closer to each other as well as into closer touch with the great centres. That is a question of great import, and speaking for myself, I think the time will soon come when the rural mail route of Canada will have to be extended for these purposes, as well as for the accommodation of people living in rural districts. These things all tend to make not only people in sparsely settled districts more contented, but those districts more attractive to other people who might wish to come into them. The United States has extended a somewhat different system, and the deficit there this year is about $60,000,000. The question is altogether one of expense, how much the country can afford and how fast it can go.

Mr. HANSON: Last year when the Post Office estimates were under discussion, I asked the minister for a statement of policy as to what the department proposed to do in connection with extending the rural mail delivery. He was good enough to say that the time was rapidly approaching; I believe he said that before another year was over the department would take up once more the policy of extending the rural mail routes. I, like a good many other members, indeed, I presume like all members of the House, have received from time to time, under the frank of the Postmaster General, copies of the Ottawa Citizen in which reports of conferences and reports of the position of the Post Office department have appeared periodically. I notice in the ministerial press that the Postmaster General, at all events prior to the time of his departure for the south—I do not know what his attitude is just at present—has been pluming himself upon the great success that has attended his efforts in managing the department, especially with respect to its revenues. I understand that last year the Post Office Department showed a surplus. I, of course, have my opinion as to how that surplus was arrived at. When I am at home, I lick a good many stamps for cheques and other things, and I generally use postage stamps. At the same time all that sort of thing goes to swell the revenue of the Post Office Department. In view of what was said last year, I think the time has arrived when the finances of the country will permit of the extension of the rural mail service in Canada. I said last year, and I say now that that is practically the only direct benefit that many people living in rural communities in this country receive. If they can get a rural mail service, this is of great benefit, in fact, of almost inestimable benefit to them. I can contrast conditions that exist to-day in my province with what they were twenty-five years ago. When I was a boy, we lived in a country district and I had to walk three times a week six miles to get my father's mail. To-day there is a daily rural service established by the late government in that particular community, and I say that all communities in the country have a right to look forward to the immediate future when there will be a rural route on every great road, at all events. in this country. I hope, however, there will be no patronage in the extension of that service.

Mr. GRAHAM: It is by contract.

Mr. HANSON: It is let by contract, and I am not altogether in favour of that system, because my experience is that people in rural communities frequently vie with each other, and the government is getting the service, in many instances, at below cost. I can quote

case after case of this character. I know of a case of a contractor taking a contract immediately before the war who, in the course of the four years his contract ran, went behind one thousand dollars. I know that is a fact, because I had to help him out and I was glad to do so. It was only after the most strenuous efforts that we were able to get that man any increase at all. A contract system in theory is probably quite all right; but in practice it works out that the government gets the service performed by rural mail carriers in this country in many cases at below cost. The time has arrived when the government ought to have a policy and to say that they are going to extend this service to people in rural communities.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I am glad to see the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) in his seat and following the discussion with reference to the merits of competition in doing public business and the serious complaints which are being made on account of this service being rendered altogether too cheaply. I am sure if this system is applied to many more branches of the service, an enormous saving would result, and that the difficulties which the Minister of Finance is undoubtedly experiencing in meeting the requirements of the situation, will be much lightened. I notice that in the British parliament the announcement has been made by the Minister of Finance that there is a surplus this year of £101,000,000, and that the saving is largely as a result of a reduction in the amount paid out in the Civil Service. This was the chief item connected with the surplus which they had in the old land.

Just a word with regard to the competitive system in connection with rural mail deliveries. I often wondered why it was this system should apply to one branch of the service and practically to none other. You see what the result is, namely, that strong claims are being advanced that the service is being rendered altogether too cheaply. This is undoubtedly the fault of the people who have tendered to render the service. When one comes to make comparisons with what is going on in other branches, it certainly gives one serious thought whether our whole system is not wrong and the methods which we have adopted are not responsible for many of our troubles. I refer to the elimination of competition, because when you do away with competition there is bound to be a fixation of prices, and this is going on all over the country to-day. I suppose that if the rural mail carriers were placed on a salary basis, as men in other branches of the service, this would be regarded as something entirely different from the practice that prevails, in the rural districts at any rate. Competition is supposed to operate in connection with everything which is done by those people who live in the rural districts. They are in competition in the markets of the world as regards everything they produce, and possibly if the rural mail carriers were put on a salary basis there would be very serious complaints from the people in the rural districts, because this would be so contrary to the system in vogue in the country. This is a matter I have thought over seriously, and I am inclined to think that this system is largely responsible for many of the difficulties and troubles we have in this country to-day. If there were a little more competition and a little less fixing of prices I think we should have a better condition of affairs and the people would render a much better service than is the case where hours of labour are fixed and a scale of wages is laid down, even in the case of government contracts. I believe it is only fair to compare this condition with what is taking place in the country.

As regards the rural mail carriers it is a shame, I think, that His Majesty's mail should have to be carried in some of the outfits which some of these people are using throughout the country; and while it may be contended that it is the fault of the carriers themselves, I am inclined to think that many of them would not be able to continue in the service at all were it not for the assistance they receive from those to whom they deliver mail. In many instances they get in the form of assistance a fair percentage of what they receive for their services. I do not think this is as it should be; I believe that these people should receive a reasonable remuneration for the work they are doing. Unfortunately, however, there are many people whose earning abilities are not very great and they do not attach much value to this service because of their inability to do manual labour. So that if they can get into a rig and go around and render this service they think that they can get along. I have in mind a mail carrier whose route takes in the road on which I live. He is not very young now, and unfortunately a few years ago he lost one of his arms. He is a man with a large family, and for a service covering some twenty-two miles I think he receives between $800 and $900 a year. A horse soon breaks down in work of this kind, and so he has to get a new steed from time to time; and when you compare his remuneration with the salary paid to a letter carrier in the city, running up to as high as $1500 or $1600 a year, with $200 or $300 bonus, there is no wonder that it is

difficult to get people in the country to do this work. I mention this as one of the many difficulties which we find prevailing in the rural districts to-day.

Many of the things which the farmers are producing they have to market in competition with the whole world, and the climatic conditions of this country are such as to render that competition all the more difficult. In tropical countries produce can be got out of the land with comparatively no difficulty. and when we in Canada have to compete against such conditions it will easily be seen what a handicap we are under. I might mention several articles produced under such favourable conditions that come into this country to the value of millions of dollars. For instance, we hear a great deal of talk about wool, the raw material of the manufactured product, upon which a high tariff is maintained, coming in free of competition. This is the system that prevails, and so long as it does prevail it seems that contracts must be let by tender for the rural mail service. But I cannot see any justification for paying the letter carrier in the city the salary he gets to-day, together with his uniform—I believe he gets two suits—and giving the rural man the remuneration which he now receives. I should like the minister to justify the difference in these two cases. He might also tell us what is the average amount paid to the rural letter carrier on a twenty or twenty-five mile route and also the average salary paid to the letter carrier in the city. At the same time I would ask whether there have been so far many losses in connection with the dividends paid on war loans which are distributed in the rural districts. The cheques are sent out in an ordinary brown envelope very similar to the envelopes that contain the applications in connection with the Civil Service Commission, and I have often thought that the envelopes containing these cheques should be registered instead of being sent out in the indiscriminate way in which they are delivered at present. Very often they are put into the wrong box. because unfortunately many of the carriers are not very careful; and in many cases there is no choice in the selection of these men on account of the competitive system. So far, have there been many losses in this respect? I know myself of some that have occurred in connection with cheques issued in payment of interest on war loan bonds.

Mr. FIELDING: I could not tell my hon. friend offhand, but I do not think there have been extensive losses. There may be an exceptional case here and there, but there have been no widespread losses.

[Mr. Sutherland.]

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Would it involve any difficulty in having these cheques registered? I do not think it would entail any extra cost to the government, and it would make for safety. At all events it would be much more satisfactory than having the cheques distributed in the indiscriminate way in which they are sent out at present. Very often children are sent to the boxes to get mail during stormy weather and it is quite possible that an important bit of mail might be blown away. There is another matter which I would bring to the attention of the minister, and that is with regard to legal holidays on which the rural mail carriers have to deliver mail. Surely it is only fair that they should be given some remuneration for delivering mail on legal holidays. They have to carry the mails in all kinds of weather and they get nothing for their services on these holidays. I think it is only fair that they should be given something for this extra work.

Mr. GRAHAM: The last point raised by my hon. friend is worth consideration, and perhaps an amount might be added to provide remuneration for work done on holidays. Perhaps something might be provided to enable a man to engage someone else to drive his mail on that day if necessary. But it must be borne in mind that these men know all the terms and conditions when they take the contract. However, it is worth considering whether it would not be just to do something in this regard, as my hon. friend suggests. As to the delivery of war loan cheques, my experience is that one of the reasons why business men use cheques is because they do not have to register them. The cheque is usually payable to order and if it is lost payment can be stopped. We have not heard many complaints in the Post Office Department as to the loss of cheques. Personally I seldom get a cheque, although I send out cheques often enough. Whenever I do so, however, I always make the cheque payable to order and never register it.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I want to put a further question regarding some information that was attempted to be elicited by hon. members from Medicine Hat (Mr. Gardiner) and Victoria, (Alta.) (Mr. Lucas). Does the minister seriously mean that there is no contract of any kind with the railway companies that carry our mail? We have been informed that they do not go out and grab for the nearest mail sack, and we can readily accept this information. We have been further informed that the onus rests on the postal employees. Is there any arrangement made

between the Post Office Department and the railway companies so that the latter know about what amount of mail, when, and between what points they are to carry it? On the other hand, does the Post Office Department know what trains are going to carry mail on certain dates? Surely there must be some arrangement under which the Post Office Department and the railway companies know how the mails are to be handled.

Mr. GRAHAM: There is no agreement with the railway companies as to the mails they shall carry.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: Not as to the amount?

Mr. GRAHAM: No, as to the mails they shall carry. There is an agreement as to what they shall get for their services, but they are not guaranteed any particular mail. The Post Office Department in its re-arrangement knows generally what railways are carrying certain mails, but the agreement with the railway companies, as I read it to-night, is that they shall get certain payment for the mails they carry. As for the Post Office Department, it can divert the mails in any way; there is no absolute contract with the railway companies that they shall have an absolute mail route.

Mr. RINFRET: Is it the intention of the government to appoint very soon a Deputy Minister for the Post Office Department?

Mr. GRAHAM: The minister himself would have to be consulted on that matter; as Acting Postmaster General I should not like to give an opinion as to what his views may be. There is an Acting Deputy Postmaster General, and there will probably not be any thought of appointing a deputy permanently until the Postmaster General's return.

Mr. RINFRET: My excuse for asking is that I have put the question many times to the Postmaster General himself. While I am on the subject I would suggest that when the government deals with the appointment of the Deputy Postmaster General it give some thought to the present condition in the various departments in Ottawa as to the respective representation of English-speaking and French-speaking deputy ministers. It is a fact that under the old government—I suppose we could not expect anything else from it—the ratio of French-speaking deputy ministers went down practically to nothing. The condition to-day is that there is a Clerk of the Privy Council, Mr. Boudreau, who has the rating of a deputy minister—

Mr. MEIGHEN: Before the hon. gentleman proceeds further, will he tell me what reduction was made by the old government of French-speaking deputy ministers?

Mr. RINFRET: I have not got the facts before me.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have the facts before me. It was one in ten years. As I understand, this government has made a similar reduction in one year.

Mr. RINFRET: I know that the Deputy Minister of Inland Revenue has disappeared.

Mr. MEIGHEN: For the simple reason that the department was amalgamated with the Customs. That is the only reduction in ten years, but under this government one French-speaking deputy minister has been retired in one year. So why is the hon. gentleman making that statement as to the old government?

Mr. RINFRET: I have not the least hesitation to present my case in another way, because the sooner we forget the old government the better.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is better to forget it than to say the wrong thing about it.

Mr RINFRET: I might put it this way, that during the ten years of the old regime our representation—because I speak for my compatriots—in the different departments as regards deputy ministers was below the standard I am now asking the new government—which is working very hard to right many of the wrongs of its predecessors—when it appoints a Deputy Postmaster General to give thought to the fact that at present the French-speaking people of this country are only represented in the departments by way of deputy ministers by the clerk of the Privy Council, Mr. Boudreau—who has the rank of a deputy minister but without the responsibility of a large department—and by Mr. Desbarats in the Department of National Defence—who is not a deputy minister, I understand, but who since his transfer to that department still retains the salary of a deputy minister. I do not wish to argue the point at length for it speaks for itself. I do not wish even to cast any aspersion on the past; I say again that the sooner we forget the past the better. But when the government of to-day appoints a Deputy Postmaster General I wish it would remember that there are in this country over two and a half million French Canadians who pay their taxes and who should certainly be allowed their proportion of representation in

the departments as anywhere else. That is my proposal.

Mr. GARDINER: Would the hon. member be satisfied to have appointed as deputy minister of the department a good Canadian?

Mr. RINFRET: I certainly would be satisfied in a general way; but I think there are good Canadians among the French Canadians; that is my point; and having a bilingual situation we must deal with it as it is. I believe you can find very good Canadians among the French Canadian employees of the Post Office Department. I will not mention any names, although I have brought some names to the attention of the government already. I am perfectly willing to admit the principle that we must have a good Canadian as Deputy Postmaster General, but I wish to protest against any condition where it seems that there are no good Canadians except among the other branch of our people. I strongly urge the government, I would not say exactly to appoint a French Canadian as Deputy Postmaster General, but in a more general and broad way to give the French-speaking people of this country their due representation in that grade of office.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Mr. Chairman, before the minister speaks I would like to say a few words anent the remarks of the hon. member for St. James (Mr. Rinfret). Towards the close he became very anxious to forget the subject that he emphasized so pointedly in the first half of his remarks, and begged us all to disregard it. He started to attack the late government and claimed that we had done an injustice to French Canadians in that we had reduced, as he said, almost to the vanishing point the number of French Canadian deputy ministers. He added that the present government was struggling hard to repair the errors of the old government, and he begged them in this particular case to do something to that end. I sought to call his attention to the fact that there was no reduction of French-speaking deputy ministers at all by the late government save in the case of one, and there also we made a reduction of one of the English-speaking deputy ministers, if not two. But the only reason that Mr. Vincent, who was a very competent deputy minister of the Inland Revenue department, was not continued was that the government amalgamated the office with that of the Customs, and very rightly so. I know the hon. member would not say that that was not the proper thing to do. Not only was that the only case, but Mr. Vincent was treated with absolute fairness by the government, as he himself would admit; I do not think any retiring deputy was ever treated more liberally. Now, the hon. member says that this government is struggling to repair those errors. All this government has done to repair them is to reduce three deputy ministers to two. There were three of French origin when we left office; there are two to-day. Is that not right? There was Sir Eugene Fiset, Deputy Minister of Militia; there was Mr. Desbarats, Deputy Minister of Naval Service; and Mr. Boudreau; there are now only the latter two. So that in the great struggle to repair the errors of the old government, described in such heroic language by my hon. friend, the result has been to diminish—and, as he would view it, to aggravate—the offence of the old government. I know that Sir Eugene Fiset is out not by way of any injustice to him at all—I presume at his own desire; I do not know—but in the amalgamation of the Department of Militia and the Department of Naval Service. All I object to is the continual effort of the hon. member, which, I am sorry to say, he has been guilty of for years, through the paper he edits in Montreal as well as on the floor of this House, to impute to the late government an animosity that never inspired it and that never was in evidence. That was purely a matter of political incitation at the hands of hon. members who sought political advantage by it. I join with the hon. member in the hope that he expresses: I hope that it will be possible to find a French-speaking deputy-minister for the Post Office Department. I know the principal need is to have an efficient man; the hon. member will agree that that should be paramount. But while we are a bilingual country, talk as we will, we cannot get away from the necessity, if we are to have content and good feeling throughout the Dominion, of dividing these important appointments in approximate proportion to the respective populations. We tried to follow that out; we succeeded in almost every respect. I know the contingencies were such that when we went out of office the French Canadians were not getting their fair share in respect to the deputy ministerships. It has to be the practice; no one has more frankly said so year in and year out than myself. Therefore I hope it will be possible in the Post Office Department that a discrepancy that was occasioned in small degree through ten years and in equal degree under this government in one year will be in some respects remedied. The hon. member speaks the whole truth when he says that he has made a recommendation. It is pretty well known through-

out this Dominion that he made a recommendation and that he got a rather curt refusal from the minister.

Mr. RINFRET: Oh, no.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It was not curt? It was a refusal, anyway, and it has not been accepted as entirely satisfactory by the friends of my hon. friend.

Mr. RINFRET: The matter is pending.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Well, it was pending in an unfortunate and rather harrowing way when that letter was written. Does the hon. member think there is still hope after that letter?

Mr. RINFRET: Well, I hope my hon. friend's remarks will not do away with that hope.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I hope not too. In fact, I will go further. I have an acquaintance with the gentleman the hon. member recommends. I not only have his personal acquaintance—not in any great degree, because he never was of my political faith; in fact, so far as I know he never was a political friend—but I have heard of him for many years and of his services in the department. For myself I know of no reason why he would not make an excellent deputy minister. I hope that will help my hon. friend.

Mr. GRAHAM: It might.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If it does, I shall be very much pleased. I earnestly hope that the trouble that has arisen over the matter will be patched up and that there will be no serious or permanent schism as a result. I rose only to state what I believed to be the principle that ought to be adopted and to express the earnest hope that something can be done to live up to it in the appointment of a deputy minister of this department.

Mr. GRAHAM: We are not on the civil government estimates, under which I suppose, the matter of the deputy minister might be dealt with. But as the item will probably go through without much discussion when we come to it, perhaps it is just as well that we should deal with it now. I may say that I know of no decision having been arrived at in the matter of the deputy ministership; none has been conveyed to me. My right hon. friend stated a truism in a three-cornered fashion when he intimated that this government had reduced the number of French-speaking deputies. But the fact is that this government did not do that. Sir Eugene Fiset, against my protest until his doctor's certificate was handed to me, insisted upon resigning. If at the end of his term of leave of absence his health should be sufficiently recovered to enable him to resume his work, nothing would delight me more, because he is one of the ablest deputies there ever was in this country.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If he had not resigned, Mr. Desbarats could not be deputy of the department; so there would have been a reduction anyway.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am not so sure about that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: How could you have one department and two deputies?

Mr. GRAHAM: It was so in the Marine and Fisheries department; there was a Deputy Minister of Naval Defence and a Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But the minister has made Naval Service and Militia one department. How can he have two deputies in one department?

Mr. GRAHAM: Under one ministerial head.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, there were two departments.

Mr. GRAHAM: I beg my right hon. friend's pardon.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I know it, and the minister knows it too.

Mr. GRAHAM: May I say a word? The bill I introduced in this House forming the amalgamation provided for two deputies. The Upper Chamber amended the bill so that that was impossible, but it was provided that Mr. Desbarats should be retained in the new department as controller of the finances with the salary of a deputy minister. When Sir Eugene Fiset insisted on obtaining leave of absence, which I reluctantly gave him on account of his great ability and long experience, Mr. Desbarats remained Deputy Minister of Naval Service and assumed the office of Acting Deputy Minister of the Department of Defence. He is now controller and acting deputy. He cannot be appointed deputy, because two men cannot draw salaries for the same position. Sir Eugene Fiset is still drawing salary. When his leave of absence expires, if he is not able to return to his work, it will be in order to appoint a new deputy. I simply wanted to make it clear that the government was reluctant to part with Sir Eugene Fiset and that it was at his own request he was given leave of absence. Now, I will direct the attention of the Postmaster Gen-

eral to the discussion which has taken place here to-night. I have a great deal of sympathy with the remarks of my hon. friend (Mr. Rinfret). In this country, where we have a bilingual situation, we who are in the majority must see to it that those in the minority have fair play in respect to these larger positions, because only by showing that spirit can we hope to have unity and amity throughout the country.

Mr. RINFRET: I do not wish to prolong this debate, but I would like to say this. I did not withdraw at all, as the right hon. leader of the Opposition suggests, from the position I first took, but as that was not my point I simply did not wish to stress it. I could mention very easily many cases both in the service and elsewhere where we claim we did not get justice from the late government, and I would not like the leader of the Opposition to-day to state that after making a mild statement at first, I was quite willing to withdraw. My only idea in not stressing the point was that it had little to do with the case I was presenting to the committee to-night.

The leader of the Opposition claims that when Mr. Vincent was withdrawn, he was well treated. I do not discuss that phase of the question. I will say, though, that when we claim a certain proportion of responsibility for French-Canadians in the service we are not thinking at all of any huge salary that may happen to be paid to one of them, but we are thinking of the responsibility for those under him, and even if Mr. Vincent was well provided for and I suppose he was, at the same time it meant a loss of responsibility and power for the element he was supposed to represent.

As for the present government, my right hon. friend himself will admit that it has only been in power a year and a half, so we cannot very well consider that it has yet had the opportunity to do all that it wanted to do. The reason why I am asking this government to give proportional representation in that sense is that I feel perfectly satisfied that it will in due time, and I am taking the first occasion that offers itself to bring the attention of the government to that point.

There is just another remark I would like to make before I sit down. My right hon. friend has said that in my paper, referring to Le Canada of Montreal, and in my speeches I never lose an opportunity or I often take occasion to raise prejudice and create bad feeling. That was his statement, if I am not mistaken. I am not prepared at all to admit that. I am expressing the views of a certain proportion of the population who do not share the views of my right hon. friend, but I always try to do it in a very moderate way and in a spirit of good understanding. I am ready to admit, however, that neither my paper nor any of my speeches are intended to please the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have sent for the statutes because I am afraid the statutes will be necessary to convince the minister that there were two departments. There was a Naval Service department and a Marine and Fisheries department. They were created at different times. They were not one department.

Mr. GRAHAM: They were under one minister.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly. Very frequently a minister has two departments. The Minister of the Interior has three to-day. The Minister of Interior is Minister of Mines; he is Superintendent-General of Indian Affairs, that is another department; he is Minister of the Interior. He is head of three departments with three deputy ministers. But the Minister of Militia made the Department of Militia and Defence and the Department of Naval Service, not two departments under one minister, but one department.

Mr. GRAHAM: It was intended to make them one department with two deputy heads.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That was the anomaly of the whole thing. You cannot have two deputy heads. The minister tried to do that and he was very readily cured. It was only a method of keeping the salary that was all. That was what the minister was after. What the minister objected to in my remarks and in which I was absolutely right is this. I said there were two departments not one. The Marine and Fisheries department was one and the Naval Service department was wholly different. I have before me the statutes now which I can read to the minister. The Naval Service was created by Chapter 43 9-10 Edward VII, and the first thing the act says is that there shall be a Department of Naval Service. There had been a Department of Marine and Fisheries years before that. It was created by chapter 45 of the statutes of 1906. No, that is the chapter marked by the Library staff, but it is not the one I sent for. The Marine and Fisheries department was created very many years ago, shortly after confederation. There were two departments under one minister, and there were two deputy ministers. The Minister of the Interior has now three deputy ministers, and quite properly, in fact four, for Immigration has been put under him. There are

11 p.m.

four different departments. That is a wholly different thing. But when the Minister of Militia took the responsibility of combining the Naval Service with Militia and Defence by that act he necessarily got rid not of a deputy minister from the service but of the office and salary of a deputy minister, because you can have only one deputy to a department. He did precisely the same as we had done with the Department of Customs and Inland Revenue. That is all I rose to say. I do not say he should not have done it; I do not say that at all, but when one complains of the result of our action in ten years I would point out that the same thing has resulted under this government in one year.

I have nothing further to say in answer to the hon. member (Mr. Rinfret). He was pretty fair in his reply. I certainly cannot dispute his initial statement that he could tell me of many cases where he claimed to be unjustly treated. I know he was continually claiming that almost every day for ten years.

Mr. SHAW: I do not know what particular item we are discussing, but I think this is perhaps an appropriate time to bring to the attention of the minister a suggestion which appears to me might have some merit in it. Under the law as it stands at present, public libraries I believe are entitled to a special postage rate on books sent out within a radius of fifty miles. That is a very desirable provision. The only point I wish to question is the limitation as to mileage. In eastern Canada I can quite understand that that limitation is very effective and perhaps meets the situation, but in western Canada with our great distances it is not, I think, working as satisfactorily. For instance, we have a public library at Edmonton and another at the city of Calgary, 190 miles away. The result is that with a fifty-mile zone, the libraries are not able to secure the advantage of the lessened postage rates, and consequently the reading public who might otherwise secure the advantage of books from public libraries are not able to secure them owing to the postage rates. My hon. friend from Edmonton reminds me that this is a very serious matter in the northern part of the province. The closest library is Edmonton, and the country to be served extends some three or four hundred miles north from that point. I rose simply for the purpose of suggesting to the minister that the zone be increased perhaps to one hundred miles. In that way no harm would be done in eastern Canada, but it would advantage the West very considerably.

Mr. GARDINER: I would like to refer back to a question that has been before the House already to-night. One or two members have made the statement that they have not been approached with regard to the appointments of postmasters where the salary has been under $200. I jokingly remarked that I had not been consulted in the matter, but perhaps I did not give the House a correct impression. I want to say that I have no desire to be consulted in the matter. I just wished to correct a mistaken impression some hon. members may have got from my remark. I would like to deal with that just for a moment. It would seem that the department is asking certain members of this House to make recommendations of the names of persons who, they think, would be capable of occupying these positions. Who is responsible for that? Who is going to be responsible for the appointment of that official in a position with a salary of $200? Does the department hold the member of parliament responsible for his recommendation? Or is the department going to hold itself responsible for that appointment? I maintain that, if they are asking the members of the House of Commons to recommend the names of people for those positions, the system is wrong, and we ought to get away from it as soon as we possibly can. I contend that where positions in small post offices become vacant the department should be responsible for seeing that a proper person is appointed to that particular vacancy, and it is not a question of a member of the House recommending any person for that particular vacancy. We must at all times hold the Post Office Department responsible for the appointments, and I hope and trust the department will get away from the species of petty patronage that has been introduced during the last twelve months.

Item agreed to.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King, the House adjourned at 11.05 p.m.

Friday, April 13, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

ROYAL ASSENT

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the following letter:

OTTAWA, April 13, 1923.

Sir,—I have the honour to inform you that the Right Hon. Sir Louis Davies, K.C.M.G., acting as Deputy of

the Governor General will proceed to the Senate Chamber this afternoon at four o'clock for the purpose of giving the royal assent to certain bills.

A. F. SLADEN,
Governor General's Secretary.

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. WILLIAM IRVINE (Calgary East): I should like to ask the government if they would consider permitting me to move the second reading of my bill on capital punishment before the end of the present session. I urge this request on the ground that on a previous occasion when the bill was called, I held it at the request of the Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin).

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I should like to have a word with the Minister of Justice before making a reply to my hon. friend. As soon as I have had that opportunity, I will give my hon. friend an answer.

HON. D. D. MACKENZIE

APPOINTMENT TO THE BENCH

On the Orders of the Day:

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): Yesterday the Prime Mininster declined to give the House any information as to retirements from the government. The statement persists in the press that the Solicitor General has retired and been appointed to the Bench. Why is not the House so informed?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am very sorry that my right hon. friend uses the word "declined". I had no intention of declining to give any information.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I asked it twice.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I misunderstood my right hon. friend. I beg his pardon. The former Solicitor General has retired. He has been appointed a judge of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia. That is the only retirement that there has been.

Mr. BUREAU: His resignation was read in the House yesterday. The right hon. member was not present.

MAPLE PRODUCTS

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. ANDREW McMASTER (Brome): I wish to bring the attention of the government to matters regarding the maple sugar industry which are d'actualité in our province.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. BUREAU: Very well.

Mr. McMASTER: The first is that in view of the low price of the article and the high price of firewood, maple trees are being cut down when they really should remain to be tapped. The association does not ask for the expenditure of money, on which fact they are to be congratulated, but merely that an educational campaign should be inaugurated, no doubt by the Department of Agriculture, to show the unwisdom of such proceeding. The second matter in connection with the same industry is that the Association of Maple Sugar and Syrup Producers complain that there are many infractions of the law at this time, and they would like to see the government move in the direction of a more exacting administration of the act under which maple sugar and maple syrup are administered.

Mr. BUREAU: The Pure Foods Act.

Mr. McMASTER (Translation): Yes, and as we now have a new Solicitor General, I think it is unnecessary to add much more, for a new broom sweeps clean.

Hon. H. S. BELAND (Translation): In answer to the first remarks made to the House by my hon. friend the member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) I wish to state that the present government has already taken the necessary measures to advertise the merit of products which are known as maple syrup and sugar. Last year an exhibition was held at Beauceville.

Mr. McMASTER (Translation): In what county is Beauceville to be found?

Mr. BELAND (Translation): In Beauce. This exhibition of maple products was generously subsidized by my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture. I have not heard it said that the producers of Brome county complained that prices of maple sugar were so depressed that this industry was no longer remunerative. I must however, add that the maple products of Beauce county are far superior to those of Brome county.

Mr. McMASTER (Translation): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I think that the hon. minister should not boost the county of Beauce to the detriment of the county of Brome.

Mr. BELAND (Translation): At all events, Mr. Speaker, taking a serious view of the matter, my hon. friend may rest assured that the Health department is taking all the necessary means to ensure a strict application of the act, so as to guarantee the purity of these products. Moreover, this question has

already been the subject of serious consideration by the House and all the hon. members are of the opinion that this industry should have the benefit of the government's entire co-operation.

SUPPLY

CIVIL SERVICE BONUS

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

Provisional bonus allowance for the inside and outside services of the Civil Service, to be paid to such persons and classes of persons, in such amounts and at such times as the Governor in Council may determine, $5,500,000.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): I would ask the attention of the committee to item 435, being a supplementary estimate to provide for the bonus to civil servants. It is just one item, and as there is a great deal of anxiety on the part of civil servants as to when it will be carried, I am going to ask the committee to assent to it now before we take up the estimates of my hon. friend the Acting Postmaster General (Mr. Graham).

Mr. HANSON: Has the government given any consideration to the question of making permanent the bonus that is at present paid to civil servants of the lower classes? I have had a great many requests from members of the outside service particularly asking me to support a resolution of that character. I have not so far arrived at any conclusion on the subject and I think there should be a declaration of policy from the government.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The government has not felt that the present is an opportune time to consider any final revision of salaries, largely for the reason that this year there have been exceptional conditions affecting the cost of living, such for example as the high price of coal which obtained last year. The government thought that under the circumstances it would be advisable to continue the bonus as paid last year, but during the recess which will follow after this session the whole question of the revision of salaries of civil servants will be taken into consideration.

Mr. HANSON: Then the government has no policy on the subject?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is the policy.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This is the same bonus as given last year and two years ago?

Mr. FIELDING: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is a cost of living bonus?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It is not quite the same as that which was given two years ago. The bonus paid last year was similiar to that of the previous year, with certain exceptions which were mentioned at the time; but this year it is the same as last year's.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is as much as it was two years ago?

Mr. FIELDING: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does not the government think it would be a great deal better to reduce the cost of living and thereby get rid of the bonus?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is what we are trying to do.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I hope the government is satisfied with its progress—

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Oh yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: —in reducing the cost of living.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It is coming down.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The government's own records show it is up going. The government in its struggle to go forward is apparently going back.

Mr. FIELDING: Every day in every way—

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: You are getting worse.

Mr. BUREAU: We are getting better.

Mr. IRVINE: Is it a fact that civil servants with dependents receive a larger salary than those without dependents?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend says "salary;" no doubt he means the bonus which we are now discussing. If he is referring to the bonus, it is true that civil servants having dependents are entitled to a larger bonus than those without dependents.

Mr. IRVINE: This applies, I take it, only to civil servants whose dependents are in Canada. I understand that those civil servants who have dependents overseas in Great Britain do not come within this class. I want to make this point, that while this is an excellent provision in behalf of civil servants, there are certain cases in which it is a distinct hardship to withhold the bonus from employees whose dependents happen to be overseas. I

know some civil servants whose mothers are too ill to leave the Old Country and the bonus is on that account withheld.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The whole bonus scheme has been worked out by the Civil Service Commission, and no doubt if the point which my hon. friend has raised were brought to its attention it would receive consideration by the commission.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The government cost of living statistics show that since March, 1922, the cost of living has steadily risen. But not only do the government statistics and the curve of the Labour department, which I shall have in a moment, reveal this fact, but the statistics of Dun, of Professor Michell of McMaster University, and indeed all other Canadian statistics, show exactly the same thing. The curve of the cost of living is now about one point and three quarters higher than it was when the government brought down its budget a year ago. The descent of the cost of living which commenced in July, 1920, and which was precipitate all through 1921, was arrested the very day this government assumed power. However, it resumed very slowly for about two months; but when the budget was brought down and went into effect it commenced to rise. It has risen ever since and is rising now; and it has risen most substantially in the last year. May I ask the government what change of policy they purpose adopting to reverse the effect of the policy they now actually have in operation?

Mr. ROBB: I might ask my hon. friend a question, seeing that he has the information before him. Is it not true that different economists who have advanced the view that the cost of living is going up say that the largest percentage of the increase is attributable in the first place to rent, and in the second place to coal?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Well, I was not discussing the causes; and as a matter of fact these are not the causes, these are elements. Rents are going up, coal is going up and wholesale commodities are also going up. I know that coal and rent are going up and in this country are very likely to continue to do so. But the government abandoned the unemployed last winter with the result that they drifted across to the United States, and now there is no one to build. We cannot improve our housing facilities without mechanics, and we are without them; they are now citizens of the United States.

Mr. BUREAU: Those who want to build can build. They have the mechanics and the labourers down my way and they are building there.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am sorry to say my hon. friend is wrong. There are portions of Canada that are virtually without mechanics altogether.

Mr. BUREAU: Portions?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes. There are portions that are wholly stripped of mechanics.

Mr. BUREAU: Where the calamity howlers live.

Mr. MEIGHEN: So from what we have heard from the Minister of Trade and Commerce there does not appear to be very much hope for the immediate future. He will remember how his Minister of Labour complained in 1921 of the noble struggle that he had made to get the cost of living down and to take from profiteers that fraction that should be added to the earnings of the workingman. He was wholly unsuccessful, as he stated, notwithstanding that fact that all through that period, from the middle of 1920 right to the end of 1921, there was a very rapid descent of the cost of living curve. He was not satisfied and complained that he was only allowed a wooden gun with which to go out after profiteers and get the cost of living down. Perhaps his colleagues or the Prime Minister will explain what kind of a gun he has had since. He has been much less successful. In fact, the operation that was well under way was arrested immediately he got into office and the reverse process has been in operation ever since and looks as if it would continue for some time. The cost of living in Canada, even at its worst, was lower according to official figures than the cost of living even in the United States and much lower than in other countries. That was the case right up to the time of the coming into power of this government. I do not think that can be said to be the case to-day. I think it will be found that the cost of living in the United States, making allowance for the difference in the method of calculation, is to-day lower than here, and our prospects for the immediate future, considering the process that has gone on in the way of the depletion of our workingmen, are not good. I should like to have the government's view of this question, as to what kind of gun they purpose giving the Minister of Labour from this on that will be an improvement upon the weapon that he has had; and as to when they expect to succeed in the noble struggle they are making against the cost of

living, so that we will not be faced with this vote continuously for years to come.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: As respects the operation of economic laws, I think my right hon. friend will recognize that cause and effect do not operate simultaneously, but that usually the effect of the operation of certain causes is only experienced at some later period. He says that the moment this government took office the cost of living began to rise. If that was the case it must have been due to causes that were set in motion while my right hon. friend was in office.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not say that. I said that the descent that took place while we were in office was arrested. It proceeded to go down a little for about three months until the government's budget went into operation, after which it immediately proceeded to rise. It is quite true it was a case of cause and effect: the government's budget was the immediate cause, and the high cost of living is the effect.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The only defect in my right hon. friend's reasoning is that his operation of cause and effect is a little more instantaneous than that which is commonly observed in regard to economic forces. Any study of economic questions will reveal that these matters are not worked out in a week, a month or even a series of months; indeed sometimes they cover several years.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What was the cause of the great descent through 1921?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Occasionally special causes operate and help to explain special conditions. The increased cost of living this past winter would almost seem to be elementary in its explanation to anyone who appreciates the important part that coal plays in the cost of production and the general cost of living. As my right hon. friend knows, Canada has need of coal earlier in the season than the United States, our need of coal extends over a longer period, and the increase in its cost increases the cost of transportation, the cost of manufacture, the cost of running retail establishments, the cost of management of households—it enters into every particular that one can have regard to dealing with the economic situation. Under those circumstances it was inevitable that the cost of living curve should be higher this year than possibly in previous years. There may be other explanations, but I think this is an all-sufficient one to account for any exceptional rise this year.

Mr. HANSON: How does the Prime Minister figure out that there has been an increased cost in the price of coal? Speaking for the Maritime provinces, where we use very largely soft coal, I can assure him that coal has been much cheaper during the entire year than it was a year ago. That coal goes as far west as Montreal and supplies the manufacturing establishments of the province of Quebec and of the Maritime provinces. I cannot speak for the province of Ontario, but I would advise the right hon. gentleman that there was no scarcity of coal for manufacturing purposes in the eastern provinces, and that there was not only no increase in the cost, but an actual decrease both in the cost of production and the freight rates, due to a special rate having been put into effect as far west as Montreal.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend has referred to "cost" all the way through. I do not know whether he intends to refer to price, but if he means the price of coal I do not think he need go beyond this chamber to have every hon. member present witness to the circumstance that the increase in the price of coal has been very considerable all through this past winter.

Mr. FORKE: Mr. Chairman, I should like to make a suggestion to the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen). I think we have a very good gun in this part of the House for reducing the cost of living, and I hope the right hon. gentleman, probably next week, will help us supply some of the ammunition.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If I help the hon. gentleman to supply it I am afraid the reverse effect would take place. I was warned only last night that my support always turned the government the other way. I shall watch with great interest the operation of the hon. gentleman's efforts on the budget this session, but I would remind him that the big factor in the increased cost of living is the 50 per cent increase in the sales tax. That is the main legislative cause of the higher cost of living. The Prime Minister is now very deferential to the effect of economic law and world forces and cause and effect. I cannot recall those words falling from his lips in the discussion of 1921. Then those things were wholly absent. It was altogether a case of enabling the present Minister of Labour to have a gun to go after profiteers. But what I want to emphasize is that not only in respect to rent and coal which he mentions now—the latter of which only in a certain portion of Canada and as to one

class has risen in value at all—but as respects food stuffs, clothing and the essential factors and necessaries of life the cost of living has continuously risen since the hon. gentlemen took the treasury benches and put their taxation measures into effect. That has been the result ever since, and as a consequence we are called upon to vote five and a half million dollars to-day, and next year we will be called upon to vote the same amount according to present tendencies. Now, will the Prime Minister or any member of his government state when they hope by the success of their anti-cost of living operations to get rid of this vote?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My right hon. friend says that the vote is increased so much this year over the period during which he held office.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, I did not say that. I said that we are called upon to vote this much this year for the cost of living bonus. This is virtually the same as we had in 1921, and it is the same as we had last year. In 1921 the cost of living was rapidly going down; now it is rising. I know that prior to that time the cost of living was higher than it is now, but I also know that relatively to other countries of the world it was lower in Canada that it is to-day. That is how the government is to be tested—by its own policy.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Before I answer my right hon .friend, will he admit that the sum we are asking to-day for bonus is virtually the same as it was in 1921?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I will admit that the Prime Minister said so himself. I asked him at the opening of this discussion.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Well, I have the figures before me now, and I can give my right hon. friend the exact information. In 1920-21 my right hon. friend asked the House, for the purposes of the cost of living bonus, for an appropriation of $12,500,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That was three years ago

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am keeping to the 1921 period, which was the one my right hon. friend referred to, and is the period during which his government was in office. He asked parliament then for an appropriation of $12,500,000, of which his government spent in bonus $10,588,890.

Mr. BUREAU: With the cost of living going down.

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: In 1921-22—that includes the other part of 1921—he asked parliament for an appropriation of $9,375,000, of which his government spent in bonus $7,710,264. When this government came into office we asked for an appropriation for bonus of $5,500,000 as against the $9,375,000 that my right hon. friend had asked for one year and the $12,500,000 he had asked for the year before. This year we are asking for the same amount as last year, namely, $5,500,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The amount spent two years ago was about the same. The amount asked for now is some five millions and a half. The Prime Minister stated at the opening of the discussion that this was the same cost of living bonus as that of a year ago and as that of two years ago, save in respect to certain adjustments that had been made of a detailed character. He will find, if he goes into it, that it is the same; naturally as we recede from the war it does not apply on as large a volume. It did not apply last year on as large as the year before because of the reduction in staff that we had made in 1921. But the cost of living bonus to-day to the individual is virtually the same as it was two years ago, and if this process continues the government is going to have to increase it.

Mr. SHAW: In view of the admitted increase in the cost of living over that of last year, has the government considered the advisability of increasing this vote for the present year? In any event, upon what reasoning has the decision been arrived at that the bonus should not be increased over that of last year?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The bonus was never intended to correspond automatically with the increase or decrease in the cost of living. It is a general allowance intended to meet exceptional circumstances. The government thinks that having regard to the possible further reduction in the cost of living before the year is much further advanced, this amount will be quite sufficient for the purpose.

Item agreed to.

Resolution reported and concurred in.

The House resumed in Committee of Supply.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Civil government—Post Office—salaries and contingencies, $1,271,448.

Mr. BUREAU: I move that item 19 be amended by inserting after the word "salaries" the words, "including Superintendent of Mail Contracts at $5,400 per annum." These words appeared in the estimates as prepared but

were inadvertently omitted from the printed estimates. The amount of the vote is not affected, as the increase made is already provided for in the item.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I would like to ask the minister how much he is being helped to-day in one of his three activities—his postal activities—by his genial friend the Minister of Customs and Excise.

Mr. BUREAU: To the extent of moving the resolution.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Now we have got step number one. I want to know how much money is being credited to the Post Office Department which is taken in by way of taxation not connected with the postal service?

Mr. BUREAU: We have carried on the same system that was put in force by my hon. friend when he was administering the War Measures Act. I have no hesitation in saying that it would be a good thing to provide that excise stamps should be used to pay excise taxes and postage stamps to pay postal charges. My hon. friend knows that it is very difficult to estimate how much money is—I will not say wrongly, but not exactly rightly collected—by my hon. friend the Postmaster General that ought to be credited to Customs and Excise.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What my hon. friend says is quite true as to the commencement of things. But where we then used one stamp for purposes not connected with the Post Office, to-day anywhere from five to twenty are used. Besides that, there are the stamps used on receipts, which have nothing to do with the postal service; so that the use of stamps for these purposes has been enormously multiplied. Surely the department has some idea how much of the revenues are properly attributable to their own activities and how much to the postal service.

Mr. BUREAU: It is impossible to make any definite accounting in this respect. Either postal or excise stamps may be used for all these purposes which are not connected with postal charges, and unless you make an audit of everybody's books, the accounts of the banks, and so on, you cannot tell how many postage stamps have been used on cheques, receipts, etc. Under the present system that cannot be done. You might arrive at a kind of average. I take it that there is no increase in the volume of business done by the Post Office Department to account for any substantial increase in revenue.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There has been really none, as I understand it. The volume of mail carried is practically the same as a year or two years ago; indeed, less than three years ago undoubtedly.

Mr. BUREAU: To do that we would have to ascertain the revenue of the Post Office three years ago and say that the balance comes from excise, but that would not be an accurate estimate. We cannot do that as the law stands to-day. I would ask nothing better than to change the law so that every excise duty would be payable with an excise stamp. Then we could know the revenue we were getting out of stamps, but as it is now, we cannot. Would the people stand for such a change in the law? Would they say it was too much inconvenience to carry excise stamps in their pockets as well as postage stamps? I do not know. I would be willing to take a chance on that, in order that the revenue could be credited where it belongs, and that could be done if we had postage stamps for postal business and excise stamps for excise duties.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My latter question, in fact, all the questions were addressed to the Acting Postmaster General.

Mr. BUREAU: You wanted to know how far the excise tax was responsible, and I wanted to help by stating the case.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am quite willing to admit that my hon. friend is of great assistance in any cause in which he is engaged.

Mr. BUREAU: Do not get sarcastic. It is your law that is there when it comes to customs; the mistake is yours.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I still say that I was talking to the Acting Postmaster General. Now we can arrive approximately at what we are after. For example, what was the amount of mail matter carried during each of the three last years? Knowing that, and knowing that there is no change whatever in the rates for carrying it, we can get a pretty good approximate idea of how much excise has helped out the Post Office Department.

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Acting Postmaster General): It is very difficult to get at an accurate statement for the reasons mentioned by the Minister of Customs. I have some sympathy, as a private individual, with the suggestion of the Minister of Customs that these two things should be kept separate and that the Customs and Excise department should get credit for receipts from the stamp tax for which it is responsible; but

as Acting Postmaster General I take umbrage against it. As a matter of fact, I think the amount received from the war tax last year appears in the Postmaster General's report, it is about $7,400,000, if I remember correctly.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend knows that is not covering the question at all.

Mr. GRAHAM: I thought that was exactly what my hon. friend asked me—how much was received by the Post Office Department on account of sale of stamps used under the war tax.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend has not quite got the point. He has a war tax of his own, and he shows the war tax of his department in his report. Am I wrong in that? What I was asking was the amount of stamp revenue which you got under these other war measures of taxation. I think the minister will find I am right.

Mr. GRAHAM: I took the figures in the Postmaster General's report, where the revenue from the war tax is given as about $7,400,000. It does not say that it represents the one cent extra of postage. I think it is an estimate of the amount from the entire sale of stamps on account of war tax. Whether that includes the stamp tax as we have it in the other form, I do not know. If it does not, I can see no way of getting the information, unless we give an approximate estimate.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Might I suggest that the acting minister ask his representative here, who I suppose knows something about the department, as to how that amount is made up?

Mr. GRAHAM: I am informed that this item in the Postmaster General's report refers to the proportional increase in the postal revenue from the increased letter postage.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then I understand that we are at one on that. The minister now knows that this extra amount raised and shown in the report has nothing whatever to do with stamps on cheques and stamps on receipts, but is merely the extra cent put on postage. We are on common ground there.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is approximately it, I suppose.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not know whether it is approximately it or not. Surely you know. I ask who this gentleman is that is advising the minister.

Mr. GRAHAM: He is one of the officials of the Post Office Department, and a very efficient man.

[Mr. Graham.]

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Which official? I want to know if he is the gentleman who is running the department now.

Mr. GRAHAM: He is chief clerk in the Secretary's branch in charge of estimates.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Might I ask whether the gentleman is running the department now?

Mr. GRAHAM: He is in charge of the estimates, and very properly so.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am not saying anything against the gentleman. I am sure he is absolutely all right. I just want to know for information. If he is not running the department, who is?

Mr. GRAHAM: So far as responsibility to the country is concerned, the Acting Postmaster General.

Mr. BUREAU: Hear, hear. Good doctrine.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Now so far as the work goes, who is running the department?

Mr. GRAHAM: Each branch is carrying on its work as usual, reporting to the acting minister instead of to the minister, who is absent through illness.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I thought they usually report to the deputy, and the deputy to the minister. Who are the sub-heads reporting to now?

Mr. GRAHAM: Mr. Murphy, no relation of the minister, is acting deputy minister, and Mr. Coolican is general superintendent of the postal service.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Now will the minister kindly tell me what the amount of mail carried was, the weight of the mail last year?

Mr. GRAHAM: I have not the particulars of that here. The mails are not weighed altogether. Under the new arrangement a great deal of mail is carried by the square foot; it is carried on the space basis, and not weighed.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am perfectly willing to help the minister in every possible way. If he wants to give the information by the square foot let us have it by the square foot. If he cannot give it by pounds, let us have it by the square foot, or any way he likes to give it.

Mr. HANSON: By the gallon.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: By the gallon perhaps.

Mr. BUREAU: That is my measure.

Mr. GRAHAM: That would be the most popular measure, I presume. As a matter of fact, I have not that information here. I could put the accountants to work and get it in a few days, but that information has never been asked for in the House before in connection with the estimates. It is the expenditure, rather than the square foot or the number of pounds, that the country is interested in.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I have always thought that there was a record kept of the volume of business done, and I think my hon. friend will find that such a record is kept in the department. I have even seen the totals of the letters handled in different offices given at different times.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is the amount, not the tons.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then we will take the amount. If my hon. friend does not want to give me the information by weight, or by the square foot, will he give me the number of letters handled last year?

Mr. GRAHAM: We have not the information, though as I said before, we might get it by putting accountants to work and going through various returns, but that kind of information was never before contemplated as likely to be asked for in this House; it never was dreamed of. I know what my hon. friend is trying to get at. He is trying to find out, if I understand him, what the return would be from stamps used otherwise than on letters.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Certainly. In other words we want to know your postal business and we cannot get the information.

Mr. GRAHAM: I have been asking that question for some days in connection with the Customs department, because my hon. friend and myself have several times discussed the point as to what the proportion of money received from the stamp tax was. Now the Post Office Department sells these postage stamps but there is no way of discovering where or how the revenue should go. A stamp vendor anywhere in the country sells his stamps to John Smith, and John Smith may put those stamps on cheques or he may put them on letters. Of course an estimate might be made. If we had the receipts from the stamps which are placed on cheques we could find out then how much money is received from that source. There is this other fact: the stamp vendors get a percentage of their sales.

Mr. HANSON: The matter then amounts to this—that the minister is not in a position to say to-day whether there is a deficit or whether there is a surplus in the operation of the Post Office Department. I mention this because the Postmaster General himself, has, on various occasions, inspired the publication of items in newspapers supporting the administration to the effect that owing to the great economies which he has effected in the department he has realized a fine surplus. Now we know that the claim is false, the assumption is untrue, it cannot possibly be justified for the reasons which the Acting Postmaster General has given.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is a fact that the business done in 1922, by all the tests that could be applied would certainly be not more and would probably be somewhat less than in 1921. All the other tax returns of the government would go to establish it. Now, assuming that, we must at least infer that the increased revenue this year over last year is due to the increased stamp tax for the nine months. That increased revenue, as I recall, is between three and four million dollars—about $3,000,000. That would be equivalent to something over $4,000,000 for the entire year. So that the government, by these extra taxes, is taking that amount
4 p.m. of money yearly from the pockets of the people. This has caused the Postmaster General periodically to make newspaper exclamations regarding the magnificent management of the Post Office Department, and afforded stump speakers, including hon. members opposite, in by-elections the only thing that had even the outward appearance of an argument in favour of the contention that they were able to present. I heard many and many a time about the magnificent management of the Post Office Department, in that we had a surplus this year. I really felt some compassion for the Minister of Customs (Mr. Bureau) when his colleague was taking the credit for taxes that he had assumed the onus of putting on. It did not seem quite fair to me that the Postmaster General should be boasting before the whole Dominion that he had been able to produce a surplus in that department because of the mere fact that the Excise department was taxing the people at the rate of $4,000,000 a year extra for stamps. It costs nothing to sell these stamps, or virtually nothing. Notwithstanding that though, the cost of management of the Post Office Department is annually increasing. The estimates this year show an amount very substantially more than last year. I would not think it should be more at all, because these stamps cost nothing to sell; what costs

in the Post Office Department is the handling of mail and mail matter. The fact, then, appears to be that instead of having more economical management we have had less; and instead of having a modest, truthful presentation of the facts we have had periodical boasting which really is nothing more than claiming credit for taxing the people.

Mr. GRAHAM: It is a mistake to think that it does not cost anything to sell stamps, but that is immaterial. It sometimes costs 50 per cent, and in other instances 20 per cent.

Mr. HANSON: That commission goes against the salaries.

Mr. GRAHAM: The fact is it costs money to sell these stamps.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Take it all through, it does not require 10 per cent to sell the stamps or near that.

Mr. GRAHAM: I have not figured out the average. In a good many cases it costs 20 per cent, in others 40 per cent, and in others again 50 per cent; I do not think there is any question about it. I am not trying to pretend that the Post Office revenue has not been swollen by the stamp tax, I admit it has, but to what extent I have been unable to find out. I have tried in various ways to ascertain, but there does not seem to be any system of accounting to cover that point—that is any system which makes a distinction between the two classes of stamps. The revenue of the Post Office Department must, of necessity, be swollen considerably by the sale of stamps that are not used for postage.

Mr. MacLAREN: Where is the printing done?

Mr. GRAHAM: The stamps are printed by the American Bank Note Company under contract with the Finance department.

Mr. MacLAREN: But the other printing business, where is that done?

Mr. GRAHAM: At the Printing bureau.

Mr. MacLAREN: Is it all done there?

Mr. GRAHAM: I imagine it is practically all done there.

Mr. MacLAREN: I am given to understand that there is some printing done outside the Printing bureau. Can the minister inform me as to that?

THE ROYAL ASSENT

SITTING SUSPENDED FOR ROYAL ASSENT TO BILLS

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

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

Accordingly the House went up to the Senate,

And having returned,

Mr. Speaker informed the House that the Deputy of His Excellency the Governor General had been pleased to give in His Majesty's name the Royal Assent to the following bills:

An Act to provide for further advances to the Vancouver Harbour Commissioners.
An Act for the relief of Margaret Elizabeth Moran.
An Act for the relief of Ethel Lillian Duncan.
An Act for the relief of Florence Mary Ramsden.
An Act for the relief of Ross John Craig.
An Act for the relief of Florence Dodds.
An Act for the relief of Blanche Hilton.
An Act for the relief of May Woodbridge.
An Act for the relief of Alice May Smith.
An Act for the relief of Albert Ernest Mould.
An Act for the relief of Winifred Rose Foster.
An Act for the relief of Emily May Small.
An Act for the relief of Irene Herdsman.
An Act for the relief of John Frederick King Hall.
An Act for the relief of Herbert Martin.
An Act for the relief of Frederick John Saunders.
An Act for the relief of Robert Archibald Logan.
An Act for the relief of Violet Marie Finn.
An Act for the relief of Harriet Ethelwin Kingsley.
An Act for the relief of Ernest Warren Porter.
An Act for the relief of May Elizabeth Meng.
An Act for the relief of Maud Vera Butler.
An Act for the relief of Lillian Black.
An Act for the relief of Florence Elizabeth McDonald.
An Act for the relief of Gretta Melville.
An Act to incorporate The Alert Guarantee Company of Canada.
An Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the financial year ending the 31st March 1924.

SUPPLY

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The House resumed in Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

Civil government—Post Office—salaries and contingencies, $1,271,448.

Mr. GRAHAM: I think I am in a position now to give fairly accurately the information sought for in reference to the probable amount of revenue derived from the stamp tax this year in excess of that of last year. Last year the whole issue of stamps was approximately $28,000,000. This year it is estimated that at the end of the year it will be about $29,750,000. That is the issue. The officials have estimated that the sale this year will exceed the sale of last year by about $1,250,000.

Mr. NEILL: I would ask the minister, if I might, why he does not compel the public to put revenue stamps on their cheques? Last year the government imposed a very heavy tax in the way of stamps to be placed on cheques, and this was done by means of putting

on ordinary postage stamps. Had the government compelled the public at very small inconvenience—or, as I hold, at practically no inconvenience—to buy revenue stamps, the confusion which we have been talking about all afternoon would have been avoided, because each branch would then have its revenue properly credited to it, and the work would be done a great deal cheaper. When you buy stamps to put on your cheque in a country town the post office official gets from 30 to 40 per cent of their face value. This is his commission; in other words, we are imposing a tax upon the public and are paying 30 to 40 per cent for the cost of collecting this particular tax. Take any other tax, such as the income tax, and you will find that the government will claim that the collection can be made for from 3 to 4 per cent. Why is not this system adopted in connection with this particular tax for the collection of which we are paying between 30 and 40 per cent? The public could easily use revenue stamps and this would entail no inconvenience and no confusion. It may be claimed that it would be inconvenient and confusing, but this is not so, because when a man buys one class of stamps at the post office he can equally as well buy the other class. Moreover we have precedent to back us up. When the late government first introduced the tax, which was then a small one, it was provided that revenue or postage stamps might be affixed to cheques. But unfortunately the matter was left optional, and when anyone went to the post office he had the privilege of using either an excise stamp or the ordinary stamp. The postmaster of course, got 40 per cent on the postage stamps while he got only one per cent on the sale of the revenue or excise stamps, and like most people he pushed the sale of the article on which he was getting the bigger profit. You might say you wanted revenue stamps and he would reply that postage stamps would do just as well and would add that he was short of revenue stamps. In the course of a few months therefore there was practically no sale for the revenue stamps. The mistake the government made at that time was in not making it compulsory for the public to use revenue stamps. The postmaster gets only one per cent on the sale of the revenue stamps, which can also be purchased from the banks, who get the same commission. If the government adopted exclusively the system of compelling the public to buy revenue stamps to put on cheques the inconvenience would be very slight and the profit to the country would be considerable. Besides this, all the confusion and dispute as to where the money should be allocated would be obviated. I would ask the minister if there is any reason that he knows of in connection with the carrying out of this business why that system should not be adopted.

Mr. GRAHAM: The only reason I have heard advanced against the system is the one of inconvenience to the public. There is a great difference of opinion upon that point. The average person buys postage stamps, and when people wish to issue cheques, in many cases the only place where they can get stamps keeps only the one kind. When the postage stamp is used for both purposes there is no confusion. It has been suggested to me that, under the conditions detailed by my hon. friend, the ordinary individual who used very few revenue stamps and a great many postage stamps might find himself putting revenue stamps on letters in spite of all his care, and putting postage stamps on cheques. Whether that reason is real or imaginary I am not prepared to say, but it is advanced at any rate. I might add that the public do not like taxes anyway, and if you impose them in the most inconvenient form they are annoying to say the least. There is a great deal to be said, however, in favour of having separate stamps for the two purposes. It would enable the Finance department or the Excise department to know exactly how effective any particular tax was. Take, for instance, the receipt tax. Under present conditions it is impossible accurately to state the revenue from the tax receipts. It can, of course, be estimated, but at best it is only an estimate, because the postage stamps that pass through the Postal department are used on these receipts. If there were a revenue stamp in use there would be no question at all, and the accounts between the Postal department and the Inland Revenue department would be cleancut, and we should have no discussion such as has taken place this afternoon in regard to the proper allocation of revenue. There is a good deal to be said on both sides. The Minister of Customs (Mr. Bureau) has had the matter under advisement for a considerable time, and had the Postmaster General (Mr. Murphy) been in good health and in the city they would probably have had some conferences concerning it. In the meantime I think I might say that on his return the matter will be discussed with the Minister of Customs because, as I have observed, there is much to be said on either side of the question. Certainly, from the standpoint of the accountants of the Finance department, it would be a great advantage to know what taxes were equitable

and were really producing income, and this result would no doubt be effected by the use of separate stamps.

Mr. NEILL: I would point out that it is no more embarrassing for a man to buy at the post office one dollar's worth of postage stamps and one dollar's worth of revenue stamps than it is for him to ask for a dollar's worth of 3-cent stamps and a dollar's worth of 2-cent stamps. He can do the one as easily as the other. I would point out also that although the method I have suggested might be slightly inconvenient, which I do not think it would be, the general public are getting educated, and if they knew, as they do know and as they realize, that the present method of collecting the tax is costing them 40 per cent whereas it would cost them only one per cent under the other system, they would undoubtedly put up with the trivial inconvenience that might be involved.

Mr. FORKE: Why does it cost only 1 per cent to sell revenue stamps and as high as 40 per cent to sell postage stamps? I would hesitate a good while before I would change the present system, because I think there is a good deal in what the Acting Postmaster General says about the inconveniences such a change would be to the public. The amount of money that is gathered for revenue through the use of postage stamps on cheques is, I believe, somewhat exaggerated, for all the large business organizations use revenue stamps, and it is only in the smaller businesses and among private individuals that postage stamps are used for revenue purposes. I can quite understand the Minister of Customs (Mr. Bureau) objecting to the present method—I do not know whether he does or not, as a matter of fact—but it would be quite natural for him to do so, because apparently the Postmaster General now gets credit for revenue that is not rightfully his. I do not believe the amount involved is very large after all. Perhaps the minister can tell us why it should cost from 10 to 40 per cent to sell postage stamps? It seems to me an exorbitant amount for the business done.

Mr. GRAHAM: The major part of the salaries of country postmasters is paid by commission on the sale of stamps.

Mr. FORKE: Then we will remember that in the estimates.

Mr. GRAHAM: If a country postmaster were selling revenue stamps for the Customs department he would only get paid really a commission on such sales, while in the other case he is paid in a measure for handling the mail as well by a percentage commission on the sale of postage stamps. In the city offices where stated salaries of a reasonable amount are paid the vendor of stamps gets I think from one to two per cent.

Mr. MacLAREN: Has the minister yet the detailed information on the question I asked in reference to the post office printing?

Mr. GRAHAM: We give our orders to the Printing bureau. The bureau supplies the printing to the postal department. For the most part, if not all, the bureau does the printing itself.

Mr. MacLAREN: Does the postal department arrange for its own printing outside of the Printing bureau?

Mr. GRAHAM: No. The practice is for the postal printing to be handed to the Printing bureau. The only order given outside direct by the postal department was for a convention programme.

Mr. MacLAREN: My information is that some of the post office printing is done outside of the Printing bureau. With the exception of these convention programmes does the minister state that all the printing for the postal department is done either through the Printing bureau or by the latter arranging it to be done outside?

Mr. GRAHAM: That is my information.

Mr. MacLAREN: Would the minister make some further investigation on that point? Of course, my information may be incorrect, but I am informed that some printing is done on the order of the Post Office Department outside of the Printing bureau.

Mr. GRAHAM: What is it?

Mr. MacLAREN: Are all money orders printed through the Printing bureau?

Mr. GRAHAM: That is what I thought my hon. friend had in mind. I am informed that the printing of money orders is done through the Printing bureau and not direct by the postal department.

Mr. BOYS: I should certainly like to support the suggestion that revenue stamps be put upon cheques and receipts, but I think it would be a great mistake to compel the public to put a two-cent postage stamp and a one-cent revenue stamp upon letters. Such a regulation would lead to no end of inconvenience, would arouse a lot of adverse criticism throughout the country, and would not secure the information that we have been seeking. If you had revenue stamps on

cheques and receipts, and restricted postage stamps to letters, the department could take one-third of the revenue from postage stamps and treat it as belonging to the Department of Customs, which would give us the information we are after now. But I am sure the public would view with disfavour any suggestion of having to put a two-cent stamp of one variety and a one-cent stamp of another variety upon every letter for delivery outside of their own town.

Mr. GRAHAM: I agree with my hon. friend that such a regulation would be objectionable. The revenue stamp tax as we may call it could be kept separate, but I do not think it would be advisable to divide the postage of letters.

Mr. BOYS: The reason I interjected my observation was because I rather thought the suggestion of the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill) was that a man might go to the wicket of a post office and buy one hundred two-cent stamps of one variety and one-hundred one-cent stamps of another variety, and I presumed his idea was that the purchaser would put a two-cent stamp and a one-cent stamp of each variety on his letters. That is what I want to protest against. It would lead to no end of inconvenience, and I am satisfied it would not prove popular.

Mr. NEILL: Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman does small credit to the common sense of the member for Comox-Alberni if he thinks that that is what I suggested.

Mr. MacLAREN: What objection is there to following the British method in regard to stamps, a method which has been in use for such a long period?

Mr. GRAHAM: What is the English practice?

Mr. MacLAREN: They have a revenue stamp for revenue purposes, and a postage stamp for postal purposes.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is really what I think the Minister of Customs is endeavouring to get, so that he will have his revenue absolutely separated from the revenue of the Post Office Department. When the Postmaster General returns I imagine that the customs collector will call upon him the same afternoon concerning this matter, as he has been pressing quite hard to have some new arrangement adopted to accomplish this purpose.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I understand from my hon. friend that the Postmaster General is returning home. When is he expected?

Mr. GRAHAM: The Prime Minister intimated the other night that the Postmaster General would not be back until after the middle of May. In his present state of health his doctor is very doubtful if he will be able to return even then.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The whole result is that nothing will be done, because you cannot pass any legislation after the House prorogues.

Mr. BUREAU: I will try to get something done before that time.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: As this matter has nothing whatever to do with postal administration, it is hardly a good excuse to shelve it until the Postmaster General comes back. This has nothing to do with the postal service; it relates to special taxation, and I do not see why the matter should stand until the return of the Postmaster General—which means simply shelving it. I hope that, as the Minister of Customs suggests, an effort will be made to put our accounts in more business-like shape. Not only is it the fact that when but one stamp was necessary for cheques the volume of income attributable to the sale of stamps for other than postal services was negligible compared to what it is now, but in the case of banks and other corporations the stamps were for the most part embossed on the cheques, so that the accounts could be properly kept.

Mr. BUREAU: That was not done in the majority of cases, though.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Yes, in the case of the majority of banks.

Mr. BUREAU: But the public did not buy them.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Very largely, yes. I noticed also that through the amendment of the Minister of Customs provision is made for Mr. Anderson. That of course, means that Mr. Anderson's employment is not subject to the Civil Service Act. Has my hon. friend not overlooked many other names that ought to be added if he desires to have the department run in conformity with the law? Over a year ago a vacancy occurred in the postmastership at Woodbridge. About a month afterwards an appointment was made by the Civil Service Commission to fill the vacancy, but that appointment has never been confirmed by the government, and an outsider from Toronto has been brought in to do the work. My hon. friend knows

that is illegal—or is the department to be administered without respect to law? I am not referring to the matter from the point of view of patronage; I am simply dealing with the question whether the Post Office Department is above the law. My hon. friend will find that in not less than twenty-three other cases appointments were properly made by the Civil Service Commission and just as regularly, for political reasons, disregarded. Now the thing is being legalized in the case of Mr. Anderson; why should the minister not also legalize it at Woodbridge and in connection with these other offices? I would like to know from what votes the payments to these persons are made and who in the department is responsible for them. Under the act it is an offence for any payment to be made in such cases after the expiration of six months. The Postmaster General has managed to get rid of officers who were doing very good work. He has managed to get rid of the former chief inspector, of a very efficient deputy, Mr. Coulter; and apparently, from what was said in the House last night, he is managing to get at outs with a very competent official of the department, Mr. Lemaire. My hon. friend may find it difficult, therefore, to pick up the scattered threads and determine just how these matters stand, but for a commencement I would ask him to give me the date of the appointment by the Civil Service Commission of the postmaster at Woodbridge.

Mr. BALDWIN: Last evening arguments were advanced in favour of increasing the remuneration of rural mail carriers and establishing new rural mail routes. As a last clincher to the argument one hon. member said: "We have a surplus and can afford to do it." Every well-posted citizen knows that that is beside the fact. I suggest, therefore, that the Minister of Customs and Excise (Mr. Bureau) make a ruling that excise stamps shall be used on cheques, notes and other documents.

Mr. BUREAU: It is a question of legislation, not of ruling.

Mr. BALDWIN: If it can be done, whether by legislation or by ruling, let it be done. I have received letters from people who wanted to get the contract for rural mail delivery at less than was being paid for the existing contract. A great deal has been said here by way of comparing conditions in Canada with those in the United States. I would like to know how many holidays hon. members would want the rural mail carriers to have, whether five, seven or nine. We who live in rural sections know that there are more days than that on which the people in rural districts do not get their mail each year owing to the roads being made impassable by storms. The mail carrier, for instance, does not carry the mail on Christmas Day or New Year's Day, and if a great storm comes up between one of these holidays and the ensuing Sunday the people living in the rural sections would not get their mail for several days. These are actual facts. It is better for the mail carrier to work when the roads are good than when the roads are bad. I was very well acquainted with the man who had control of the rural mail delivery system in Minnesota, and he informed me that there were several days in each year when delivery of mail was impossible on account of severe storms, the breaking up of the roads, and so on. It is the same in northern New England but there are no holidays.

If the mail carriers were to be granted all the legal holldays, as some hon. members have advocated we would be in a fine predicament because there are people living in these back sections who occasionally have some business to do. They may occasionally receive a lawyer's letter giving them perhaps one or two days to pay, or maybe a notice from their bank. That is something that these kind-hearted members who spoke last night in favour of this profligate use of our public money might well consider. We know that all municipal taxes throughout this great country and the United States have doubled and trebled of recent years, and it is because of this wishy-washy way of doing business, of bonusing people, giving them holidays and letting them out of a contract and get more money. In the United States with its much denser population there are ten more patrons to the mile of rural mail routes than there are in this country. We have many rural mail routes that never should have been established. There are instances where a mail carrier is driving on a spur road two or three miles and back. There is nothing like that in the United States. In that country if people live on a spur line they must come down to the main line if they want to get their mail. I only mention these facts because there seems to be quite a mix-up in the ideas of some hon. gentlemen regarding the rural mail delivery system.

Mr. BOYS: May I ask if my hon. friend has any spur line in his riding?

Mr. BALDWIN: I have.

Mr. BOYS: Of two or three miles in length?

Mr. BALDWIN: I certainly have.

Mr. BOYS: I have been trying to get one or two and could not succeed.

Mr. BALDWIN: They were established in my county in 1915. There are a great many routes costing this country altogether too much. In my county there were mail routes running practically across the county that cost not more than six or seven hundred dollars and that are now costing more than six or seven thousand dollars and serving the same people. Many of these rural communities that are being served by the rural mail service would be glad to have it abolished and go back to the little post office. A great many queer things happen in some cases. Certain little kitchen post offices were left, and post offices that were well conducted, housed in a public building in a community where there were two or three churches, and where business was being done, were obliterated because some postmaster may have voted for reciprocity in 1911.

Mr. BOYS: I congratulate you on your influence.

Mr. BALDWIN: I was a postmaster and mail carrier for thirty-six years, so I have some knowledge of handling the mails.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Perhaps the minister can now give me the information I asked him for.

Mr. GRAHAM: The officer is not here at the moment. I have not the data, but I think my hon. friend would know it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I should like to get it on Hansard. There are twenty-three other cases I want to take up with my hon. friend.

Mr. GRAHAM: There are not twenty-three cases.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then the appointments must have been straightened out recently.

Mr. GRAHAM: These cases are only temporary. They arise because of conflict between the Post Office Department and the Civil Service Commission as to their nominee. Out of the hundreds of appointments to post offices, large and small, and until recently they all came under the Civil Service Commission, speaking from memory there are only twelve or thirteen appointments outstanding now. That is not a very large proportion.

The date of the certificate issued by the commission was the 29th of June, 1922. Take the case of Woodbridge. I am not going into details. The commission have absolute power to make that appointment, and eventually their nominee if they do not change their mind will have to be the man appointed. In the meantime there is a temporary man placed in charge of the post office at Woodbridge. The contention of the department is that both being returned soldiers the man named by the department having had postal experience is the better qualified for this position. Personally, I do not know, but that is the contention of the department, and they hope to be able to convince the Civil Service Commission that they are right. As a matter of fact, the commission has the authority and their judgment must eventually prevail if they cannot be convinced that it would be wiser to name the other man.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I would like to ask my hon. friend how long he thinks these vacancies should stand. I want to point out some things to him. The act provides that temporary appointments may be made for six months. That is the limitation imposed by the act. Now these vacancies have stood a good deal longer than six months. At Woodbridge the temporary man who was put in there was brought up from Toronto. I quite admit that they are both returned men, but I would ask my hon. friend whether he does not think in connection with these country post offices that the appointment should go, as it always did in the past, to a resident of the village? Or does he think a man should be brought in from outside? That is what is being done. There is no possible excuse why the law should not be complied with unless it is that the Postmaster General of this country says that he puts himself above the law. There is no good having any half measures here. What is the use of having criminal statutes if ministers of the Crown act with cynical indifference to the laws that are supposed to bind them? Is it simply because the hon. gentleman is in the position of trust that he now occupies that he is to be regarded as above the law? Should he not rather be the first to show others that the law ought to be respected? Does not my hon. friend think so? The people of that place had the right to have the law observed and that appointment made. I would ask my hon. friend how it is that the cheques for payment have been able to be smuggled past the Auditor General, because under the act payments are only allowed to be made for these temporary purposes for six months? What is my hon. friend paying these temporary men, and where is the money coming from? What officer of his is certifying to these payments?

Mr. GRAHAM: The Civil Service Commission, as I understand it, does not take the extreme view that my hon. friend has announced just now. I do not think there is

any law being violated. I would not like to refer to the Auditor General as my hon. friend has done. I do not think anything can be smuggled by the Auditor General of this country.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Who is the Auditor General of this country?

Mr. GRAHAM: Well then, the Auditor General's office. If my hon. friend thinks that is the case, he should go after the officials of that department.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Oh no, the certificate would come from this department.

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend did not say that. He said it was being smuggled past the Auditor General.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I said nothing of the kind.

Mr. GRAHAM: All right, Hansard will show.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What I said, and Hansard will show it, was that I would like to know who the official is who is supposed to see the law carried out but is certifying to these payments so that they can get past the Auditor General.

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not think there is any question of smuggling names or cooking accounts. It cannot be possible, I do not think there is anything of the kind. There has never been any question as to any of these payments in the case of this office or other offices similarly circumstanced. As I understand it, rural postmasters are not regarded with the same strictness, in the matter of the six months' limit, as perhaps other civil servants are, because the Civil Service Commission readily understands the difficulties surrounding the appointment of these officers as distinguished from those that are appointed to the inside service.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think that before the item passes my hon. friend should bring down the papers showing exactly how these payments are made. My hon. friend says that the general act does not apply to the postmaster.

Mr. GRAHAM: I did not say so.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I so understood my hon. friend.

Mr. GRAHAM: You understood wrongly.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then I am very happy to be corrected. If the general act does apply we have no right to make any of these payments after the expiration of the six months, and we are entitled to know therefore how they could be made. Consequently, as the minister does not say that the act does not apply, I will ask him to bring down the papers showing how these payments are made.

Mr. GRAHAM: I will bring down the papers. In the meantime we can continue with the item.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: No, Mr. Chairman, I am afraid I will have to ask that it stand until the information for which I asked has been brought down.

Mr. GRAHAM: There are other hon. members who doubtless wish to discuss the item; my hon. friend is not the only one who has the right.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The Chairman asked whether the item should carry. I have no objection to anybody else discussing it, none whatever.

Mr. GRAHAM: Go on and discuss it then.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The minister seemed to think that somebody else wanted the floor and, of course, I should be very pleased to yield the floor, or anything else, to my hon. friend at any time. I notice we are having an increase in the staff.

Mr. GRAHAM: No, a reduction.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: A reduction, is it? That is splendid. In the general total there is a reduction, but I notice that in some instances there are changes in the numbers. Has my hon. friend any particulars to give as to that? Is there anything he lays any claim to in connection with that as to economy or the like?

5 p.m.

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: In which case?

Mr. GRAHAM: In the whole. There is an abolition of sixteen positions and the creation of eight positions with smaller salaries, a reduction of eight officials. although there have been some increases in salary, statutory and otherwise, there is a decrease in the whole amount of $2,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Just while we are on the question of totals, will my hon. friend give the receipts of the department up to the end of the year?

Mr. GRAHAM: Up to the end of the year, as I informed my hon. friend some time ago, the receipts would be about 29¼ millions.

The issue of stamps would amount to more than that, but the receipts would be about that total.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think that should be gross receipts.

Mr. GRAHAM: It is gross receipts.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: If it is then was my hon. friend right when he said that more stamps would be sold. It was stamps issued, was it.

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes, issued.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Before the item carries I want to know exactly how the regular practice which has been referred to is being carried on in this department. It may be that when the information comes down we will find there is nothing irregular, there may be some extraordinary explanation of it, but at present there is what, on the face of it, is a confession that the law is absolutely disregarded in connection with the Woodbridge post office. My hon. friend says the law is disregarded in connection with some eleven other post offices and he says it is a very small number. I think my hon. friend will find there are more cases than the eleven which he admits.

Mr. GRAHAM: I will tell my hon. friend the exact number.

Mr. HOCKEN: The details show a decrease of something over $2,000. Will the minister tell us the amount of the superannuation allowance in the case of the former deputy minister and the former superintendent of postal services because, I think, if these two items are added the decrease becomes an increase. I want to say that in superannuating these gentlemen the government has got rid of the two most experienced and best qualified postal officers in the Dominion, men who are just as capable of doing the work they formerly did as they ever were and perhaps a little more so. Instead of trying to promote economy it looks as though the Postmaster General were trying to put a friend into a lucrative position; under the guise of a superannuation the government have practically dismissed the former deputy minister and his chief assistant, the postal superintendent. If you add the superannuation in each case to the expenditure it will show an increase instead of a decrease. And this is done by a government that makes some sort of spurious claim to be economical.

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend asked for the retiring allowance. Dr. Coulter receives $4,200 and Mr. Ross $3,900.

Mr. HOCKEN: That is over $8,000?

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend must remember that both these gentlemen paid a certain amount into the superannuation fund. Their retirement would not involve any charge at all upon the post office; the fund from which that is taken is a different one altogether. If my hon. friend's argument were correct we might take the whole list of superannuations that have taken place in connection with the department and charge the expense against the Post Office Department. Both of these gentlemen asked for their retirement and it was granted.

Mr. HOCKEN: Is there correspondence to show that?

Mr. GRAHAM: I have a copy of Dr. Coulter's letter. I have already read it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Frozen out.

Mr. HOCKEN: Did Mr. Ross ask for his superannuation?

Mr. GRAHAM: I am informed so. I have read Dr. Coulter's letter.

Mr. HOCKEN: I would like to see the letter brought down.

Mr. GRAHAM: Which letter?

Mr. HOCKEN: Mr. Ross.

Mr. GRAHAM: We will get copies of them both.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think the acting minister seriously wants to let the House understand that either of these gentlemen got out voluntarily. I do not think the Postmaster General, if he were here, would say so. I think the minister would take the responsibility for bringing about their retirement, rightly or wrongly—he would claim, of course, rightly. But the fact undoubtedly is, unless I am very much misinformed, that the minister came to the conclusion that they should be out, and then he proceeded to get their resignations, their requests for retirement. They came. Of the fact I do not want to speak at first hand knowledge; but I feel so convinced that that is the case, that I do not think the minister should seek to give the House the other impression. There are circumstances when such a course is justified, That I am not discussing for the moment; but I object to the House being given the impression that these men wanted to get out of the service, and that they came forward

themselves and forced themselves out. I am quite certain that is not the case. The minister is talking around the subject when he says that they paid into the retirement fund and became entitled to the $4,200 and the $3,900. That is correct, and the amount is not charged against the Post office Department, but it comes out of the country. If they were in the service, they would not be getting that. They would be getting the salaries that the new men are getting, and the country would be saved this $8,100 until the time came for them to retire. Therefore, what the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Hocken) says is absolutely right. Instead of being ahead, the country is behind just the difference between the $8,100 and the $2,000. Is it not a fact that Mr. Hector Verret has been retired?

Mr. GRAHAM: Some time ago, I think.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But by the present minister within the last fiscal year?

Mr. GRAHAM: I think the position was abolished by the Griffenhagens.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That would be a very good thing. That would be a contraction. I see this does not appeal to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe).

Mr. LAPOINTE: It certainly does.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Everything except an expansion is a joke to him.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Some contractions are.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is nobody, I understand, in Mr. Verret's place?

Mr. GRAHAM: I was informed the position is abolished.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I hope the government does not undo that piece of good work that was done by the late government, although I am really apprehensive that it will, and get somebody in there. As regards those two gentlemen, they have been relieved of their duties by the will of the minister, with the result that the country is out at least $6,100.

Mr. BOYS: Has there been any change in the policy of the department respecting what we have been calling spur lines? As I understand the matter, what is meant is this. A carrier has to go two or three miles up the line and has to double and come back. If there has been a change, I should like to secure one or two extra services in the county of Simcoe. I note that the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Baldwin) said that in his constituency he had a number of those. I congratulate him; he has done good work for his patrons in his constituency, and I would like to do the same for mine.

Another matter I should like to bring forward is this. I do not want the department to do for me anything that is not being done for others. I have five farmers on a route, and the furthest one happens to be within a mile from where the carrier passes on the highway. I understand there is a rule of the department that they will not serve any man who is not a mile away, even if he is on a spur. The result is that these five men have to walk, perhaps in very stormy weather, all the way from a quarter of a mile to seven-eighths of a mile to the corner, and there they may have to wait half an hour or an hour on a bad day for the carrier to come along. A change of that kind would not be very expensive. I suppose there are many such instances; but if that sort of thing is being done in other ridings, and there has been a change in policy, we should all know of it, because I have no doubt that every member has cases of this kind, and it is not right that some should be successful in their efforts to secure relief while that relief is denied to others.

Mr. GRAHAM: I imagine the same policy applies as far as practicable to all communities. There may be certain circumstances surrounding particular communities where the population is very dense, where there may be an exception; but I know of none, and I know of no change in policy. Surely in the older sections it is not cruel to ask a man to walk nearly a mile when there are in this country so many sections where people have to drive seven or eight miles to get their mail. I do not think any exceptional treatment is being given.

Mr. BALDWIN: The mail route of which I spoke before was established in the summer of 1915 against all overtures of mine and everything that I could do myself to prevent its being established, not by this government, but by the late government. That is in connection with what I said about a postmaster being dismissed for having voted for reciprocity in 1911.

Mr. HOCKEN: What is causing the delay in appointing a deputy minister for the department and in filling the other position of superintendent?

Mr. GRAHAM: As a matter of fact, I am not in a position to say what is causing the delay. I would presume that it is the illness of the minister more than anything else.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is the cause of that?

Mr. HOCKEN: Is it the delay that is causing the minister's illness, or the minister's illness that is causing the delay?

Mr. GRAHAM: I might as well make it clear that there is no question of the minister's illness and serious illness. I would not want any of the members to be led to believe that there was not a serious condition of health existing with the Postmaster General. I know that to be true.

Mr. HOCKEN: It is a very serious thing that a department of this kind should run along so far and through the session of this House without any responsible person in charge, without any person who knows the department to represent it in this House. There is no deputy minister to come and advise the acting minister about anything connected with the department. That is a serious thing and some effort should be made to fill these positions. Perhaps the acting minister can appoint a deputy.

Mr. GRAHAM: The acting minister will not do that. I will call my hon. friend's attention to this fact, that he was quite contented, in times gone by, to have a minister who never came into this House. The Postmaster General was then in the Senate. No person regrets more than I do the absence of the Postmaster General.

Mr. HOCKEN: He had a deputy minister.

Mr. GRAHAM: As good Samaritans do in a government or elsewhere, whoever is able does his best to carry the burden of the absent one.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the minister have any hopes of being relieved of either the Militia department or the Railway department in the near future, and if so, which one? He ought to know about that.

Mr. GRAHAM: My right hon. friend is really asking too much.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The minister will, perhaps, give us the list he has of post offices held up.

Mr. GRAHAM: There were twenty. My hon. friend was nearly right. Since the list was made, postmasters appointed by the commission have taken charge of five.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: When were the appointments made?

Mr. GRAHAM: I will hand my hon. friend the list I have.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then I suppose this can be put on Hansard without wasting the time of the committee in reading it.

Mr. GRAHAM: It has already been brought down as a return.

Mr. HOCKEN: Get a ruling on it.

Mr. GRAHAM: The right hon. the leader of the Opposition moved for it one day in the absence of some other hon. member, I forget whom. At any rate it has been brought down.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I notice from it that my hon. friend has apparently obeyed the law in connection with the five cases. Am I right in that assumption?

Mr. GRAHAM: I would not put it that way.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That would be too frank.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Would it not be true?

Mr. GRAHAM: I would not go so far because I want to be accurate, and I do not want to admit even tacitly that I broke the law. I would say, that, as in all cases, investigations are proceeding and communications are being exchanged, and the department after conference and due consideration have given instructions for the postmasters, to whom certificates were issued by the Civil Service Commission, to take their places in these five instances. As a matter of fact it is only a question of time, unless the commission changes its mind, when the same thing must be done in connection with all cases, because the power eventually rests with the commission.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Am I to understand that the cases against which the minister has a mark are the ones in which the law has been carried out?

Mr. GRAHAM: I would not put it that way.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Are these the cases in which the appointments made by the commission have been made effective?

Mr. GRAHAM: I stated the matter clearly.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: No.

Mr. GRAHAM: Well, to the average person. I explained that in these five cases, after conference and investigation, the department had given instructions for the persons to whom the Civil Service Commission had

issued certificates to be placed in charge of the offices.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Would my hon. friend conceive it to be the duty of a minister to carry out the appointments made by the Civil Service Commission under the act?

Mr. GRAHAM: It would be the duty of a minister to see that the laws governing his department were carried out; and unless the minister or the department can convince the commission that its appointee is not the best qualified person for the office in question, then eventually the minister must acquiesce in the appointment of the commission.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Another question. In the minister's view, how long a time has a minister the right to hang up these appointments?

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend, lawyer-like, is of course getting down to the cross-questioning.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Not at all; I am merely trying to get the facts, that is all.

Mr. GRAHAM: I would not say that my hon. friend was trying to get the facts; he is trying to elicit opinions.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am asking your opinion.

Mr. GRAHAM: Well, you know, opinions are not evidence. My hon. friend is not trying to get the facts.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am going to the statutes, but you do not like statutes.

Mr. GRAHAM: Of course, my opinion I can give for what it is worth. Circumstances differ and each case has to be dealt with on its merits, and as the responsible head of the department views those merits. Conditions might arise in one case that would not at all obtain in the other, and the information necessary to be submitted to the commission might be more easily obtainable in one case than in another. My view, as I have already expressed it, is that eventually the Civil Service Commission, if it adheres to a nominee of its own, must make the appointment, as it has the right to do under the act. But in order that the public may be served as efficiently as possible, and that the machinery of government, not only of the departments but of the Civil Service Commission as well, might work smoothly, I think, the commission act fairly in allowing a reasonable time in which to see whether information cannot be placed before them which might lead them to view the situation as the Post Office Department views it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I wonder whether my hon. friend can tell me what investigation is going on at Woodbridge? He says that when the investigation is over the appointment will be made unless the Civil Service Commission changes it mind. Well, what investigation is now going on?

Mr. GRAHAM: I would not care to give the details.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Surely my hon. friend knows there are none. He must certainly know that nothing has been done, but that there has been a mere refusal by the minister to carry out the law. Nothing has been done in connection with the thing for months, and if the minister wants to say now, as a matter of fact, that an investigation is going on, then I would ask for the details.

Mr. GRAHAM: Further inquiries are being made. Now that my hon. friend has asked so many questions, showing that he has no confidence in the acting minister or in the department and being evidently under the impression that we are smuggling things by, I might inform him that I have given instructions to hasten to a conclusion as rapidly as possible some of these positions which he says are being hung up. I do not think that anything can be gained by hurrying too rapidly, and personally I should like to know all the circumstances. Now, I could relate some circumstances about Woodbridge.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Go on.

Mr. GRAHAM: But that would not help the situation there; and I could do the same in regard to a good many others. That, however, is not my province. I want to get matters cleared up as rapidly as possible and that is what I purpose doing. I do not want to say anything further until I get all the information I want.

Mr. BRISTOL: Assuming that the Civil Service Commission has appointed a postmaster at Woodbridge, is it the function of the minister, not merely to examine into the qualifications of the appointee, but also to nominate someone else for the appointment, giving reasons therefor?

Mr. GRAHAM: No, I would not go that length. In the case of Woodbridge the man is in charge now who was in charge when the certificate was issued to the other man.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The position is temporary.

Mr. GRAHAM: It can only be temporary. He has been there now since the certificate was issued to the other man.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: He has been there a year.

Mr. GRAHAM: It does not make any difference how long he has been there. The other man's certificate was issued in June, 1922, and that is quite a while ago.

Mr. MEIGHEN: How can he be kept in the position for more than six months?

Mr. GRAHAM: He has been kept in it and paid.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Illegally.

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not think the commission complies strictly with the act in regard to this six months' provision, in the case of the outside service. I do not think that is their practice. However, these matters will be cleared up in due course, and I want to see it done in all these cases and see the occupants of the positions made permanent as nearly as possible.

Mr. BRISTOL: The point I am getting at is simple. Members of parliament to-day are not permitted—at least that is the understanding—to make recommendations to the Civil Service Commission as to who they think should be appointed as postmasters or in any other capacity. I take that to be the law; at least it is what is generally understood to be the practice, the object being to preclude patronage. Now, is it a fact, with reference to these twenty or any one of them, that the minister of the department recommends to the commission some person in lieu of an appointee whom the commission has already recommended? Is that the practice now, or has it been done in any case? If it has, it seems to me perfectly clear that the most powerful person is endeavouring to exercise patronage and induce the Civil Service Commission to make other appointments that do not seem to be in compliance with the law.

Mr. BUREAU: Read the evidence before the committee. It is to the contrary.

Mr. GRAHAM: There is nothing to hinder my hon. friend making a recommendation to the Civil Service Commission, but that does not mean that his nominee would be appointed; he might be or he might not.

Mr. BRISTOL: I understood it was not proper for us to do so. I am glad to know that it is proper.

Mr. GRAHAM: You will find the Civil Service Commission receives recommendations from all sorts of persons; I know the department does. When a vacancy occurs an inspector of the department places a person in charge temporarily until such time as the Civil Service Commission makes its selection. In this case the department, rightly or wrongly has differed with some of the nominees of the Civil Service Commission on information that the department has. But the occupancy of the position by any person other than the commisioners' appointee is and can only be temporary, and eventually, if the Civil Service Commission does not change its viewpoint, its nominee is the proper person for the vacancy and must be appointed.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If what the minister says is carried to its logical conclusion it merely means that the intent of the act is defeated. The Civil Service Commission makes the appointment to the position. The government have the power to refuse that appointment. They would be justified in refusing to confirm it if, on the appointment being notified to them, they knew of circumstances that in their judgment disqualified the appointee, in which event it would be the duty of the government, I think, simply to transmit those circumstances to the commission. That would not involve any delay at all, would be carrying out the spirit of the act, and would be as far as the government in any case would be justified in going. If, on the other hand, after the Civil Service Commission makes an appointment, the government set to work to find whether the appointee is going to suit them from all standpoints, and they have an investigation themselves over the action of the commission, and they have a temporary man continued and continued temporarily in the position until they get through with their investigation, that is simply defeating the act. The word "eventually" means nothing; the word "temporary" means very little. Temporary employment may be for ten years. The act provides for six months, but six months should not be necessary. The duty of the government to install a man at once, unless they know of circumstances, not political, that they believe have not been brought to the mind of the commission, in which event they would be right in transmitting the information. Beyond that they have not any right to go ahead conducting prolonged investigations in review of the work of the Civil Service Commission. I think that is a fair statement of the position. If the government just go far enough in the exercise

of the prerogative that the minister says they have, why, they might just as well recommend the repeal of the act. Putting a man in a vacancy in the first place, and keeping him there until the government is satisfied after their own investigation of the recommendation of the commission, is simply repealing the act.

Mr. BUREAU: It ought to be repealed anyway.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I understood my hon. friend is going to bring down the pay sheets showing just how these temporary employees are paid. It may be that they can be paid legally under the act, but I do not think so.

Mr. GRAHAM: I have not made any promise to bring down the pay sheets. My hon. friend wanted to know how we "smuggled" in those pay sheets. That was the word he used. I insisted that they were not "smuggled." He asked by whose authority payments were made and I told him I would get the information. I do not propose to bring down all the pay sheets.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I only want a sample.

Mr. GRAHAM: I will bring down the information I promised to clear his mind. In the meantime we might as well go on discussing the item, because I suppose there will be a discussion on it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not believe any one wishes to discuss it further. I suppose this statement from the minister is to go in Hansard?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Marcil): It will have to be read if it is to go in Hansard, unless unanimous consent is given for it to be taken as read.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am willing to have it go in Hansard.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: If the hon. gentleman wants it read I have pleasure in complying with his wishes. This, then, Mr. Chairman, is a list of post office appointments which have been hung up by the hon. Postmaster General. The first column contains the names of the post offices, the second column the names of the commission's nominees, the third column their military status, and the fourth column the names of the temporary incumbents. Bearing this description in mind, I now read the list. The first place is Alexandria, Ontario; the commission has appointed Mr. W. A. Morrison; his military status is O.A.S.; the Postmaster General maintains Mr. Peter Ferguson in Mr. Morrison's place.

Mr. BUREAU: What does O.A.S. mean?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend will have to ask the minister; I am reading his own list.

Mr. ROBB: Overseas active service.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The next place is St. Barnabe Nord, P.Q.; the commission's nominee is Mr. J. N. Gelinas—

Mr. DUFF: How do you spell that name?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Capital G-e-l-i-n-a-s.

Mr. BUREAU: Go on. I know about that case; it is all right too.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Mr. Gelinas' position is held by a nominee of the Postmaster General, Mr. Charles Marcouiller. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would like me to spell that name?

Mr. DUFF: Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM: I suggest that my hon. friend is not reading the document; he is editing it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: If my hon. friend is objecting to my method of reading I am quite ready to change it.

Mr. GRAHAM: Put the document in Hansard.

Mr. BUREAU: Mr. Chairman, may we comment on this as the hon. gentleman proceeds?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Marcil): Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Yes.

Mr. BUREAU: This man Gelinas bought out the place from his predecessor, Gelinas. I was informed of it. I said that even though under the old administration it was the custom to barter post office or other government jobs I would not stand for it. Thereupon Mr. Marcouiller was chosen and appointed by the Civil Service Commission. There are the facts.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then the return is all wrong; it does not show how the department acted.

Mr. DUFF: You are reading it upside down.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am reading the statement as I received it from the Acting Postmaster General.

Mr. GRAHAM: Leave out the editing and get it right—read it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Here it is. The commission's nominee is stated to be J. N. Gelinas. My hon. friend from Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) says they did not appoint him, they appointed Charles Marcouiller.

Mr. BUREAU: They appointed him and then dismissed him when they found he was bartering a public office.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Who is there now?

Mr. BUREAU: Marcouiller.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: He is there—

Mr. BUREAU: And he is going to stay. He has the sanction of the Civil Service Commission.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then, Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask my friend if he will not bring down a statement that gives us the facts—

An hon. MEMBER: Go on with your reading.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: —because the facts are incorrectly stated here apparently.

Mr. BUREAU: No, the facts are correctly stated, Mr. Chairman. The Civil Service Commission, through their inspector, Mr. Green, recommended this man Gelinas. I went to the Postmaster General and told him that it would not do to barter these public offices. He agreed with me, and the Civil Service Commission confirmed the appointment of Mr. Marcouiller. He was recommended by the department at my instance, he is there and is going to stay there, and he is going to give good service too.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Well, Mr. Chairman, this is only another tribute to the tremendous power and influence of my hon. friend.

Mr. BUREAU: My power is due to honesty. The straight course is always the shortest.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The next post office on the list is that of Field, B.C. The commission appointed Mr. J. Roberts, whose status is "O.A.S.". The nominee of the Postmaster General is Mrs. F. Howatson. The next is St. Moise Station, P.Q. The commission's nominee is Mrs. A. L. Michaud; the Postmaster General's nominee is Mrs. S. Vaillancourt. The next is St. Phillippe d'Argenteuil, P.Q.; the commission's nominee is Mr. T. LaMarche; the Postmaster General's man is Osias Laurin.

Mr. DUFF: Is he in or out?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: He is in; he is the Postmaster General's man. The next is Portneuf, P.Q. The commission appointed to that office Mr. Joseph Thibault, who has military status. The Postmaster General's man is Mr. Isidore Marcotte.

Mr. DUFF: What is the revenue from that office?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The hon. member will have to ask the minister. The next is the post office at Maddington Falls, P.Q. The commission have appointed to that office Mr. Emilien Rivard, who has military status. Evidently there is a family quarrel here, because the minister's nominee is the wife of the commission's nominee. The next is Clementsport, N.B. The commission's nominee is Mr. H. G. Potter, who has military status; the Postmaster General's nominee is Captain Elias Rawding.

Mr. DUFF: Did my hon. friend say that was in New Brunswick?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Yes.

Mr. DUFF: That is another mistake.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: You will have to take the matter up with the minister. I wish we could get down a proper return. The next post office is that of Almaville, P.Q. The commission's nominee is Mr. J. Beaumier and the Postmaster General has in the office Mr. Alexander Boisvert. Woodbridge, Ont., commission's nominee, James Morgan, who has military status. The temporary incumbent, the Postmaster General's man, is Mr. J. J. Deane, also with military status. The next one is Ste. Flore, P.Q.; the commission's nominee is Mrs. H. A. Houle, and the nominee of the Postmaster General is Mrs. P. Arvisais, Blackville, N.B., commission nominee, Mr. G. M. Barry, who has military status; his place is filled by Miss A. B. Astle. Then, the next one is Wardner, B.C.; commission's nominee, Mr. J. A. Harris, who has military status; his place is held by Mr. Ole Holm, Brussels, Ont, commission's nominee, Mr. C. R. Coultes, who has military status; his place is held by Mr. W. S. Scott, Tamworth, Ont., Mr. P. K. Stinson, who has military status; his place is held by Mr. L. P. Wells, Portsmouth, Ont.; commission's nominee, Mr. G. H. Wickman, who has military status; his place is held by Jethro Graham, Yamachiche, P.Q., commission's nominee Mr. Germain Beauchemin, who has military status; his position is held by Mr. Arthur Descoteaux, Mamora, Ont.; commissioner's nominee, Mr. James Hickey, who has military

status; his position is held by Miss L. G. Shannon, Kenabeek, Ont.; commission's nominee, Mr. J. E. Irwin; his place is held by Mr. James Enright, St. John N.B.; commission's nominee, Mr. A. W. Lingley; his duties are performed by the postmaster and other employees in charge of staffs, as shown by the return. I point out, Mr. Chairman, a situation which I do not think so many of my hon. friends will laugh at; out of this long list, the gentlemen appointed by the Civil Service Commission all hold military status. whereas of the appointees of the Postmaster General but one holds military status.

Mr. COPP: Who appointed Mr. Lingley in St. John?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: He has been appointed by the commission but he has not been given the position.

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend did not read all this document.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: You said I was a bad reader, and I stopped.

Mr. GRAHAM (reading):

Instructions have been issued for the transfer of Blackville, Portsmouth, Wardner, Tamworth and Marmora post offices to the commission's nominees, but the transfers have not yet been reported to the department.

Now, that is very important. Of these post offices my hon. friend has named, five have been handed over to the commission's nominees. That should have been read and put in the record.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend said that before.

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend was reading this document and putting it on Hansard, and he left out a very important item, namely, that of the twenty offices mentioned, twenty-five per cent have already been placed in charge of the commission's nominees. So that this document, without further comment, must be discounted twenty-five per cent. Moreover, it bears out what I have already stated: you cannot make appointments to all these offices in rural districts on the basis of the rule of three. I said a few moments ago that information was being secured in respect to all these different cases, and that as rapidly as possible we were filling the positions, where the commission changed its mind, according to the commission's nominee. Twenty-five per cent of that has been done—yes, more, the commission changed its mind in connection with the post office to which my hon. friend (Mr. Bureau) has referred. I contend that in connection with appointments to these offices the department has been doing very well; very few are at this moment not in the hands of the nominee of the Civil Service Commission and such as are not are being placed there. But in some instances the commission has changed its mind after getting all the facts. As I said before, if the commission does not change its mind after all the objections are presented, its nominee must stand. In the meantime I maintain that the position of the department is commendable, not attackable, on this point, because it is not an easy matter to handle throughout the whole Dominion of Canada.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Why was the Portsmouth appointment held up? There was no sale of that post office.

Mr. GRAHAM: That appointment is now in the hands of the nominee of the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): But why was it held up so long? I can understand delay where there is a question of the post office being sold, but there was no such question in this case.

Mr. GRAHAM: There were strenuous representations made to the department that this post office should be put in a separate building, also that it should be kept in its present location. The suitability of the commission's nominee was also questioned and the department investigated the matter, just as it does in a great many other cases. That is the report I have. The department having investigated the matter asked that the commission's nominee be put in the position, and that was done.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): He is a good man. There is no dispute about that. I know him.

Item agreed to.

Post Office—outside service—to provide for the payment of salary at the rate of $1,000 a year to Lucien Pacaud as the representative of the Canadian government on the Pacific Cable board, as from January 16, 1923, $208.33

To pay J. W. Paddle, postmaster at Sunset lake, Saskatchewan, and mail contractor on the Spalding and Sunset lake route, for the loss of a horse while conveying the mail on October 6, 1922, $150.

To pay certain employees of the postal service in the Quebec district for extra services in connection with checking incoming and outgoing British mails during the summer of 1922, $288.14.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is this Mr. Pacaud the assistant of the High Commissioner?

Mr. GRAHAM: Joint secretary.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: This amount is in addition to his salary, of course?

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is his salary?

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not know. That would come under the estimates of the Prime Minister for the High Commissioner's office.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It looks as if this was entirely a new matter.

Mr. GRAHAM: Oh no. The Post Office Department makes this appointment every year, and this year it has appointed Mr. Pacaud.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Who acted before?

Mr. GRAHAM: Mr. Lang, I think.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Who is Mr. Lang?

Mr. GRAHAM: He was not in the High Commissioner's office, and it was thought better to have a man from the High Commissioner's office, so Mr. Pacaud was chosen.

Mr. STEWART (Humboldt): With reference to the second item, is it the usual practice to indemnify mail carriers for the loss of their horses on the routes?

Mr. GRAHAM: I am hardly in a mood to admit anything. We have to take each case on its merits. The inspector made a report on this case, recommending that we might well pay this man $150 for the loss of his horse under all the circumstances, and the department is carrying out his recommendation. I would not say that it would be constituting a precedent, for this reason: Every case will have to be considered on its merits, and if cause is not shown, the department would not be compelled to pay. There have been cases before, I think, where men have been indemnified under similar circumstances.

Mr. ROSS (Simcoe): What I want to get at is this: It is not that the amount is very much, although it is a pretty good price for the horse, but if this vote is passed will the minister give me the assurance that in a similar case the owner will get the same treatment? I lost one of my own, and I could give the details which I think would justify payment.

Mr. GRAHAM: I would say this, that every case will be dealt with by the department on its merits, and if my hon. friend makes out as good a case as this man, he will have to be paid for his horse.

Mr. ROSS (Simcoe): Might we know what the merits are, so that I might compare my case with this one?

Mr. CAHILL: And make the evidence to suit the case.

Mr. GRAHAM: This driver lost one of his horses while carrying the mail. We heard a lot last night about the mail carriers and how poorly they are paid. Well, this horse met with an accident and was killed. We had an inspector investigate the circumstances, and he recommended that we ought to pay for the horse. That is the whole case. If my hon. friend presents his case to the department and the inspector, after investigating it, feels that he ought to be compensated, there is no doubt in the world he would be paid.

Mr. ROSS (Simcoe): I suppose it would be all right to present the case here.

Mr. GRAHAM: Oh, no.

Mr. ROSS (Simcoe): I mean the general details. They are practically the same.

Mr. STEWART (Humboldt): What kind of an investigation did the inspector make into this matter.

Mr. DUFF: A post-mortem.

Mr. GRAHAM: I cannot say exactly what kind of an investigation he held. We have to trust our inspectors and officials. The inspector made his investigation and the department is acting on his recommendation.

Mr. STEWART (Humboldt): Is it not a fact that this mail carrier simply wrote in to the inspector a statement of the case, and on the strength of that letter a report was made without taking any evidence whatever, the inspector simply forwarding the letter to the department with the recommendation that the claim be paid? I understand that those are the circumstances.

Mr. GRAHAM: I could not say what further investigation the inspector made, but on the evidence that he had he recommends the payment of this amount. What else can the department depend on?

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): What was the nature of the evidence?

Mr. GRAHAM: I will read the letter of this mail carrier. I wish some of those members who were so sympathetic towards the mail couriers yesterday were busy here now. Here is a poor mail courier who has lost his horse in this unremunerative work for a hard-hearted government, and some hon. gentlemen object to his being compensated for the loss of his horse. His letter reads:

Dear Sir,—I beg to report that the incoming mail of October 6th to Sunset lake arrived four hours late owing to a serious accident.

One of the mail courier's horses was killed while travelling through a bush trail about two miles from Sunset lake by a pole, which when stepped on one end by the horse flew up and the other end entering the horse's stomach caused death almost instantly.

The delay resulted through effort spent to save the horse and the difficulty of procuring another to complete the trip as the above occurred in a lonely spot.

This horse was a splendid percheron mare and as her value represents more than a full year of mail courier's salary, you will realize what it means to me as I had only three horses before.

Will you kindly forward a request to the General Superintendent of Postal Service, asking him if, under the unfortunate circumstances, some remuneration for this horse can be made as her loss without remuneration will seriously cripple my ability to continue the performance of my mail service as only one of my remaining horses is able to travel on the road and I am at present continuing with a borrowed horse.

Trusting you will give this matter your early consideration and thanking you for the above favor, I am

Yours faithfully,

Sgd. J. W. PADDLE,
P.M. & Mail Courier.

Now if that statement be true a splendid Percheron mare would be worth more money than an ordinary animal. It is not extravagant therefore to contribute $150 towards the loss which this man has suffered and I submit that it is not establishing a precedent.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): I still doubt very much whether this animal was worth $150. I did not attend any horse sales in the West in October but I did in January and I saw good horses—young horses at that just ready to break in—sell for $20. Those were better horses than I have seen on most of the rural mail routes in western Canada, and I think the amount in this case is entirely excessive. I think it should be reduced to at least $75 and I move accordingly.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the resolution carry?

Mr. STEWART (Humboldt): I am not opposed to this payment because of the amount or because the horse was not worth $150, although knowing the actual district where the accident occurred I should be inclined to doubt whether this very valuable Percheron mare was worth $150 last October. Apart, however, from that the objection in my opinion, is that it is creating a precedent. I think this man took the contract, as was said here last night, at a figure altogether too low; he probably underbid somebody else in order to get it. I do not know as to that but this I am aware of: This man is carrying the mail 52 times a year, on a round trip of 22 miles, for $125, being $25 less than the figure at which he values the horse. Now, I submit that he should not have used a $150 horse for carrying the mail. Bearing in mind the wear and tear involved, and the other conditions, he would have been better advised to have used a $50 pony to carry the mail at the price he was getting. I want to state that there are scores of mail carriers in that same district, or in similar districts within a couple of hundred miles of it, who are having losses owing to accidents to their horses and they never ask the department to recoup them. They are quite prepared to face the possible consequences when they take the mail contract. I say this would be a dangerous precedent to establish. For example, let me cite the following incident. I happen to know a mail carrier who lost a team of horses not so far away from this very post office a couple of years ago. It was about this time of year and a certain creek was in freshet. His team was drowned in trying to ford the creek; the owner thought he had not time to take the bridge which would involve a detour of some 15 or 20 miles. I never heard of any complaint by him. He was making a business of carrying the mail and he took his losses as a matter of course. I know of others who have lost horses under circumstances just as exceptional as these. They sound exceptional but actually they are not so. Just as in all bush countries it is not an uncommon thing for a horse to injure himself—very often fatally—by stepping on a stick. This man knew the conditions, just as other mail carriers know them, because he had often travelled the bush roads. Other men take these chances without any hope of compensation and this man should do the same. I am not going to oppose this item but I must say that it is creating a very dangerous precedent. There will be a great number of other claims made in future, quite as justifiable as the present one, and it would be well to draw the line before it is too late.

Item agreed to.

At six o'clock the Speaker resumed the chair and the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

BUFFALO AND FORT ERIE PUBLIC BRIDGE COMPANY

House in committee on Bill No. 37, to incorporate Buffalo and Fort Erie Public Bridge Company (as amended, and recommending that the title thereof be changed to an Act to incorporate Buffalo and Fort Erie Public Bridge Company).—Mr. Marcil (Bonaventure) in the chair.

On section 18—new section:

When the corporate obligations of the company shall have been paid and its capital stock shall have been retired in the manner prescribed in its by-laws, its property, rights and franchises situate within the Dominion of Canada shall be conveyed to the said Dominion or to such province, municipality or agency thereof as the Governor-in-Council may designate; and its property, rights and franchises acquired from or situate within the state of New York shall be conveyed to the said state or to such municipality or agency of the state as the legislature thereof may designate.

Mr. BOYS: I would like to ask the Chairman of the committee if there is any further information regarding this clause. I have no desire in any way to try to impede the course of this bill; but in the committee, when the clause was suggested, I could not see how it could have any useful application. May I bring to the attention of the committee the point I there took. The clause reads:

When the corporate obligations of the company shall have been paid and its capital stock shall have been retired in the manner prescribed in its by-laws.

In the first place the company cannot possibly have any by-laws at the present time, because it is not incorporated. How the capital stock of a company can be fully retired, except with the consent of those who hold stock, I cannot imagine. I understood, perhaps, there would be some explanation, and if there is I would be very glad to hear it.

Mr. McGIVERIN: This bill was passed last session in this House; it then went to the Senate and was held up there at the request of the National Railways, who have since withdrawn all opposition. In the meantime, an act on similar lines was passed by the legislature of the state of New York, and there was introduced by the New York legislature a section 16, which is exactly the same as clause 18 in this bill, the idea of the company being that it is a public enterprise, undertaken by public-spirited citizens in the state of New York and Ontario, to build this bridge and to carry out the undertaking as regards expenditure, with the idea that the state of New York and the Dominion of Canada, or the province of Ontario, as the case may be, will eventually take over the expenditure or the assets of the company. As regards what my hon. friend says, the bill is not very clear. I cannot, however, see any objection to its going through in this form, because in any case either country would have the power of expropriation as regards its half of the undertaking. The hon. member for Welland (Mr. German), as one of the promoters of the bill, stated that it was originally intended in 1913 or 1914 to be an undertaking as a memorial to the one hundred years of peace, and that in the meantime the war intervened. The strongest explanation that I can make is that it was at the request of the joint promoters in New York state and in Canada that this provision was incorporated in the bill, and it was apparently insisted upon by the legislature of the state of New York that it should be so incorporated.

Mr. BOYS: I do not for a moment suggest that the people behind this are not public spirited, that this is not a very desirable thing or that it would not be very useful in that part of the province. Therefore, I want to do all I can to assist the matter; but my hon. friend has not quite answered the inquiry I made. The clause I have quoted provides that when the corporate obligations of the company shall have been paid and its capital stock retired, its property rights and franchises in Canada shall be conveyed to the Dominion or to any province, municipality or agency thereof as the Governor in Council may designate. How can the time ever come when that will be done? It stands to reason that if they want to make a presentation of it to the government they can do so without this clause. I cannot see the purpose of the clause. It does not compel them to hand it over. There are no by-laws at present which say that the stock is to be issued and that stock shall be retired within a certain number of years or by an annual payment. I have done my best to figure out the purpose of the clause, but it seems to me that in its present form it is useless. I suppose it is the same clause as appears in the New York bill, but what good purpose it serves there either I cannot see. It did occur to me that the purpose of the clause was possibly to protect the state of New York on the one hand and Canada on the other, or in other words, that the company could not ask the Dominion of Canada to take over the bridge until its obligations were paid and its capital stock retired. If that is the purpose of it I certainly do not think that this clause accomplishes it. However, if the chairman himself thinks that the clause is a useful one and protects the country in any way I shall not further oppose it. The chairman heard the further explanation given at the last meeting at which I regret to say I was not present, and so I shall say no more. But I must admit that I do not see what good purpose the clause serves. There are certainly no by-laws now in existence, because there cannot be by-laws of a company that is not incorporated.

Section agreed to.

Bill as amended reported, read the third time and passed.

PRIVATE BILLS

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 86 (from the Senate), for the relief of Frederick Wesley Graham.—Mr. Hunt.

Bill No. 87 (from the Senate), for the relief of Catharine Gunyo Chatterson Odell.—Mr. Macdonald (Pictou).

Bill No. 88 (from the Senate), for the relief of Marietta Isabel Wilson.—Mr. Church.

Bill No. 89 (from the Senate), for the relief of Marian Eugenie MacCordick.—Mr. Jacobs.

Bil No. 90 (from the Senate), for the relief of Elizabeth Frankland.—Mr. Church.

Bill No. 91 (from the Senate), for the relief of Arnold Carrington Burke.—Mr. Church.

Bill No. 92 (from the Senate), for the relief of Emily Margery Chrimes.—Mr. McQuarrie.

Bill No. 93 (from the Senate), for the relief of Lyle Johnson.—Mr. Church.

Bill No. 94 (from the Senate), for the relief of Annie Belle Wilson.—Mr. Church.

Bill No. 95 (from the Senate), for the relief of Henry John Burden.—Mr. Ryckman.

Bill No. 96 (from the Senate), for the relief of Ethel Olmstead.—Mr. Rankin.

Bill No. 97 (from the Senate), for the relief of Edward Lewis Britton.—Mr. Arthurs.

Bill No. 98 (from the Senate), for the relief of Ruby Minnie Stallworthy.—Mr. Porter.

Bill No. 99 (from the Senate), for the relief of Chistopher Campkin.—Mr. Maybee.

Bill No. 100 (from the Senate), for the relief of Andrew George Suffel.—Mr. Preston.

Bill No. 101 (from the Senate), for the relief of Joseph Ross Wallace.—Mr. Church.

SECOND READING

Bill No. 105, respecting the Canadian Order of the Woodmen of the World.—Mr. Gordon.

SUPPLY

On motion of Mr. McGiverin for Committee of Supply:

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Chairman, with the permission of the House I would ask that bill No. 75 which appears under Public Bills and Orders be given second reading. For that purpose I would move that the committee rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again this day.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think the hon. member in charge of the bill (Mr. McMaster) might tell the House the reason for the urgency!

Mr. McMASTER: Mr. Chairman, I cannot—

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Marcil): This motion is not debatable.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

Progress reported.

[Mr. Boys.]

MARRIAGE WITH DECEASED HUSBAND'S BROTHER

Mr. ANDREW McMASTER (Brome) moved the second reading of Bill No. 75 (from the Senate) to make lawful the marriage of a woman to her deceased husband's brother or such brother's son.

He said: This legislation, Mr. Speaker, originated in the Senate, where it was passed with practically no discussion. I do not intend to delay the House at any great length in exposition of the bill, which after all is of a very simple nature. For the last forty years our law has provided that a man may marry his deceased's wife's sister; in other words, that a widower may marry his sister-in-law. But strange to say the inverse is not the case, and the widow cannot marry her brother-in-law. Now it would appear to me that on the most reasonable grounds there is no real distinction or indeed any distinction to be drawn.

It may interest hon. members if I refer for a few moments to the history of the legislation in this parliament upon the subject. In 1880 Mr. Girouard, at that time member for Jacques Cartier county, who, if I mistake not, was afterwards one of the Justices of the Supreme Court, introduced a bill permitting not only the marriage of the man with his deceased wife's sister, but also the marriage of the woman with her deceased husband's brother. The bill was debated at very considerable length and passed by an overwhelming majority. However, the Senate of that day was not composed as the Senate of to-day is, and there the bill met with opposition and was rejected, but by a very small majority. If that measure had passed there would have been no necessity for the present bill. Two years afterwards Mr. Girouard introduced another bill, in which he asked merely for legislation permitting the marriage of the man with his deceased wife's sister. That bill was debated for some time, it received a large majority in this House, and was also passed by the Senate. Therefore, as I stated at the outset of my observations, for the last forty years a man in Canada has had the right—although he has been under no obligation—in the event of his wife's death to marry any one of her sisters. But the wife who lost her husband has not had the right to marry his brother.

Now, it would seem to me that if we believe in "equal rights for all and special privileges for none" that men and women in regard to this as in regard to many other matters should be put on the same basis. My first argument in support of the bill is that for the last forty years in which the

present legislation has been on our statute books I know of no inconvenience caused by it. I believe if this bill were accepted and we could cast our minds forward for forty years, we would see that no inconvenience would result from the adoption of this legislation. I am told that the provision under which a woman is forbidden to marry her deceased husband's brother is often disregarded. the marriage taking place in this country, or is often avoided by parties going into the United States—because there is only one state in that country which forbids such a marriage—there contracting the marriage and returning to Canada if they see fit to do so. I think public opinion is in favour of this bill. When Mr. Girouard brought in his bill of 1882, which is the present legislation, he was able to invite the attention of his colleagues to the fact that three hundred women in Montreal had petitioned for the legislation. I can now tell the House that the Local Council of Women, representing a large body of thoughtful women throughout the country, some 300,000 in number, have asked for this legislation.

There cannot be any objection to this legislation on the part of those who are guided in life by the Scriptures. We will remember that little idyll found in the Book of Ruth which tells us that Naomi said to her daughters-in-law that they should go home because she was unable to provide them with husbands in the country to which she was returning. In the old days—if we are to have recourse to those early times for enlightenment and example—it was not only the right but the obligation of the male survivors of a deceased husband to marry the widow. You will remember that the founder of the House of David, before he married Ruth, received his right to do so from a nearer relation. So that I think we need not have any religious qualms in accepting this legislation. It seems to me so reasonable and so equitable as to really not require any argument, and I shall reserve anything further I may have to say in the case of any opposition being made to the bill. It seems to me that the bill speaks for itself.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time, considered in committee, reported, read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY

TRADE AND COMMERCE

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Marcil (Bonaventure) in the chair.

Trade and Commerce—Commercial Intelligence Service, including salaries, travelling expenses, contingencies and other expenditure of Trade Commissioners, Assistant Trade Commissioners, Junior Trade Commissioners and Commercial Agents; and miscellaneous expenses in connection with the development and extension of Canadian trade, $320,000.

Mr. MANION: How many trade commissioners have we, and what are the principal countries in which they are located?

Mr. ROBB: We have twenty-three trade commissioners and four commercial agents. The trade commissioners are located at Melbourne, Cape Town, London, Manchester, Glasgow, Shanghai, Liverpool, Hamburg, Rotterdam, Milan, Buenos Aires, Yokohama, Barbados, Auckland, Paris, Calcutta, Brussels, Rio de Janeiro, New York, Singapore, Jamaica and Havana, Bristol, Mexico City. The commercial agents are located at Sydney, Australia; Christiania, Norway; Nassau, Bahamas, and Port of Spain, Trinidad.

Mr. MANION: There has been a good deal of talk in the press at times about our commercial agents, or the lack of them. Would the minister state what are their general duties and what success they are having so far as this country is concerned?

Mr. ROBB: The duties of the trade commissioners are to look after trade generally, to keep in touch with the conditions in the countries in which they are located, to discover what products Canada may with profit ship to those countries, to keep in their offices a register of exporting firms who desire to do business, to advise the business people of the country where they are located as to what goods might be purchased in Canada, and generally speaking to survey trade conditions and advise the Canadian people where they can do business profitably in that country.

It frequently happens in the countries where the trade commissioners are located that there may be a difference of opinion at the custom house when Canadian goods arrive there, and the trade commissioners resident in those countries and on fair terms with the Customs Department of that foreign country are able in many instances to iron out the difficulties and make it easier for Canadians to trade there. Then from time to time the trade commissioners advise the government of proposed tariff changes that might be looming up in those countries, and represent as diplomatically as possible to the people of those countries the advantages it would be to them to give fair terms to Canadian products.

Another part of the duties of the trade commissioners is this, and it is done with considerable profit to Canadian industries. A firm in Canada desiring to export products to one of the countries where we have a trade

commissioner located, may communicate with that commissioner and ask for the names of people there who would handle Canadian products. The trade commissioner gives the names only of those whom he considers reliable. From time to time he sends reports to the office of the Minister of Trade and Commerce here, where we have in the department junior trade commissioners in training, supervisors of commercial intelligence and an editor who classifies all this information and sends it out weekly to exporters, boards of trade, banks, colleges, and generally speaking to any person who might be interested in export trade.

Since my hon. friend has invited some observations on the trade situation I would like to point out that Canada is reaching out everywhere throughout the world for export trade, and we are doing fairly well, perhaps better than we ourselves realize. Canada geographically speaking is as well situated as any country to do trade with the different countries of the world. If you take a look at the map you will discover the advantages we have in location, the short haul for our products to the different markets of the world as compared with other countries. Canada, as I said a moment ago, trades with the whole world, but I think we might say without disparagement to any of our smaller customers that we have nineteen or twenty first-class customers who take from us various products in agriculture, mineral, and manufactured goods. The United Kingdom is our best customer, but the United States, notwithstanding what we hear of the Fordney tariff, is a very close second. It may interest the committee to know that of our nineteen or twenty first-class customers, for the year ending 31st December the United Kingdom took from Canada $379,540,481 worth of goods; the United States took from us $349,292,392 worth —a very close second. Our next best customer was the sister Dominion of Australia with a purchasing record of $17,411,298. Japan is our fourth best customer, buying from Canada last year $15,799,800 worth. France comes next with $12,869,332; Italy, $12,195,499; Belgium, $12,014,190; and we believe that when the treaties that will be submitted to the House in a few days are proclaimed and go into effect they will add very materially to our business with France, Italy and Belgium. Our exports to The Netherlands last year amounted to $10,891,889; British West Indies, $9,306,935, plus $3,218,332 to Bermuda and British Guiana;; Newfoundland, $8,800,174; New Zealand, $7,124,598, and let me say right here that per capita we have no better customer than the little sister Dominion of New Zealand, where there is an excellent feeling towards Canada. Germany, our enemy of yesterday, is to-day one of our good customers. We sold to Germany last year $7,651,117 worth of goods.

Mr. HANSON: How much are we buying from Germany now?

Mr. ROBB: I have not the figures just now. China including Hong Kong, which is listed separately, bought from us $5,293,808 worth; Greece, $5,964,156; Norway and Sweden, $4,597,000; Cuba, $4,905,468; Mexico, $3,231,580. I am sure my hon. friends will appreciate that there are possibilities of greater trade development in the future with Mexico as conditions in that country become settled.

For the twelve months ending February, 1923, the total exports of Canada amounted to $928,356,656, or an increase of $165,808,061 over our exports for the same period the previous year. Canada is not only a large exporting nation of agricultural products, but she is becoming an exporting nation of manufactured goods. It is true that agricultural products enter largely into our exports, but it is also true that our exports of manufactured products are increasing rapidly. Canada perhaps unconsciously is becoming an exporter of manufactured goods.

I am sure it will interest the committee to have a comparison as between the exports of Canada and exports of our great neighbour to the south, the United States. For the year ending March 31st, 1922, the records of the statistical departments of the United States and of Canada show that of the total exports of these two countries, the exports of raw material of the United States were 39 per cent, and of Canada 44 per cent. Of partly manufactured products the exports of the United States were 11 per cent, and the exports of Canada 14 per cent. Of manufactured products the exports of the United States were 49 per cent, while those of Canada were 41 per cent. When we analyze our business on a per capita basis Canada ranks very high as compared with other countries. On a per capita basis the little Dominion of New Zealand comes first with an export of $154.54. Canada comes second with an export per capita of $100.63, and keep in mind that 41 per cent of that export consisted of manufactured products. The United Kingdom has an export per capita of $63.36, and the United States has an export per capita of $33.95 as against a per capita export for Canada of $100.63.

Mr. MANION: I presume I would be quite right in supposing that in manufactured exports are included such commodities as flour? That is, any goods which are not produced from the soil and sent out in the shape of raw material would be included in manufactured articles?

Mr. ROBB: If we ship wheat that is a raw product. If we ship flour that is a manufactured product. If we ship milk that is a raw product. If we ship butter that is a manufactured product. If we ship pulpwood it is a raw product. If we ship paper it is a manufactured product. If we ship pulp it is partly manufactured.

Mr. MANION: The reason I asked the question is this; I take the facts to be just as the minister states them, but very often in explaining our exports I have noticed that statistics are given with the idea particularly of boosting one side or the other. So that the statistics are mixed up. For example in agricultural exports butter, condensed milk, flour, and things of that sort, are included which are really manufactured articles as my hon. friend says.

Mr. ROBB: This statement has been prepared for me by the statistical department. It is without any colouring whatever and is given exactly in the form in which they hand it out. Now, coming back again to the question of our exports. The total exports for the 12 months ending in February of this year were $928,356,656, of which 42 per cent were finished products. When it is recalled that in 1890 the total exports of Canada only amounted to $185,000,000, and that less than 6 per cent of those were manufactured products, it will be realized what great progress Canada has made in those 32 years. I would not like the House to believe that we should remain as we are with our arms folded, that we should be satisfied with our immense exports and the volume of manufactured products we are sending out. It seems to me that it should be the ambition of this country not only to increase our production but to increase the manufacture of our own products in our own country.

9 p.m.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Converts every day.

Mr. ROBB: I have in mind the days of my boyhood when many of the farms in our part of the country had a mortgage on them, and the people were struggling to build homes and become properly established with comforts for themselves and their children. They were then breaking the land and growing a little grain, and they sometimes had to haul that grain 20, 25, 30, and even 50 and 60 miles to market. In that country to-day the conditions are changed. There are no mortgages on the farms or, if there are any, they are very few in number. The children of many of the people who then had mortgages on their farms to-day have investments in victory bonds and other securities. They possess comfortable homes, with large barns and great herds of cattle in the fields. It was the cow that paid off the mortgage on the farms in eastern Canada; and, looking at conditions throughout the country, it seems to me that we should not be discouraged for the future. The eastern provinces—the province of Ontario, the province of Quebec and the Maritime provinces—are well adapted for dairying; but there is another province in the Dominion which, perhaps, possesses as great, or even greater advantages for profitable dairying if the people there will work as the people of eastern Canada worked—I refer to the little province of Alberta. The conditions essential to successful dairying are cheap feed for the cattle, water and a good climate. I am sure no person will say that the province of Alberta has not a good climate, that it has not plenty of water, that it has not plenty of good feed for stock. I would like to remind my fellow members in the province of Quebec—

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): May I interrupt the hon. minister?

Mr. ROBB: Yes.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I wish to deny most emphatically that there is an abundance of feed or even of water in that province.

Mr. ROBB: Well, I visited Alberta for many years annually long before my hon. friend came to this country, and if he is discouraged with Alberta, I am not. I do not believe that my hon. friend with his pessimism represents the true feeling in that province. When I remember that in the autumn of last year, at the greatest exhibition held in Canada, the province of Alberta carried off most of the best prizes for butter; when I remember that the province of Alberta is as near the sea as many ports of the province of Ontario—

An hon. MEMBER: Except for freight rates.

Mr. ROBB:—I have no reason to feel discouraged over the future of that country. I know that dairying means hard work.

An hon. MEMBER: And no pay.

Mr. ROBB: I am not prepared to admit that, but it means comfort, it means happy homes, it means the family united where there is work for the boys and the girls.

An hon. MEMBER: And fourteen hours a day.

Mr. ROBB: Yes, fourteen hours a day and longer than that. But we are working fourteen hours a day in this chamber and we are doing fairly well at it. I am not making this statement with the idea of casting any reflection on my hon. friends from the western provinces, but rather to encourage them, and to say to them that what eastern Canada has accomplished, surely western Canada can do also. I am not one who believes that the son has less grip than his sire, and I believe the young men of to-day, if they are ready to get down and work as their forefathers worked, will find as good a future in Canada as in the country whence they came.

Mr. GOULD: In his early remarks the minister stated that trade commissioners were in foreign countries for the purpose of advising the government. Particularly he mentioned that they were there to anticipate if any false moves, we might say, were made in connection with the tariff. Are we to understand from that that our trade commissioners are in foreign countries for the sole purpose of anticipating these tariffs, to endeavour to get as low a tariff rate for the exports of this country as possible?

Mr. ROBB: I would not say that. They are there to watch conditions and to advise their government from time to time. Let me repeat again, they are there also to advise Canadian shippers of advantages in the countries in which they are located. In that connection, let me read for the information of the House a letter that I have from the Saskatchewan Co-operative Elevator Company, Regina, dated the 29th September, 1922, to our trade commisisoner in Calcutta, India:

> Dear Sir,—We have to thank you for your very comprehensive letter of August 18 giving statistics on the 1921-22 wheat crop and outlining the conditions under which India's wheat cultivation is carried on.
>
> We note that your monthly reports are embodied in the Commercial Intelligence Journal, and as suggested by you, are taking steps to be put on the mailing list for this paper.

Then on the 11th April, they wrote for this information for a ten-year period, which Mr. Chisholm, the agent there, supplied them. Let me cite this record to show of what advantage these men are. Through the efforts of Mr. Emery, trade agent in China, of this crop there has been sold a total of 225,000 sacks of flour shipped from the Vancouver Milling Company, the Robin Hood Mills at Calgary, the Robin Hood Mills at Moose Jaw, and the Maple Leaf Milling Company at Medicine Hat. We have also a record of a large quantity of butter which was shipped from a creamery in Alberta to China.

Mr. HARRIS: We are, I am sure, all very much indebted to the worthy minister for giving a few of his observations on the trade situation. I rather think he trampled on the ground of the Minister of Agriculture, and that he would have been better advised to have interested us in his travels to foreign lands. I have in mind more particularly the question which he himself raised last year, namely that our trade commissioners in some of these foreign lands were found to be doing business, as he said, due, perhaps, to the niggardliness of this particular vote or votes of a like nature, on back streets of various towns and cities. It would be very interesting to the committee if the minister would, as the Minister of Agriculture did, give us a little summary of what he found to be the condition of affairs as regards these particular officers.

A further question which I have in mind is this. Is any effort being made on the part of the Department of Trade and Commerce to secure the same trade relations between Canada and Cuba as the United States enjoy with Cuba at the present time. I hope the minister will, at least, tell us some of the things that he observed in that trip of his around the world.

Mr. ROBB: I thought I had given my hon. friend a rather interesting review of trade conditions in that part of the world.

Mr. HARRIS: Did the minister find our trade commissioners working on back streets as he said, and does he anticipate that he will require a larger appropriation this year than in the past?

Mr. ROBB: We have made a considerably increased allowance to the trade commissioners and also increased their living allowance, so that they are getting much better located than they were. In Shanghai, China, we have recently organized an exhibition room, where samples of Canadian products for sale in that country are continually on exhibition. We have this on the rental basis, so that the firm shipping the goods pays a rental that almost covers the total expense. I think this is on a paying basis, or practically so.

Mr. HARRIS: Will the minister give me the information regarding Cuba?

Mr. ROBB: As my hon friend knows, negotiations regarding tariffs are under the Department of Finance. A representative is in Cuba now watching Canadian interests.

Mr. HARRIS: A representative of the Department of Trade and Commerce?

Mr. ROBB: Yes.

Mr. LEWIS: I was delighted to hear the minister speak so optimistically regarding the prairie provinces. I wonder whether his optimism is well founded.

Mr. ROBB: I hope so.

Mr. LEWIS: I happened to be in Moose Jaw last week—

Mr. STEVENS: Did the hon. member meet the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) there?

Mr. LEWIS: This time I did not go into the barn; but I noticed in the window of one of the grocery stores, fresh eggs marked 18 cents per dozen. These came from the country; and the farmer had to pay for the crate and breakages before the eggs reached the store, and I presume there was a little profit on the crate too. I asked some of the people in the country what they were receiving for eggs and they said 14 cents. I just wonder, considering what they have to pay for their food, whether it is a profitable situation for them to sell eggs at 14 cents per dozen. I also found that dairy butter, not creamery butter, was selling at 22 cents. It does not seem to me that these prices show that the West is going to be prosperous in a very short time. It is true that we need all the markets which the minister has spoken of, and I trust by the opening up of the larger markets of the world, the price will increase and the farmer will be given a fair deal for what he is raising.

Mr. GARDINER: The minister has given the committee the amount of exports that Canada had during the last year. Can he give the committee the same figures as regards the imports?

Mr. ROBB: I have some imports from different countries. This is not so well classified as the other. I would be glad to hand the statement over to my hon. friend if he is interested.

Mr. GARDINER: What is the total?

Mr. ROBB: I have not the total.

Mr. GARDINER: The minister stated that there were practically no farm mortgages in Canada.

Mr. ROBB: In the section of country where I was born and brought up.

Mr. GARDINER: Just that one section.

Mr. ROBB: I was citing conditions in that part of the country when I was a boy when there were many mortgages. I said that to-day there were but few mortgages in that part of the country. What I said was that the people who at that time had mortgages to-day have victory bonds.

Mr. GARDINER: Can the minister give us some idea as to what peculiar conditions in that part of the country would be responsible for this freedom of the farms from mortgages? His statement seems an extraordinary one.

Mr. HANSON: Perhaps it is the good old cow business.

Mr. ROBB: A little hard work—

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Does the minister mean to say that we do not work hard out in the West?

Mr. ROBB: I am not saying anything about the West; I am talking about the East. The hon. gentleman asked me to what cause the condition I have described is attributable. A little hard work and patience and continuous saving from year to year will bring it about.

Mr. IRVINE: Are there for sale any of those cows that paid off the mortgages?

Mr. ROBB: Yes, not long ago, I know, one sold in British Columbia for $1,600.

Mr. SALES: A Quebec cow, sir? Is the minister aware that we have had evidence only this week from prominent men in the province of Quebec that the very conditions he speaks of actually obtain there, namely, hard work, long hours and small pay, and indeed less than small pay, rather no pay at all but a deficit instead, and that these same conditions are driving the young people off the land in that province at the present time? Is the minister aware of that?

Mr. ROBB: I am told that the young people are leaving the land not only in Quebec but in old free trade England.

Mr. SALES: Well, that only proves a fact that has been well known for many years, indeed throughout the ages, that the men on the soil are expected, as they have always done and as people think they will continue to do, to work longer hours than anyone else for less money. That is the fact of the matter and we can prove it, and that is the very reason the people are leaving. The young

people are getting educated; the boys are getting more sense. I can give you my own personal experience. I sent my boy to the Saskatoon Agricultural College and when he came back he used language which I cannot repeat in the House of Commons. It was the first time I had heard him express himself vigorously. He said, "I am not going to be such a—well, such a fool as you are." I said, "What do you mean, Jack?" He answered, "I am not going to work fifteen hours a day to grow cheap food for the man who wants to work eight." And I cannot blame him.

Mr. FAFARD: Are you opposed to education?

Mr. SALES: No sir, I am not; but when you educate a young man you develop his powers of comparison and when he sees one man working eight hours while he has to work fifteen, he naturally resents the idea.

Mr. PELLETIER: Let them combine forces and work together.

Mr. HANSON: The fault does not lie with the man who has to work fifteen hours but with the man who does not want to work more than eight. Perhaps some of the evil lies in that direction.

Mr. COOTE: The hon. member tells us where the cause lies, but he does not tell us who is hit in the result.

Mr. HOCKEN: A barber works fifteen hours a day all the year round. Does the farmer in the West work fifteen hours a day throughout the whole year?

Mr. SALES: Do you think he ought to?

Mr. HOCKEN: I am asking a plain question. Do these men in the West work on the farms fifteen hours a day all the year round?

Mr. SALES: I can answer the question so far as my own farm is concerned. We have stock on it and while the men certainly do not work fifteen hours a day throughout the entire year, in winter they work ten at the very least; and always bear in mind that they work hard on Sundays as well.

Mr. PRITCHARD: I am surprised to hear the minister make the statement we have heard this evening. I cannot speak for Quebec, of course, but the hon. member who referred to conditions there was speaking from the evidence that has been brought out in regard to that province and no doubt that is the best evidence we can have. I can, however, speak of conditions as they exist in my own province. I happen to represent as good a farming section of the country as can be found in Ontario and perhaps as good as any in the whole Dominion, and a few weeks ago I got certain information from one of the men of the type the minister speaks of. This gentleman who is a successful farmer has been in his locality for thirty years and I want to make a reference or two to the statement he made to me. Now, the minister stated that in eastern Ontario or Quebec, which is much the same, there are no mortgages outstanding to-day. I wish I could bring myself to think the same. As a matter of fact, and quite naturally, we have mortgages in Ontario, and I do not see any way by which we could possibly avoid having them. Let me explain why. A farmer gets a section of land, it matters not whether it is large or small. If he raises a family and puts by a little for a rainy day he is under the necessity of mortgaging the farm, if he wants to have something to live on in his old age. Obviously therefore he cannot hand the farm over to his son without encumbrances. The son gets it with a mortgage on it and he too raises a family and naturally gets into the same position, so that again the mortgage is passed on to the next generation. If I might speak of the farm on which I live, I might remark that my son now represents the third generation holding the same homestead. For these reasons therefore it is inevitable that we shall have mortgages; and although I have not the statistics by me to give figures, I am satisfied that there are as many mortgages on our farms to-day as there were thirty years ago. I honestly believe also that the men holding these mortgages are not as well satisfied with the securities as those who held mortgages at that time.

Mr. HARRIS: Is there a mortgage on the holdings you have in the city of Toronto?

Mr. PRITCHARD: I do not happen to have a home in the city of Toronto.

Mr. HARRIS: Have you any holdings in the city of Toronto?

Mr. PRITCHARD: Yes.

Mr. HARRIS: For the benefit of the committee, will the hon. member give his equity in these holdings in view of the opinions he has expressed?

Mr. PRITCHARD: Wait until the time comes; I will do that later. I want to deal with the question to which the minister referred. I met at the railway station a short time ago a gentleman from the constituency adjoining my own, and I might quote what he said in a conversation we had, in order to convince the committee that some of the statements that

have been made in this House have not been made without some foundation of fact behind them. This man has been successful in his farming. You talk about dairy cows. For thirty years he has had as good a herd of Jersey cows as can be found anywhere in the country, and they have been as intelligently cared for. He works fourteen of fifteen hours a day, and while he was not complaining, because as I say he has been successful, he gave me some facts which I think it is well for the House to know. When I informed him of the nature of the debates that have taken place in this House he told me that he and his son had sat down and figured their profits for the year 1921, and they discovered that they had not quite a dollar a day after deducting all expenses. That is a well managed farm and I defy the minister, which is saying a good deal, to find a more successful man than this gentleman. Yet that is just what he told me a couple of weeks ago. These conditions exist whether we want to admit the fact or not; and while we are not grumbling in western Ontario, and no one can say he has heard us grumble much in this House, I do not want to sit here and have statements made which I know are not true concerning the district I represent as well as that part of the country generally. I have sat here and listened with a good deal of patience to men who have tried to be optimistic,and I can bear with them, because I would rather take an optimistic than a pessimistic view of things generally. I do not like the world to know our actual condition. It is bad enough to let the House know, but unfortunately Hansard publishes our statements whether they are pessimistic or optimistic, and they go forth to the country. I have refrained from saying anything pessimistic, but I do not want the impression to go out to the contrary because otherwise we who know the actual conditions in our constituencies may be laughed at when we get up in this House and refer to them even in the most guarded terms. We will not stand for that. If the member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken) or the member for East York (Mr. Harris) wants to know particulars of what I refer to I shall be pleased to enlighten them in my room, but I am not going to publish them on the floor of the House.

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry): I am sincerely glad to know that the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Robb) and so many other hon. members are keenly interested in dairy farming. It is news to me, because I have been interested in it in a direct way all my life, but since coming to this House I have not heard very much upon this phase of farming. I believe dairy farming in eastern Canada is perhaps the most prosperous line of agriculture which our farmers have been following, but I think the minister left an impression which is not altogether correct. I do not know what particular part of Canada he was referring to in the very rosy picture he unfolded to us of a farming community that was encumbered with mortgages thirty or forty years ago but now enjoys prosperity in the way of comfortable homes and victory bonds. I would like to know just exactly where that favoured spot is, because from my acquaintance with the dairy industry in Ontario I very much question whether the picture truly depicts actual conditions.

I have before me evidence, some of which I laid before this House two years ago in the course of the budget debate, and which has been further confirmed since that time by Professor Leitch of the Ontario Agricultural College. Professor Leitch was brought up on a farm and educated at the agricultural college. He has had practical experience in managing farms on a commercial scale, and for a number of years past he has been making a special study of mixed farming in Ontario, both dairying and stock-raising. In his sworn evidence before the Special Committee on Agricultural Conditions he gave a summary of conditions that obtained on a certain number of specially selected farms. These farms were selected as representative of average conditions in certain sections of the province, which were by no means the poorer sections. I do not wish to quote this evidence in detail, but here are some of the results which he gave to the committee and which are substantially in line with my own experience. I sincerely hope that this summary will elicit as much cheering from the members in my immediate vicinity as did the remarks of the Minister of Trade and Commerce.

For the year ending May 1st, 1921, summarizing the financial operations of dairy farmers in the county of Oxford—the banner dairying county in Ontario, equal I think to the section to which the minister was referring—after allowing 5 per cent on investment and 26 cents an hour for eleven hours a day for 365 days in the year to the farmer, the cost of producing milk was found to be $2.70 per 100 pounds, while the price received was the same. The following year there was a considerable reduction in the cost of production, it dropped to $1.95 per 100 pounds, but the price received was also lower, being $1.8?

per 100 pounds. So that with this very moderate allowance for wages and profit the farmer was selling his milk at a loss of 12 cents per 100 pounds—that is, 12 cents per 100 pounds less than would allow him 26 cents an hour for wages and 5 per cent on his investment. Surely no commercial undertaking could ask for a less margin of profit or a lower wage than that. Following this same calculation down for the year ending May 1st, 1923—assuming, of course, that no change will take place in the figures for the next month—on the same basis the estimated cost of producing milk will be $1.70 per 100 pounds, while the price received will be $1.65 per 100 pounds, or 5 cents less per 100 pounds than the cost of production.

Those are average conditions in the very best dairying section of Ontario. I assume that conditions are no better in the particular section to which the Minister of Trade and Commerce was referring. Although the dairy farmer is engaged in perhaps the most prosperous line of agriculture in this country, those are the results that he is obtaining at the present time, and surely the picture is not so rosy as the minister would have us believe. Those figures do not show anything unusual. There is no occasion for a dairy farmer to be alarmed at them, there is no particular reason for discouragement, because he has always had to put up with conditions such as these and very often very much worse. I do not know if they were any better at any time. Perhaps during 1918 conditions may have been just a little bit better than those figures would indicate. But those are the figures for the last three years, and they indicate in a fair way the condition of the dairy farmer to-day in this province.

Although the men of forty or fifty years ago no doubt should be accorded great credit for their energy and courage, I have it on the authority of men who are older than the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, men who have been engaged in this work all their lives, that dairy farming at the present time is very much harder than it was fifty years ago; that farming in this part of Ontario, in the province of Quebec, entails more work, more energy, more thought, more constant application, than it did forty or fifty years ago. I believe that to be the case.

Mr. ROBB: I think that is right.

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry): If that is the case, and if it is true, as the minister avers, that there are fewer mortgages now than there were then, I must conclude that the men engaged in this business are entitled at least to some credit for the way they are carrying on. I question that statement, however; I doubt very much whether mortgages, even in the dairy sections of this province and the neighbouring province of Quebec, are becoming fewer. I do not wish to draw any pessimistic picture of the prospects of the dairy farmer, but I would like to have these few figures placed on record in order that an accurate estimate may be formed by hon. members who, perhaps, do not know the actual conditions of dairy farming as they exist to-day.

Miss MACPHAIL: When the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Kennedy), who has just spoken, said that the farmer, his wife and family work and the farmer gets the money, he stated the truth. It is true that the farmers work hard; it is true their days are long and their pay is poor. But it is also infinitely true that the farm woman's day is longer and her pay poorer. With all due deference to the superior wisdom of men, one mistake that I think the men continually make in this House is that of treating the problem of rural depopulation as a man's problem and a man's problem only. Hon. members talk about the boy getting an education, as if when you have talked about the man and the boy you have finished the family—but you have not. You want to remember that the girl is also getting an education. The girl has seen her mother work as that mother does not want her daughter to work and as the daughter herself does not want to work. If you go over a rural community to-day—take your own constituency, for example,—and tabulate the results of your observation, you will find more young men on the land than young women: the girls leave first, and that is a pretty sure indication that the boys will leave later. I have noticed so often that the matter is looked at from the man's point of view. When a man is forced to quit farming, if you go into the case carefully you will find—and this applies to over half the cases—that he quits because of inability to carry on the work any longer. It is because the wife or the housekeeper in that house is broken down in health, or because of the woman's rebellion at the drudgery of her life. So I feel that the other view of it, the feminine view, the woman and girl part of the household, will have to be considered before the problem of rural depopulation is to be solved.

I am glad the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Robb) is so optimistic; it is easy for people who are not farming to be optimistic. Our farm at home has no mortgage against it; there are no sons in the family

or there would be a mortgage against it. There is some little money coming in besides that which is the direct result of farming, but we did not break even last year and will not this year. How long can anybody go on under those conditions? I sent out eight questions to 900 soldier settlers on the land in Ontario. I have received up to date possibly 400 answers. If the minister would like to have a pleasant Sunday afternoon, I will lend him these 400 answers, and if he still says there are no mortgages on the farms of Ontario I am sure that after reading the information contained in these replies he will not be so optimistic.

Mr. CALDWELL: Being a member of this special committee which is taking evidence with regard to agricultural conditions in Canada, and being a farmer myself, I have been very much disappointed at much of the evidence we have received. I know that in my own province of New Brunswick the agriculturists are in very bad financial condition. We were told by our provincial government within the last six months, when we went to them for some assistance to tide the farmers over and enable them to produce a crop this year, even to enable them to stay on the land—because large numbers of them are migrating to the United States, owing to the very serious conditions prevailing here—we were told that had we been raising cattle we would to-day find ourselves in good circumstances; that had we ceased two or three years ago to grow potatoes and gone into the stock industry, we would now be in a comfortable position. I had hoped that that was the case, because if only one province of Canada was in a bad financial condition with regard to its agricultural industry, it would not be very serious.

Our committee has endeavoured to get evidence from all the provinces, and I think we have obtained evidence from most of them with regard to the agricultural conditions. I wish to state briefly some of the figures that Professor Leitch put before us—and by the way, I think his was the most convincing evidence, due to the fact that he had actual statistics. A lot of people do not take very seriously the statistics compiled at the experimental farms; they are government institutions, and whether the work is correctly done or not it is apt to be looked upon as not carried out under normal conditions. Professor Leitch, as the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Kennedy) has said, has carried on experiments on farms under actual farming conditions. He took seventeen average farms in Ontario and instituted on each an accurate system of bookkeeping. He visited the farms frequently through the year to see that the books were accurately kept. An account was kept of all outlay for actual operation; the farm was credited with every item of production, and at the end of the year those seventen farms had a balance on the wrong side of the ledger of. on the average $460. These seventeen farms were representative, he told us, of the best counties in Ontario; they were in one of the finest stock raising sections in the province, and on those farms dairying and the growing of fat cattle were carried on.

I thoroughly agree with the member for Glengarry when he says he believes that cattle growing and dairying are the most profitable branches of agriculture in Canada. I have come to that conclusion after listening to the evidence of witnesses from the various provinces on the different phases of agriculture. We also had before us very recently a milk dealer from Montreal who was raised on a farm, whose brothers, he told us, are farmers. He himself is not farming, but we came to the conclusion after listening to his evidence, that few of the witnesses who appeared before us understood farming conditions better. He told us of the conditions in the province of Quebec—which, by the way I looked upon as one of the most prosperous provinces of the Dominion. We had been told repeatedly that the farmers of Quebec were both prosperous and contented. I had hoped it was so; indeed, I believe it is true in larger measure of that province than it is of any other. But this milk dealer told us that due to the cost of the production of milk exceeding the price received for it, the young people were leaving the farms; they were drifting to the Canadian cities in small degree and to the United States in a much larger degree, and the consequence was that the older men were not able to carry on the operations to the extent that they formerly did. They could not afford to hire help to carry on their industry, therefore they were selling off their cattle and decreasing production; and the situation was viewed with alarm. He said the time was coming in the not far distant future, when, if present conditions continued, dairying would reach the vanishing point in the province of Quebec—notwithstanding the statement made by the Minister of Trade and Commerce to-night. I cannot help thinking that the minister is living in the past; that he has not been out in the country during the last two or three years. I admit that there was a brief period during the war when farming was profitable in all its branches. I want to admit this also. I think that during

the prosperous period the farmers contracted habits that would be considered more or less extravagant by the farmers themselves, but not by city people by any means, because in the most prosperous days I do not think the farmers enjoyed anything like the luxuries and comforts that might be considered luxuries that are enjoyed by people in the cities in the very worst times. That is my candid opinion, and I have had a good opportunity for observing.

The hon. member for Calgary just now took the words out of my mouth when he asked if any of these cows were for sale that the Minister of Trade and Commerce spoke of. Our committee would be glad to dispose of them at fancy prices to help pay off the mortgage on the farm and keep the farmer in comfort. We have heard from many men who have been raising cows and have been given very full statistics on production, and know something about the conditions.

Mr. ROBB: I fear I have somewhat stirred up hon. gentlemen, and they are getting away from the real issue. I am bound to say I cannot quite follow all this debate. I present to my hon. friends proof taken from the statistics of the Dominion of Canada that our exports have increased from $185,000,000 thirty-two years ago to $928,000,000 to-day. I tell them of the conditions that existed when I was a boy, when there were mortgages on the farms, and of the conditions that exist there to-day. I never pretended for one moment that farming was a very profitable proposition to-day. I know it is like most other businesses in Canada to-day, the profits are smaller than during the war period, but I maintain that there is no reason in this country for the pessimism which we have heard expressed in the House. I do not believe that sort of argument is the best thing for Canada. I was simply trying to strike a note of encouragement for my friends of the western provinces when I expressed that opinion, and it is only an opinion for what it is worth, although I am bound to say I have heard it shared in by many people. I remember not so many years ago when every Alberta man you spoke to told you that Alberta was the best province in the Dominion. Go to Alberta, was what they all said. Those were the days when the easterner was buying town lots at fancy prices. I tried to point out to my hon. friends the natural advantages of that sunny province, and I have hope yet for the province of Alberta because, geographically situated as it is, being as near to the sea as many parts of Ontario, with a fertile soil and wonderful agricultural possibilities, a splendid supply of coal, good running water, and producing the best wheat in the world—

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): We can't get a price for it.

Mr. ROBB: —why with such resources, should it not have a great future before it? You can use your coal and your natural gas—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. ROBB: —I mean the variety up at Medicine Hat, to drive your flour mills and turn your wheat into the best flour in the world, and have the offal to feed to dairy stock in the province. Just have a little of the courage of the early men who cleared the land in eastern Canada and things will come all right. Nobody who travels along the countryside and sees the comfortable homes and large barns and great herds of cattle in the field can fail to be impressed with these the best evidences of prosperity. Of course, there are always people who are leaving the land. I left the land myself, out of compulsion. In those days it was not so easy to get a farm as it is now. I was the elder of two boys, and I left the farm much against my will to become a miller's apprentice. My brother is on that farm to-day. He has the adjoining farms and we hope that his boys will remain there and their boys after them, because we know it is a happy and a comfortable home, and that there is a prosperity and contentment on the land that you do not get in the cities where you have to get up at the shriek of a whistle in the morning, and are fined if you are late getting to work.

Mr. CALDWELL: That is not as bad as an alarm clock.

Mr. ROBB: I agree with the hon. member across the way who said it is the woman who works hard, and if there is any place where a woman has to work hard, it is on a dairy farm.

Mr. STANSELL: I have for some time been an admirer of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and I am sure that he has now justified that opinion by his ability to start something. I am glad that the discussion has turned on subjects that are prolific of debate and with which I am intimately acquainted—dairy cows, mortgages and natural gas. I do not propose to prolong this discussion, most of which, if I may be allowed to say so, is rather fruitless.

The CHAIRMAN: If the hon. member will allow me, I was just going to call the atten-

tion of the committee to the irrelevancy of a discussion of agriculture upon this item. Unless the committee is willing to allow it, it is altogether out of order.

Mr. ROBB: I think it is a profitable discussion.

Mr. STANSELL: I thought that possibly owing to the absence of the Minister of Agriculture his department was being administered by the hon. member for Chateauguay-Huntingdon.

An hon. MEMBER: He is over there now.

Mr. HANSON: He is very subdued though.

Mr. STANSELL: I do not wish to lead the discussion into irrelevant channels, but I do desire to say something that has not been said on this subject and which I think ought to be said, and that is with respect to the question of farm mortgages. You cannot prove anything by the existence of farm mortgages as to the prosperity or lack of it in farming, and I think I can show why. From my knowledge of farming in Ontario there have always been farm mortgages, and I believe there always will be. Whether farming is made more profitable or not, that condition will continue for this reason: The man who is not a success on the farm, and whose farm is mortgaged, will naturally have to let it stay mortgaged because his lack of success does not enable him to pay it off. On the other hand the man who is successful, and let me say that profits on the farm are small, only succeeds in paying off his mortgage after a number of years of hard work, and by that time he is ready and properly entitled to retire. One of the boys or an immigrant buys the farm, makes a small payment and gives a mortgage to the former proprietor for the balance. So mortgages will continue. They may be changing all the time. Some men may make money, and others may lose, but owing to this continual transfer of property mortgages will continue to exist on the farms. The man who takes up farming as a means of living is a man of small means as a rule, and can only secure a farm by making a small payment and giving a mortgage for the balance. So it proves nothing as to the prosperity or lack of it in farming to point to farm mortgages, and anyone who argues from that basis is on aboslutely unsound premises. I think that is one point that has apparently been overlooked.

I would like to say further, I believe from personal experience and from some knowledge I have gained that there is a farm problem at the present time, and if we had a little less discussion and a little more practical work I think a great deal could be done towards bringing about a solution of that problem. I propose to offer a suggestion to the House which if acted upon would do a great deal towards solving the problem. If you will bear with me just a moment or two I will attempt to do what very few have so far tried to do this session. It is a common thing to find that the man who has had no experience in a particular subject is the one who professes to know most about it. I would recommend to the government that they appoint a small committee to investigate this problem and attempt to find a solution, and I will outline what I think the work of that committee should be. First, I would ask for half a dozen members of this House who know nothing about farming by actual production but who know all about it in theory. I would also have half a dozen members of the farming group in the House—

Mr. GOULD: Here is one.

Mr. STANSELL:—who know all about other lines of business by theory and nothing from actual practice. I would further recommend that half a dozen businesses may be acquired at the expense of the government and half a dozen farms in various parts of the country secured. Then I would reverse the existing operation and put the farmers into business and the business men on the farm where they would have the benefit of instruction from the colleges of agriculture. These men could be given a good deal of help and being intensely practical individuals —experts if I might call them such— could easily become familiar with the particular operations to which they were devoting their attention. Then, after two years had elapsed, I would let these men come together, give parliament the benefit of their experience, and recommend to this House something in the nature of a real solution for the existing difficulties. In the meantime, of course, the profits in both cases would go to the state. Now, I have something else. The undertaking in question would only employ twelve men. I would suggest that the rest of the country, while this experiment is in process, get down to hard work and stop grumbling until the committee is able to present a report.

Mr. STEVENS: May I ask the minister a question or two pertaining to this item. He will recall that last year when these estimates were under consideration I brought to his attention—indeed it was under his consideration as well—the question of the development of

trade with certain islands in the southern Pacific, more particularly the Fiji Islands. This may, perhaps, seem to the committee comparatively insignificant, but as a matter of fact there is a prospect, I think, of developing some very excellent trade to the advantage of both parties. I received correspondence lately, and I have no doubt the minister also has, more particularly on the question of cocoanut oil, considerable quantities of which are brought into this country, and its importation. If the minister could give the committee some information in regard to that question I would like him to do so. I do not think it is necessary for me to enter into details as he knows, perhaps, the whole subject pretty fully. Before I complete this request, however, he will recall that one of the points at issue was the providing of suitable cold storage facilities on the steamers running between our Pacific coast and Australia, calling at Fiji to bring the products of Fiji to Canada. The minister will also recall this: That the market in times gone by, prior to about a year or two years ago, for Fiji fruit—pineapples, bananas and such like, was chiefly in Australia. But in that case they competed with the northern Australian product and therefore the new tariff of Australia largely shut that fruit out. On the other hand we have an excellent market for those fruits and Fiji offers a capital market for our manufactured goods. Would the minister give the committee the benefit of the latest information on these points?

Mr. ROBB: I have not before me the figures of the general trade with Fiji, but my recollection is that generally speaking the Fiji group purchases about $80,000,000 worth of goods a year, some of which products Canada might supply. Prior to the introduction of the latest Australian tariff the Fiji business was largely with the Dominion of Australia. They exported to that commonwealth considerable quantities of bananas, some oranges and pineapples; but Australia placed a very heavy duty on these imports particularly bananas. I am not just sure of the rate but it was prohibitive the hope being entertained of starting a banana industry in Australia. It was represented to the Dominion of Canada that Fiji would be a profitable source of trade for this country inasmuch as they could supply to us the bananas and other fruits which we now purchase from the Central American states, and that in return they would buy Canadian products.

Let me say in passing that there is some misapprehension as to the value of the Fiji market. I stopped there on the way down to Australia and met the governor and his council; in fact, travelled down with the colonial secretary, who has a summer home in British Columbia and who had gone there for a rest. They give to Canada a preference in that market. In some of the islands quite an area is devoted to raising cattle; but their principal source of revenue, as far as I could make out, would be from the production of pineapples. I am not sure that it would be possible to introduce their bananas on this market because our people have been accustomed to a banana different to the species which they produce. Also I am not very sure, from the information I gained, that the Fiji banana has the requisite keeping qualities for shipping. They had there an expert banana man who had been brought from the West India Islands, a Scotchman, and he had hopes that they would develop in the Fijis a considerable banana business. I had a meeting with the planters down there and arranged with the New Zealand-Canadian line, which is subsidized by us, to reserve certain cold storage space for shipments of Fiji products to Canada. They were to try the experiment for a period and I gave
10 p.m. them the assurance that if they would supply sufficient business to make it a paying proposition we would then consider their request to equip and put on that service some of the vessels of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine. I am satisfied we shall get business going down there, maybe not going to Fiji but to other countries, provided we can get return cargoes. I was not satisfied, however, that it would be a paying proposition to equip a vessel at this time. Nevertheless, the experiment is being made in the manner indicated, and after we have the experience of six or eight months we shall be better able to determine what can be done.

Mr. STEVENS: Could the minister give the committee a statement regarding the negotiations between his department or the government and the government of Australia in connection with preferential treatment, and more particularly having reference to the very large and important newsprint business going on between the two countries?

Mr. ROBB: Let me say right now that I appreciate, as does the government, the consideration hon. members opposite have shown in not pressing any questions upon the negotiations with Australia. As my hon. friend knows, in the negotiation of treaties between one country and another, it is generally arranged that the statements are made at the same

time in both countries. We in Canada are in this condition that we must await the pleasure of our Australian friends before we can make an announcement. I would say this, however, that I was very kindly received in Australia; that I sat in with the Tariff Board of Australia for three weeks; that they have a statement prepared to submit to the new government, and that we have hopes that the new government will favourably consider the proposition, so that trade between Canada and Australia will continue to grow.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I cannot help but be amused at the minister's solicitude for fear there would be a premature announcement of that pregnant and fruitful mission of his to Australia, for fear something would be said that would compel him to make an announcement prior to the exercise of a similar privilege by the public men of Australia. When a treaty is arranged, it is usually announced simultaneously in both countries; but when no treaty is arranged and nothing on earth done, I cannot see any necessity for simultaneity in such a case as that. I would think promptness, frankness and repentance would more become the political commercial traveller in conditions of that kind. For the life of me I do not know what the minister's idea was in starting to Australia, in the midst of a political campaign, to negotiate a treaty. The Australian officers, whoever they might be, the Australian ministers could have no idea or no basis for an idea whether either the officers or the ministers would have any authority at all in the course of a few days, or in the course of the time that inevitably would elapse before a treaty could be made. The minister, of course, was kindly received. Why would he not be? He surely did not think there would be rudeness on the part of our Australian cousins. He was kindly received; no doubt he attended many dinners; no doubt he had a fine trip and no doubt he saw quite a lot of the world both going and coming. I understand he passed through the Suez canal. He visited Fiji. I do not know but what he also saw some parts of China.

Mr. ROBB: India.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He may have also polished off his almost perfect knowledge of India. That all took place. But what could have been done towards the negotiations of a treaty, I do not know, and I do not know what the minister could honestly have expected to do. He is back and he says: " Do not ask for results, because these things should be announced simultaneously in Australia and in Canada." He may have studied over a few schedules with tariff commissioners there. How much further does that get him? No further at all. I venture to say that he is not one day nearer a treaty with Australia than he was the day he came into power. Does he intend to go back next year, or is this a case for a return visit from somebody in Australia? What is the purpose of the government in this regard, or is there some other minister who is now in for a trip? I suggest that in view of the valiant, if not triumphant, services of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) of late, some of these favours be accorded to him, and that the globe-trotting be not in the future monopolized by the Minister of Trade and Commerce.

Mr. ROBB: It is fair to the leader of the Opposition that I should say to him why I went to Australia. My right hon. friend and I entered this House the same day, and I have a great admiration for his agility and cleverness in trying to draw an opponent. Let me assure him right now that he is not going to draw me far enough to say anything about the treaty, when it will be announced or what it will consist of when announced. But it is fair to answer the question why we went to Australia. I was sent to Australia by the government on the invitation of the genial friend of my right hon. friend, the Prime Minister of Australia, who first sent his minister, Senator Pearce, as my right hon friend knows. We met Senator Pearce together.

Mr. MEIGHEN: About a year and a half ago.

Mr. ROBB: Oh, no.

Mr. MEIGHEN: A year and a quarter.

Mr. ROBB: My hon. friend is a little off. In February of last year, Senator Pearce opened negotiations with this government. The Prime Minister of Australia cabled the Prime Minister of Canada urging him to send a minister down there to conclude negotiations opened by Senator Pearce. We considered the matter; it was decided that some person should go down, and the morning when I had instructions to cable the Prime Minister of Australia when we would arrive, the Canadian press intimated the possibility of an election in Australia. We again cabled the Prime Minister of Australia pointing out what the Canadian press carried, and a reply came back to come along at once, that there was nothing to interfere with the negotiations. I started and reached Vancouver. The morning I reached Vancouver the Canadian press announced the dissolution of the Australian parliament, and

the Prime Minister of Canada cabled the Prime Minister of Australia pointing out the news carried in the Canadian press and suggesting that we defer the trip until after the elections. But the Prime Minister of the sister dominion of Australia urged that a minister from Canada should come along. Would my right hon. friend say that we should have been so discourteous as to refuse that invitation from a sister dominion.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It was not a case of discourtesy; it was a case of this government exercising its judgment as to when an opportune time for the conference might be. The Prime Minister of Australia may have been very optimistic as to the result of the contest.

Mr. ROBB: Others have been.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It does not follow that his optimism should have been shared by the government of Canada so far as to transport a minister of Trade and Commerce diagonally around the world to negotiate a treaty with a government that undoubtedly had no security of tenure, and that now, I understand, is out of office. Were the ministers with whom the hon. member negotiated returned? Are they to-day in power? Not one of them. What was the value of his negotiations? He should have been the judge whether this expenditure and this absence from office and duty here were wise on behalf of the people of Canada. The Prime Minister of Australia should not have been the judge. The government of Canada should have exercised its judgment in the premises, and if it did, so much the worse for its judgment.

Mr. ROBB: My right hon. friend is wrong. One of the ministers with whom I had friendly conferences regarding trade, is to-day Prime Minister of Australia.

Mr. MEIGHEN: One of them and all the rest on the other side. The government is a different one altogether; the influences are not the same; it is not controlled by the same factors in any way. The minister has no treaty. If he went to Austrailia and negotiated with responsible parties, where is his treaty? He has not a treaty.

Mr. CAHILL: Does one always have to have a treaty when one looks for one?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, but we like to have one when we pay for one. I honestly hope the results, when they come after the next or the succeeding visit, will be better than the results so far of the various treaty-making efforts of the government. I would much rather the infertility continued. I would much rather the death and decay that seem to surround this government would remain, and that nothing of new life would even ferment, than that we get much more of the character of treaties that have been presented up to date.

Mr. COOTE: I was endeavouring to get an opportunity to say a few words before the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Stevens) threw his cocoanut oil on the troubled waters; but I was unsuccessful. I wish to draw the attention of the minister to a little item which I read in the press a short time ago, possibly while he was on his tour of the world. In this article it is stated that the Minister of Trade and Commerce had been addressing some members of the Country party in Australia. A deputation was urging upon the minister the extension of the British preferential tariff to Australian products. I quote the following:

> The deputation stated that the Country party was wholly in favour of the removal of high duties on agricultural implements and tools of trade, and in return it was hoped that the Canadian government would extend preference to Australian products. In the course of his reply Mr. Robb said, as reported in the Country News, of Adelaide, the official organ of the Country party:
>
> Our country is very different from yours and while our tariff has not pleased everybody, it is at least endorsed by those who are producers. I maintain that it is neither good policy nor good business to encourage immigration to a country and then, when they have settled down to work, penalize them by heaping burdens on their industry.

In the report I am quoting there appears in parenthesis at this point "hear, hear."

> Our policy is to make implements of production and tools of trade as cheap as possible. Then production itself is cheapened, foodstuffs are cheapened, cost of living is lowered and the nation is sounder and safer (Applause). You may rest assured that if there is no reciprocal arrangement at last made between Australia and Canada it will not be Canada's fault (Applause).

The article goes on to say:

> We can appreciate the applause of the deputation; Mr. Robb's remarks embody an eminently sound policy, but why doesn't he talk like that in Canada?

Mr. MEIGHEN: He used to.

Mr. COOTE (reading):

> Why has he to go over to the other side of the globe to tell farmers that it is bad business for a nation to tax their implements and tools of trade? If he would tell the farmers of Canada that it is not good policy or good business to encourage settlement on the land and then penalize the settlers "by heaping burdens on their industry," he would gain as attentive and as appreciative an audience as ever he could get in Australia or anywhere else. Doesn't good policy and good business, like charity, begin at home? Mr. Robb in Australia is anxious that the farmers should have cheap implements and tools of trade; it means cheaper production and cheaper living. Mr. Robb in Canada

supports precisely the same policy as the Australian government of taxes on agricultural implements and tools of trade, and a consequent penalizing of the primary producers.

I hope that last sentence libels the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Robb). I trust it is not true and that he will support a policy that will mean cheaper tools and implements of production for the farmer. I hope we shall find him supporting a budget of that nature, although I am not very sure about it. But I did wonder to-night when the minister made his statement whether he had been hunting for a market for butter while on his tour of the world. If so, it seems to me that Australia was rather a peculiar place in which to start looking for it. I was very much pleased indeed to hear of the possibilities of dairying in the province of Quebec, and I am glad to hear that in that particular section of the country the farms are not mortgaged. But I want to warn those people beforehand that they must be on the look out. The Minister of Trade and Commerce has urged the Alberta farmers to go more heavily into the production of butter, and I want to quote something for the benefit of the minister who can warn his people at home of what is ahead of them. This is taken from the evidence given by Mr. Leitch before the special committee which is inquiring into agricultural conditions. Professor Leitch was asked this question by the chairman:

Q. You know the Department of Agriculture is advocating mixed farming to a large extent to our western people. If that is carried out to any appreciable extent, it will mean the competition of the West in butter and cheese, butter especially. What effect will that have?—A. Under present conditions the quality of Canada's butter supply—of course, it can have but one effect, and that is to reduce the price.

By Mr. Hammell:

Q. What about our export surplus?—A. That cannot readily compete, on account of its quality, with the countries of Denmark and Australia.

By the Chairman:

Q. We do not make as good butter as Australia?—A. No.

By Mr. Caldwell:

Q. We do not have the grading?—A. The three western provinces make butter that is a credit to this country. Ontario and Quebec butter is a disgrace to the country.

Q. How about the Maritime provinces?—A. I could not say.

By the Chairman:

Q. Professor Leitch, give us the reasons for our falling down in butter production, and give us some remedy.—A. Up to two years ago, we did not make enough butter in Ontario to supply our own home demand, and since we were just making enough, or not quite enough for the home demand, the price was good.

Our people, the consumers of Ontario, are not quite educated to a high quality of butter, they are easily satisfied, but two years ago we had a little surplus to export from Ontario, and it went over to England, a large part of it, and made a very bad reputation for itself as compared with the butter from Denmark and Australia and western Canada, but the quality reflected on all Canadian butter.

Now, I think it is my duty to point out to the minister that if he gets all these farmers in Alberta producing butter, when it comes into competition with the poor butter of Ontario and Quebec the farmers there will have a hard job to market their product. Alberta can produce butter; the farmers there produce the best butter in Canada. I saw that statement in the Agricultural Gazette a few months ago; it was reported that Alberta in a Dominion-wide competition had the highest score of any province in Canada in their butter exhibit. If we are making the best butter, it is quite evident as the minister will see, that when we begin to compete with this poor butter of Ontario and Quebec they are going to experience a great deal of difficulty in marketing their butter at any price, because as Professor Leitch says, when the quantity is increased the price will be lowered. The people of Alberta can make good butter and they will make large quantities of it if you will show them the market for it. When I went home last summer after the session, the man who was running my farm told me that they had sold their butter at 18 cents a pound in June. Surely it is not necessary to argue, even with the Minister of Trade and Commerce, that no matter how good a cow you have, butter at 18 cents a pound will not return such wages as will sustain life. I was visited by a woman from our home town a few weeks ago. She stated, that four weeks ago to-morrow, in that town of seven hundred people there were one thousand dozen eggs marketed and the price paid by the stores was 15 cents a dozen.

Mr. FOURNIER: That is bad treatment of the hens.

Mr. COOTE: Yes, it is hard on the hens. Ten years ago that might not have been so bad. But the woman who takes these eggs into town and gets 15 cents a dozen for them probably wants to buy some gingham or cotton to make clothing for the children at home. Ten years ago the price of checked gingham, 36 inches wide, in the T. Eaton Company's catalogue was 18 cents a yard. In their present catalogue the same quality of gingham, 27 inches wide—you will notice it has been narrowed down—is 23 cents a yard. Factory cotton in 1912 was 10 cents a yard, now it is 25 cents per yard. It will take quite a few dozen eggs to buy enough cotton or gingham to clothe two or three

children now. Circular pillow cotton used to be 18 cents ten years ago, to-day it is 35 cents a yard. I could give quite a long list of articles showing that compared with ten years ago the purchasing power of the farmers' eggs will return him about 8 cents or 9 cents a dozen. Now, do hon. gentlemen think it is fair for the Minister of Trade and Commerce to urge us to pin our faith to the cow—and I suppose he would include a few chickens?

Mr. FAFARD: It has been stated to-night that during the late by-election in Moose Jaw eggs were on sale in a certain grocery there at 18 cents a dozen. I must correct that statement. Maybe it was made in good faith, but I do not think it is fair to the hens of Moose Jaw. I have before me the Moose Jaw Evening Times of April 9th in which the price for eggs is given at 40 cents a dozen.

Mr. FORKE: Mr. Chairman, the statement of the last speaker has induced me to rise to my feet. I think it is agreed by all, nowithstanding the difference of opinion expressed, that agriculture is really in a bad way at the present time. I do not like this constant cheering when any remark is made about farmers not working all the year around. It is not true. I can assure you that the farmers of Manitoba do work all the year round.

An hon. MEMBER: And the farmers all over.

Mr. FORKE: I have remarked before that I am not as pessimistic perhaps as some of my friends, although I do not differ with them as to present agricultural conditions. But I think there are other factors that perhaps we do not pay enough attention to, and I am confident that if the hon. member who has just given us the price of eggs at Moose Jaw could have given us the price which the farmer received for those eggs there would be a considerable spread disclosed. Two or three weeks ago while in an Ontario farm home I asked the lady of the house what they were getting for eggs. She phoned to the local store and found the price was 35 cents a dozen. When I returned to Ottawa I asked my wife what she was paying for eggs and she told me 60 cents a dozen. Now, Mr. Chairman, there is one of the greatest difficulties we have to overcome in our system of doing business—the cost of distribution. I do not care whether the producer is a manufacturer or a farmer, each is suffering alike because the spread is so wide between the price the producer receives and the consumer pays. It is no use our throwing recriminations backward and forward; this will not do us any good. The cost of distribution is one of the great problems that faces us, because this cost represents so much waste. I do not think anyone all along the line is making exorbitant profits to-day, but our system is too cumbrous and complicated to meet modern conditions.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: What would my hon. friend suggest to decrease the cost of distribution?

Mr. FORKE: I have no remedy offhand, but I have no hesitation in stating that I think a good deal can be done by legislation. At the same time I believe the remedy to a certain extent is in the hands of the people themselves.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: How would my friend decrease the cost of distribution by legislation?

Mr. FORKE: That is a pretty difficult question to solve offhand.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: It is difficult for everyone.

Mr. FORKE: I think co-operation would help a great deal. The cost of production can be brought down by various methods that I might enumerate and will perhaps have an opportunity to do so in this House at a future time. We have theories, they may not be correct, but at the proper time I am quite prepared to state my ideas of what can be done from the economic point of view. I do not suppose my hon. friend opposite will agree with me. However, I give him credit for believing he is right, and I hope he will extend to me the same courtesy.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Surely.

Mr. FORKE: I thoroughly agree with my friends who have painted a rather black picture of agriculture. Where I differ from them is in my outlook towards the future. I have even some faith that the cow of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce can assit us with her butter, and no doubt our hens too can be relied upon to do their duty. But the tremendous difference between the price received by the producer and the price paid by the consumer ought to be eliminated. Recently I received a letter from a merchant in a town in Manitoba in which he said he was only able to pay 19 cents a dozen for eggs. I do not know what is being paid in the cities at the present time, but I have an idea that a great many of those 19-cent eggs are going into cold storage and will be sold at a very

much higher price later on when the supply is scarce. I think the farmers by having cold storage facilities and marketing their eggs at proper times may help themselves along this line.

Mr. ROBB: I promised the hon. gentleman opposite a few moments ago to give him figures respecting butter shipped to the Orient last year. We shipped 174,784 pounds of butter and about 6,000 pounds of cheese.

Mr. COOTE: Is any valuation given?

Mr. ROBB: The value is given at $54,366.19. I am not sure whether that is f.o.b. at point of shipment or at Vancouver.

Mr. FORKE: I would point out to the minister that the export value does not cut very much of a figure so far as agricultural products are concerned. The prairie provinces this year produced some 300,000,000 or 400,000,000 bushels of wheat—a tremendous amount. No such wealth was ever produced by the same percentage of population in the world before, and yet we find that those producers are not able to make a living. The export value shows that the wealth is in the country, but the people who produce that wealth are not reaping the benefit.

Mr. ROBB: I have not been offering these figures as indicating profitable business at all, but merely to show the extent of Canadian business.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I will ask the House to bear with me a moment while with much deference and humility I offer a few observations on the subject that is under discussion, although it is not the subject that is referred to by the motion. I was interested in the remark of the hon. leader of the Progressives (Mr. Forke). He begged of the hon. member for Chambly and Vercheres (Mr. Archambault) that as the two of them differ in their attitude towards this farmer's problem the hon. member for Chambly and Verchères would give him credit for sincerity, which he would reciprocate. I know that the request will not be denied, for the reason that it is only a few months since the hon. member for Chambly and Verchères adopted the same attitude as is now adopted by the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Forke). It is only a few months, indeed, since the difference between the sale price of the farmer and the purchase price of the consumer was laid at the door of a profiteering government by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce himself, and was laid at the door of that awful monster, protection, by all hon. gentlemen across the way. Consequently they should not be slow in according courteous treatment to the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Forke) while he now presses home the arguments in which they were so prolific just eighteen months ago.

Let me refer to another feature. I do not think anyone has listened to these contentions longer than I have or has been the object of them, the one to be destroyed by them, more directly than I have been. The leader of the Progressive party himself, in the fall campaign of 1921, emphasized the serious position the country was in because of the policy pursued by the then administration; because of what he alleged was the big interest affiliation of the Prime Minister of that day. Why, he said, we have the spectacle of the farmer's products going down until he cannot make a profit, while the stock of Dominion Textiles, for example, is at a figure higher by far than just a few years ago; the one is up and the other away down. The hon. gentleman had on his paint and feathers and was on the warpath to bring about a change in those conditions by political effort. To-day the farmer's products are much further down, textile stock is much further up, and the leader of the Progressives has retired from politics. Why all this change? What is the cause of the intensifying, the aggravating of the condition against which there was so much thunder in the fall of 1921? There was nothing complained of in that day that to-day does not exist in intensified and aggravated form. I appeal to hon. gentlemen to my left if such is not the case. It is the case; the cost of living higher; the farmer's products selling lower all along the line; what the farmer has to buy standing up; prosperity harder to find in every part of this Dominion.

An hon. MEMBER: Do not be pessimistic.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, I will not, but before I am through the hon. gentleman will understand my views on these questions; at any rate it will not be owing to lack of effort if I do not make them understood. Much of what hon. gentlemen complain of respecting the condition of farming in Canada is true. In fact, I do not know of very much they have said that is not true. The condition of farming in this country to-day is a very difficult one. The farmer is undoubtedly getting pre-war price for what he sells and is paying almost double the pre-war price for what he buys. That is true of the whole Dominion.

Mr. McMASTER: Is Saul also among the prophets?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Well, Saul also may be among the prophets—I heard Saul prophesy a

year and a half ago in the person of the hon. member for Brome, but I have not heard Saul anything like so loud in recent weeks, and I do not look for very much from him in this session. Now, in eastern Canada the pressure of these conditions does not come home in quite the same degree as it does in the West, for reasons that I will advert to later, but which for the moment I will only describe in these words: In western Canada the tendency to invest the profits of the inflation period was greater than in eastern Canada, because the land, which is the farmer's capital, was nearer at hand and more abundant. That is one reason; another is this: That the volume of purchases per man is greater in the West, and consequently when the cost of purchases rises, the western man feels it more than does the eastern farmer. Nevertheless conditions are difficult in every province. I may be asked whether I attribute this to the administration. If I followed the example of hon. gentlemen opposite I would do so. I do it in part; I believe there were variations in taxation a year ago that in at least substantial degree—material degree; put it that way—are responsible for the extra burdens the common people of this country carry now. But I do not attribute it wholly to hon. gentlemen opposite or to any policy being followed by the government of the day, it is only partly due to that, and that part, while it is material, is not the main factor by any means. Why do I say so? I ask hon. gentlemen to look the world over now, as I asked them to do two years ago and a year ago, look into other countries and ask themselves the question: Is the condition of agriculture better there than it is here? Are not the same wailings, the same cries and complaints, heard in every country of the world at this hour? Are they so loud and so fierce and so well foundationed in any country as they are in the Old Land, free trade England to-day? What is the main problem of the British government right now?

Mr. FORKE: Taxation.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Taxation, yes; and they are heavily taxed. We do not know what taxes are compared to what they have over there. But agriculture over there is not specially taxed; the great burden of taxation does not fall on it at all.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): What about the rents—the rent burdens of agriculture over there?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Of course they have a rent burden, but you have an interest burden in its place. The hon. gentleman attributes it to rent over there? What about Ireland? In Ireland the rent burden has been pretty much done away with, but precisely the same conditions prevail.

Mr. BIRD: Does the hon. gentleman contend that the ratio of taxation to wealth is greater in Great Britain than it is in Canada?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, I think it is.

Mr. BIRD: Is the right hon. gentleman certain about that?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think it is. It is on the mass of the people. The tax in Canada on very great wealth is heavier than it is there, and the tax on the mass of the people is heavier there, although it has been made heavier in this country within the last year. Hon. gentlemen assert that there must be something wrong with government policy because agriculture is in this position and because there is a constant diminution of the proportion of agriculturists in our country to the total of population. I know it is in the minds of hon. members—I know it is not in the mind of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and never was; he only pretended it was—that this condition is due to false fiscal policy. Well, if there is a country in the world that illustrates the diminution of agricultural population more clearly and more forcibly than any other, it is Great Britain. Great Britain to-day has not more than 17 per cent of its population on the land.

Mr. FORKE: Surely the right hon. leader of the opposition would never compare Great Britain with Canada on equal terms as regards agriculture?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Of course not.

Mr. FORKE: Great Britain is not an agricultural country at all; it is an industrial country.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But it was pretty much an agricultural country before free trade came in; I will give the hon. gentleman the figures in a moment. I say that to-day 17 per cent of the population of Great Britain are on the land. In the year 1850 there was over half, of the population, on the land, so that it was pretty much an agricultural country. I think that the process of diminution has been intensified there by the failure to provide a preference for the British producer in the British market. But I do not think that is the main cause in the diminution of the proportion of agriculture.

Mr. EVANS: What was the population at that time? Are there not as many on the land now as then?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not by any means. If the hon. gentleman will read the reports of the expert committees appointed by the government of Mr. Asquith he will find that the number on the land to-day is not by thousands, nor tens or hundreds of thousands, nor by something over a million what it was then. It is, I think, between one and two million less than it was at that time. There are reasons for it, I know. I was just about to say that it is not due in the main to the fiscal policy of the British government, although I know it is the opinion of the great bulk of agriculturists of the Old Land, and I think they are right, that if the fiscal policy of Great Britain were different and they had a preference in the market they have helped so much to build up, there would be a larger proportion of farmers in that country to-day; but there would not be anything like the proportion there was fifty or sixty years ago. Is there a country in the world to-day where there is the same percentage of agriculturists as there was fifty years ago? There is not, and I will say this further: There is no country in the world where the diminution of agriculturists in proportion to the rest of the people has been less than it has been in the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. COOTE: Would Canada have had a less proportion of her people on the land to-day if she had not for years carried on a persistent, paid, government propaganda to put people on our vacant lands?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think we would have had less people on the land if we had not had that propaganda, not only less on the land but less everywhere else. I do not think the propaganda has resulted in a larger or smaller proportion on the land. I think it has resulted in a somewhat larger population, more on the land and more elsewhere as well. I do not think it has affected the proportion by any perceptible amount whatever.

I was speaking of the Old Country. Now I come back to Canada. I ask hon. gentlemen to inquire and tell me of a country in the world where the proportion of agriculturists to-day as compared with fifty or eighty years ago is as great as it is in Canada. I do not think there is one. I know the United States is not one. I know Great Britain is not one. Great Britain has gone down from nearly sixty per cent to about seventeen per cent, where it is to-day.

Mr. COOTE: Was there any other country that had the same amount of free land to exploit?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The United States had. Australia had, the Argentine had—all these new countries of the world had. I do not know that they had as much fine new land for agricultural purposes as we had, and if we had the more that would be one reason why we have diminished less than they have, and what the hon. gentleman has in mind would be right. But what is the fundamental cause of the diminution of the proportion of agriculturists in the Dominion, in the United States, in Great Britain, in France, in Germany, in Australia, in every country in the world? Surely it is not because the people the world over have been following mirages in fiscal policies, have not had brains enough to see what is the right and proper course. We cannot come to that conclusion, because while one country has followed one course, another has followed another, and it so turns out that those who pursued the policy of free trade have found their proportion of agriculturists come down most rapidly of all.

Mr. EVANS: Does the hon. member mean to say that there are vacant farms in Great Britain?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have seen them, but I would not say there are vacant farms where the land is good and reasonably fit for agriculture. I do not know whether there are or not, I know that land has gone out of cultivation and into grazing to the extent of millions of acres. However, that is not the point. I am trying to deal with the matter in the large. There are influences of a minor character that are different in one country from another, but when you find every country has its urban population multiplied and its rural population diminished, you must look for something more basic than anything that is peculiar to the individual country.

What is it that is basic? Why surely it is this, and this is not anything new on my part. I was seeking to make this clear to the Prime Minister when he was leader of the Opposition, and I did not have much success. I will have far better success to-night. I know it was understood then thoroughly by the Minister of Trade and Commerce. The fact is we do not require as large a proportion in the world to-day to produce what the farmer produces for the world as we did in those times. Why do we not? Some would say, because we have machinery which produces more rapidly, we do not need as many on the land. That is true, but that is not the main cause in my opinion, for the reason that we have also machinery in other occupations of life producing other goods much more rapidly than they were produced in olden times. It is

one of the reasons, however, because the multiplication of production by machinery is more emphatic on the land than it is in many others of the occupations of mankind.

But the main reason to my mind is this, that with the advance and evolution of civilization the needs of the human race multiply, the demands of the human race multiply. They multiply in one field after another, in the field of what we wear, in the field of the amusements necessary to entertain us, in the field of travel. In all the different spheres of this life the demands of the world are getting greater, more complicated, more multiplied, and it takes a bigger proportion to cater to these demands to-day than it did in days gone by. Where an hon. gentleman to-day travels at the rate of a thousand miles a year his grandfather travelled at the rate of a hundred miles a year. It takes men to conduct that travel. It takes a part of the world's population to provide the facilities and see that these things can be done. Then there are a thousand engaged in amusing the world to-day where only fifty were engaged seventy-five years ago. That is all consuming a portion of the population, and consequently, because of that continuous process that has been going on for decades, the world does not need and therefore the world does not employ as many in producing the single article of food of which the human being consumes just as much to-day as it did half a century ago, just as much and no more. I have tried to make clear what I regard as the fundamental cause, and what I think economists—I do not pretend to be one myself—regard as the fundamental cause of a process that is world wide.

Mr. FORKE: The hon. member, I think, has given us a complete outline, but he has missed the point.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is the point?

Mr. FORKE: The point is this. The wealth has to be produced from the land just as much as it ever had to be, and those on the land to-day have to cater to a much larger population than formerly. That is one of the reasons why agriculture to-day is in such poor shape. We have radio and other inventions that must be paid for. How are they paid for in Manitoba, let us say? Largely from the products of the soil. Consequently the soil is more and more taxed to pay for all these luxuries.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think the hon. member's mind is on the right line. If, of course, we assume that the farm pays for everything—

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. FORKE: I do not say that exactly.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is the line of his reasoning.

Mr. FORKE: There is no wealth in Canada but what is produced from the natural resources of the country.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Or in any other country.

Mr. FORKE: Well then, the more luxuries are multiplied, the heavier the burden becomes on those who produce the primary wealth of the country.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not see that at all. Any man who works, whether he works at the basis or at the top, whether he is working to bring the gold out of the mine or the coal, or working to turning those products into something else, every man is contributing to the world's wealth.

Mr. FORKE: Excuse me again. Does the hon. member think that the man who is working at the production of radio apparatus is as necessary to the human race as the man who is producing a bushel of wheat?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not at all.

Mr. FORKE: Then why put them on a level?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I was not putting them on a level. I say that every man who produces of the world's wealth, whether he is producing at the top, at the acme of the last effort of manufacture, or at the very bottom out of the soil is contributing to the world's wealth.

Mr. FORKE: I do not deny that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is all I stated, but the idea, to my mind, is entirely erroneous that the more the world enjoys the more those on the soil have to pay for it, work and bear. It is not so at all. No man is compelled to stay on the soil in any free country. There are those who think a terrible calamity has occurred if their son leaves the farm and goes to the city. I have no sympathy with that view whatever. I think the future of our land depends upon the growth of boys on the farm and their maturing not only into farm life but into all walks of life. The greatness of our nation depends upon the young farmer who is getting into other walks of life as well as producing sufficient of the products of the farm to meet the economic needs of the country in which he is born. When a man finds he can do better elsewhere, his country has no call on him to stay on his father's farm. If he thinks he can do better any where else he has

just as good a right as any other man to get into another field. It is a free country and he can go where he thinks he may do better. We are producing proportionately far more than we did years ago. We are producing far more grain. If we produced twice as much I do not think it would be any better for those who were producing it—it would be worse. Let those who wish go where they can be best employed to their own advantage and in my judgment in so going and so acting they are doing the best thing for the country in which they live. There will still be plenty of wheat produced, there will still be plenty of barley produced, and it may be that prices will be higher because there will not be so many working at it. Then we will get that readjustment for which we are waiting.

We are however suffering much to-day from a condition which I think is more or less artificial. Time will have to cure it, and such measures as will tend to cure it should be adopted. In the world to-day, by virtue of the power of organization, those engaged in other walks of life have an advantage over those employed upon the land. Because of the power of labour to organize owing to the uniformity of the work in which they are employed, they have been able to hold up the production costs of goods made elsewhere than upon the land. Had the farmer equal power of organization—he has an equal right—then he would be in a position to obtain results parallel with the results of those engaged in production in other fields.

Mr. FORKE: My right hon. friend has got my point of view exactly; he has stated everything I have been trying to get at.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am very glad if that is so, but I was dealing with another phase of the subject. I am trying to show now the cause of the extreme feature of present conditions. It is not due to the fiscal policy of one country as opposed to the fiscal policy of another. It is due to something far more basic, namely, what I mentioned first. But this affects the situation too: There is an artificial element in production of another character. Much can be gained by the economic organization of the agriculturists of the country. The economic organization of agriculturists is an essential thing and must be perfected in this country far further than it is especially in organization for distribution. Organization will come that will control the total output of the farmer's products and thereby make his sale price bear some relation to his cost of production just as is enabled to be done in other fields of production. How long that will be in coming no one can foresee; but there will be far more effective organization, economic organization, of the agriculturists of this country; and I hope I will not be accused of political prejudice—much less any other kind of prejudice—if I suggest that if the efforts of the agriculturists of Canada had been directed on economic lines for concerted production—or indeed, restriction of production—in fields that were shown not to be successful; more economic distribution of the products of the farm, more direct distribution of those products to the consumer than we have through the cumbersome system of to-day—if that had been the main object of agricultural organization in Canada, instead of the attainment of political power, it would have been better for the farmers of this country. I hope I shall not be misunderstood as attempting to say that I have any objection, or that anybody has any objection, to the farmers obtaining political power. Not at all, they have the same rights as any other people in this Dominion; but there cannot be anything gained by a political farmers' party.

11 p.m.

There can be a lot gained by economic organization amongst farmers. Where it has been directed along that line great results have been achieved. They have been achieved more easily, I think, in smaller and more compact countries of less diversified conditions. There conditions more readily lend themselves to organization. Great things have been done in Belgium, in Holland, and in other countries of that character. They have also been done in larger countries. Even in the United States the farmers have achieved great results, when they have centred their energies upon economic organization and have not launched into other fields.

Now, having advanced these ideas I want to emphasize again that I do so certainly out of no prejudice to any part of our population. I do not pretend to have any special knowledge of farming; I have never sought to impose a knowledge of farming either on this House or any audience; but I think I know something of farm conditions. Before I take my seat, let me say that I do not pay very much attention to the evidence of any man no matter how expert as to whether farming pays or whether it does not pay. You can bring an expert to try and show what a thing costs and what it sells for by taking so much an hour for 11 hours a day in the case of a farm; and you can get a result that will show that no class of farming pays in any part of the country. But I have been on land

when we had to sell farm products—dairy products—at less than the worst quotations—yes, less than one half the worst quotation—offered by any hon. member in this House, and I know that on that farm the mortgage was paid off, I know that a large family was given an education. I venture to say that if Expert Leitch had got into the recesses of the house on that farm and had got at the same material that he got at to come before this committee, he could have shown there was a loss on the operations of that farm every year. I do not know how we are going to get reliable or useful statistics as to what a bushel of wheat, or a quart of milk, or a pound of butter costs. With all deference I venture to say it cannot be done but I do know of farmers who through good and bad times, through difficult weather as well as through fair weather, have managed to make comfortable homes and comfortable fortunes, have managed to raise creditable and useful families, and such is the best proof that agriculture has paid in general. In the stage at which we are now I know there will be little money made, I know that many will go back, but these things adjust themselves as time moves on. What we are suffering every country in the world has gone through; and the way we can accelerate the return of better times is firstly by better organization; secondly, by intelligent direction; and, thirdly, lightening the taxation burden by economies in overhead expenditures which, in the case of a country, means economical administration.

The CHAIRMAN: (Mr. Marcil, Bonaventure): It is my duty to warn the committee once more, as I have done already, that we have wandered far away from the item under consideration and unless it is the wish of the committee to proceed I must call hon. members back to a consideration of the question. I will read the resolution, if necessary, unless the committee wants to suspend all rules and continue discussing the condition of agriculture.

Mr. McMASTER: I did not intend to take part in this discussion but there have been some observations made by the right hon. leader of the Opposition which impel me to say a few words. The speaker in one breath advised the farmers of this country to be more businesslike, and to get organized better both for production and for marketing. I would ask the House to consider whether there can be any organization of production if you are to remain in happy ignorance of the cost of production, and I would make the point that the experts who have come before the committee which has been examining into agricultural conditions have endeavoured to apply business principles to farming and to the question of whether or not it ever has been possible, is possible, or will be possible in this country to make farming pay on a purely commercial basis. It is well that the real facts should be known and that the people should find out where they stand. I always like to listen to the leader of the Opposition, and I felt a thrill of pride pass through me to-night when from his remarks I gathered that he had not been hearing my voice as often as he was accustomed to, and that he did not expect to hear it for some time to come on such a subject as this. That is one of the reasons why I hasten to correct that impression.

I want first of all to direct the attention of the committee to what I would call an historical inaccuracy in the argument of the leader of the Opposition. He will persist in his contention that free trade hurt agriculture in Great Britain. May I tell him and this committee that the agriculturist of Great Britain, that is the man who was actually doing the work on the land, the working agriculturist who had been an independent person for some generations before, by 1835 to 1840 was almost a serf working for another man, or as one of them said, "I be protected and I be starving." I do not forget that when I was a boy in Scotland, an old lady, who remembered those days, told me that before the abolition of the Corn Laws in Scotland, the people went hungry. That was the condition in which agriculture was before the elimination of the Corn Laws. It was such a condition that not only the intellectual people, but the sympathetic and kind-hearted people of England, rose in their might and did away with that economic injustice which then existed.

The right hon. gentleman went on to say—

Mr. MEIGHEN: Before the hon. gentleman proceeds, does he dispute the fact that practically the entire body of agriculturists of England resisted the abolition of the Corn Laws, just as practically the entire body is asking for protection on their products to-day.

Mr. McMASTER: The right hon. member is wrong in his history. I have given a certain amount of sympathetic study to the history of England between 1815 and 1846. During the Napoleonic wars the landlords of England made a great deal of money. The farmers of England occasionally made money, but in times of scarcity they made tremendous profits out of their poor fellow citizens. Then the landlords raised the rents and there was not

any great profit for the farmers. The landlords got a great deal of money during the Napoleonic wars. After the Napoleonic wars were over after 1815, the cost of wheat, of corn, of other cereals, dropped in the old country; but rents did not drop. What happened was this, that the landlords of England, who controlled both houses of parliament, the House of Lords and the House of Commons in England, imposed by law, semi-starvation on the vast body of the English people, the poor folk. They prohibited the entrance of corn into England until corn was 80 shillings a quarter. That was the law of 1815. In 1827, they inaugurated a sliding scale which very little helped the situation. The British workmen always protested against that. Finally, after years of agitation, a few British manufacturers formed the Anti-Corn Law League in 1837 or 1838. After eight years of one of the most wonderful popular agitations that ever took place in any country, they converted the people to their views. First of all they had to convert the workmen in the towns. The workmen in the towns were not sympathetic to the Anti-Corn Law League at first. They thought it was a "bourgeois movement," to use the expression of to-day. They thought it was a "masters' movement." John Bright and Richard Cobden converted the workmen in the towns. Then they went out and they were able to convert the agricultural labourers. As time went on they were able to convert the farmers, and finally they were even able to convert a certain number of landlords, and certain great lords and territorial magnates rallied to their cause. A Tory premier, Peel, who had been elected in 1841 as a protectionist, against the Whigs, who at that time were more or less free-traders, saw that if Great Britain was going to be saved from the social disturbances which took place and which caused tremendous revolutions in 1848, if they were to preserve the British constitution, there was nothing to do but to do away with this economic injustice and to wipe out the Corn Laws. That is a plain, unvarnished and inadequate statement of what happened in connection with the elimination of the Corn Laws in Great Britain.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): History repeats itself.

Mr. McMASTER: History repeats itself but in a different fashion. The people who were suffering through economic injustice in England, were those who suffered from the power of certain people, who had a home market for all that they could produce, maintaining prices at an arbitrary level through legislation. To-day the revolt against protection, against a high tariff in this country, comes from people who are able to produce far more than they consume and who wish to compete in the markets of the world on a fair basis with their competitors from other lands, just as the British manufacturer or the British workman who at that time could manufacture far more than was required to supply the people of Great Britain, wished to send on equal terms his goods to South America, Europe and elsewhere in the world. Great Britain adopted a policy of free trade. Capital and labour were then free to seek the greatest economic returns. There has been a certain diminution of the rural parts of England; but the rural labourer of to-day is in an infinitely better position than his grandfather was when he and the farmer who farmed the land and the landlord who owned the land were protected by a high tariff on what they produced. If men came into the towns of Great Britain from the country places, that was not only because they wished to earn better wages, but because there was in many an English village—this did not apply to Scotland to such an extent—a petty tyranny of vicar and landlord, which the spirits that desired freedom could not endure. It was only in the eighties that the farmer had the right to shoot hares that were destroying his growing crop. If he did that before then he might find himself in difficulty before the bench of magistrates.

What is the fundamental cause of hard times among the farmers? The leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) showed himself, as all men of sense should be, sympathetic with the conditions of the farmer. But he seemed to think that this was a world-wide condition. It is not, altogether. If you look at Europe you will find that the peasant is about the only man there who is really getting on at all well. In Europe a vast number of people have been reduced from the level of being able to eat bread to what in the old days of protection in Great Britain used to be known as the potato level, when people had to eat potatoes and rye because they could not afford wheat and wheaten bread. The fundamental difficulty of the situation to-day is that the purchasing power of Europe has depreciated because of the war and the inability so far of the European peoples to settle their disputes on a reasonable basis, in view of the fact that each one, afflicted with an extravagant development of the protectionist virus, has raised tariffs against the other and made the position much worse than it would have been had they only allowed trade to flow between the different

countries on that continent. It was a fine thing in one way to allow the national aspirations of the different races in Europe to find expression in the formation of free states. But when these states have raised tariff barriers against the other they hurt themselves to an enormous extent.

I have just one more word to say. There is something in what the leader of the Opposition says, that there are a relatively smaller number of people required to grow food than was the case years ago, and that occupation for the surplus—those who are released from the land—is found in the fact that although people can eat only three meals a day—I think if they live in England they can eat five, although in this country they eat three a day—they can wear any amount of clothes and use any quantity almost of the necessities and luxuries of life all of which things must be manufactured. There is something in that. That may have something to do with the relative diminution in the rural population of any country. But I respectfully submit to the committee that Canada is about the last country in the world where that principle should have had application, because I know of no country, except perhaps the Argentine republic or Australia—and Australia only to a certain extent, for the whole northern half of that country is so warm that it is difficult for white men to live there—I say I know of no other country in the world where that principle should have been applied. It seems to me that it should have come into Canada later than it would anywhere else, and I am afraid that we have suffered concurrently with the rest. But what I would point out is that Canada has not only in the past forty years suffered a diminution in her rural population; we have failed to keep our immigration as well as our natural increase either in the cities or in the country. That is the serious question before the people to-day, The farm is the reservoir of man-power, says the leader of the Opposition. I agree with him. He and many other men in this country and in this House are striking examples of the contribution which the farm has made to the city. But it is a mistake to drain the reservoir too much; it is a mistake to kill the goose that lays the golden egg.

Mr. ROBB: I do not like to interrupt the debate, but I would observe that there has been no criticism whatever of the item under consideration. It represents a reduction of $10,000 while we show an increase of business of $165,000,000. At this late hour I think we might adjourn the debate upon the fiscal policy of the country until the budget comes down.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But it shows something more than that. The cost was the same when we had a business of several millions more than now, so that the argument of the minister would not be of much value. Possibly I might be allowed to move the adjournment of the debate after I have offered some remarks. I did not think I had ventured to discuss the fiscal issue as such; that was not my object. The part of my remarks to which the hon. gentleman took exception was my statement that the state of prosperity of the British farmer would, I thought, be better to-day had he had a fair preference in the market he himself contributed to build.

Mr. McMASTER: That is, the home market?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes; the hon. member takes exception to that statement. He states that though the agriculturist was the last to be converted, he really was converted to free trade before it carried. Well, his statement is that of a man living seventy years after. I will refer him to a speech of a public man at the time that this contest was on, just about the period when the Corn Laws were abolished; and I will tell him where he can find that speech. This man was himself a free trader, and I rather think, had I been in his position at that time, I would have been one too. But I would not have been one had I been a British agriculturist.

Mr. McMASTER: You would have been had you been a farm labourer.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not know how the farm labourer would get on unless the farmer prospered.

Mr. McMASTER: The landlord took it mostly in the rent.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think there was any great difference of view between the farmer and the farm labourer.

Mr. McMASTER: Oh yes, there was.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the hon. gentleman will read the speech of Thomas Babington Macaulay, after his election in Edinburgh, when he returned to his constituency to thank the electors, he will find one very significant commentary on the election which that gentleman had just been through, that being about the year 1849. Macaulay said: In my county I had the greatest difficulty in ascertaining where my opponents stood on the issue of free trade. When I got to the city I found

large posters, "Vote for Smith and Free Trade," and as soon as I got into the rural districts I found equally large placards, "Vote for Smith and Protection."

Mr. McMASTER: But Disraeli said, within two or three years of that, that protection was not only dead but damned.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, because the population of the cities was increasing rapidly, and was greater than the population of the country; and of course there were some in the country who were in favour of the other policy. But I was not arguing the general issue; I have done that before and I will do it again at the proper time. I only rose to furnish some evidence of what actually was the division of opinion in England at that time. I have done so, and the hon. gentleman can find the reference I have given him within a few yards of where I sit. As to the condition of opinion now on this question, I do not know that I can do anything better than point to the report of the committee established to look into the condition of British agriculture and to devise some means of extricating it from the calamitous situation in which it finds itself to-day. That report recommends one principle and one principle only, that of protection; and the committee heard British agriculturists fully before submitting its report. It may be that the peasant of Europe is in a rather better situation than the other stricken elements of that disaster-pursued continent. That may be true. But I wonder if that is true in Great Britain. Europe is not a free trade body of nations; it is a protected group of countries. It is only in Great Britain where we find a government appointing commissions to discover some cure for the distracted state of the agricultural population. And the cure they recommend is the one I have just outlined to my hon. friend.

Now, I always admire fidelity, even though it is blind fidelity, and I have no objection at all, in fact I hope the hon. member believing as he does—and I have not the least doubt of his sincerity—will continue to air his opinions in this House and to press them home. But I sympathize with him now in that whereas in the last parliament he enunciated and propounded those views to the applause of two parties, he has now to be content with the applause of only one.

Mr. FIELDING: Is it not also correct that the British government have declined to act upon the report to which the right hon. member refers?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think they have acted yet. I rather detect, though, in the interruption of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) that he has no belief at all in tariffs.

Mr. FIELDING: No. it is rather a desire on my part to see that the facts of any given case are correctly stated.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not state what the British government has done. The report has only been in a week.

Mr. FIELDING: That happens to be important.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes; but the report has only been in a week. If the government of Great Britain acted upon that report and introduced legislation within a week of its receipt they would be a great deal more expeditious than the government of Canada now is.

Mr. FIELDING: Hear, hear.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Marcil): Shall the motion carry?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. BIRD: No.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Marcil): I think it is about time to call the attention of the committee once more to the circumstances that I allowed the departure from the rule in the first instance because I was told there was no objection to the discussion; but it is altogether irrelevant and out of order.

Mr. BIRD: I shall be very brief, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Marcil): I must apply the rule.

Mr. BIRD: I was stimulated to rise by the remarks of the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen). I think his attitude of mind is to be commended, although the process of his reasoning is open to criticism. I think the spirit he has shown is what we want to see manifested to a greater extent in this House, where there should be a serious effort to settle the problem that confronts our agriculturists. However, we have had the experience of seeing the subject treated more or less lightly, and consequently the note of seriousness voiced by the leader of the Opposition is very welcome to my ears. I am one of those who admires the rare quality of the right hon. gentleman's mind, but listening to him to-night I regretted that it was not engaged in a better cause. Circumstances have placed him in a position where he has to main-

tain a dead issue; but I think if Providence had dealt with him differently we would have found him addressing his mind, as he did to-night, effectively to living problems, much to our satisfaction.

Now, he referred to the comparative conditions prevailing throughout the countries of the world with regard to agriculture, and he specified Great Britain in particular. I do not think that agricultural conditions in that country are commensurable with agricultural conditions in Canada. Farming is altogether a different proposition in the two countries. But there is one relevant point; the farmer in Great Britain believes he is the victim of fiscal conditions; the farmer in Canada believes the same. It makes no difference that in Great Britain the complaint is based upon the operation of free trade, while in Canada it is based upon the operation of protection, the principle is the same. Agriculture whether in Canada or Great Britain is suffering from the social policy of the respective countries. The social policy in Great Britain is free trade, and with all due deference to the member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) I must say that the British farmer has suffered from that policy.

Mr. McMASTER: If the British farmer suffered from the introduction of free trade, how was it that rents went up from 1846 until about 1870, when vast quantities of cheap cereals coming from the newly opened lands of the western part of the United States brought rents down?

Mr. BIRD: I think the hon. gentleman will admit that rents in Great Britain are not closely related to the prosperity of the farmer.

Mr. McMASTER: The British farmers have to make a certain amount of money before they can pay rent to their landlords.

Mr. BIRD: I think the hon. gentleman must admit that the present attitude of the British farmer is sufficient evidence that he believes the fiscal policy of Great Britain is detrimental to his interest.

Mr. McMASTER: Some British farmers want to keep our cattle out, others want to let them in so they can finish them. There is a difference of opinion.

Mr. BIRD: I do not want to delve into history, but I know that the British farmer since the abolition of protection has been a consistent supporter of the protectionist party. No matter where his labourer stood, the British farmer has always stood for protection. But that is not the point. I am trying to show that in Great Britain the farmer has been the victim of a social policy, and I contend that he was rightly asked to suffer because he was in the minority. The social prosperity of Great Britain depended at the time upon the acceptance of free trade; the social prosperity of Great Britain to-day depends upon the maintenance of free trade, and the British government has had to turn down the request of the farmers for protection on that very account. The present British government is a Conservative government, predisposed to protection, and yet it has said to the farmer: We cannot grant you protection because it would be against the social interests of this country. So the British farmer at the present time, no matter what he has been asked to do in the past, has for the moment been called upon to sacrifice himself for the social prosperity of his country.

Has not that been the case in Canada? Has not the farmer here in the last generation or two sacrificed himself for the social prosperity of the country? From the beginning this has been a social policy. The agriculturists of Canada have been asked and are being asked to sacrifice themselves for the social prosperity of the nation. I contend that whether in Great Britain or here what is wrong socially cannot be economically sound. That is the position the British government is taking now, and I suppose that the protectionist in this country takes the same attitude.

We ask ourselves, in the condition we are now in, in a preponderatingly agricultural country; can we afford to take that attitude? Can we afford in the interests of Canada as a whole to ask agriculture to sacrifice itself? When the farmers of England approached their government they said: Now, farming is either an economic or a social proposition. You have either got to let it rest on an economic basis and accept the results, or you have to treat it socially; and if you treat it socially you have to grant it either protection or a subsidy. Those are the two propositions that the British farmers put before their government. But the present British government, which is a protectionist government, said: "We cannot give you either a subsidy or protection, because we believe it would be against the best interests of the country to do so." In Canada we have to face the question of the social welfare of all the people. If it is the desire or if it is thought right that Canada should sacrifice the farmer for the rest of the people, well, we have nothing to say. The farmers in England have nothing to say. They have accepted the decision of the government and they have to govern themselves accordingly—to go out of

[Mr. Bird.]

business, if necessary, in order to save the country socially. Are you going to sacrifice the farmer of Canada economically in order that Canada socially may prosper? That is the position you are up against. You cannot laugh this thing out of court; it will come up recurrently and will have to be faced.

I shall not go into the argument of the right hon. leader of the Opposition in regard to the diminution of the proportion of the population engaged in farming. I think that in that respect he got beyond his depth. It was all very well for him to argue that agriculture had diminished relatively with respect to numbers, with respect to its size. That is to say, the more shoes you put on the people's feet the less food you have to put into their stomachs, or the more you amuse their minds the less you will have to satisfy their appetites, and so on. You can argue along these lines, but you do not touch the point we are dealing with to-night. It may be true that agriculture is diminishing proportionately, but why should that be the basis of a contention that agriculture should at the same time diminish relatively with respect to its economic standing. Why should the farmers be worse off than they are to-day, even though they are less in number? According to the usual methods of reasoning, if the farmer belongs to a more exclusive set and ministers to a larger body of people, he ought to be better off than he was before; but that is a point that the right hon. gentleman altogether shelved.

Let me say a word in conclusion in respect to the right hon. gentleman's remarks concerning organization. We all know on this side that organization is of great value to the farmer, as it is to any other class in the community. The right hon. gentleman is not here but I would like to ask him what his definition of economics is, and what his definition of politics is—where he draws the line between the two. He received a great deal of applause from his own followers when he deprecated the entry of the farmers of Canada into politics, and yet he wanted the farmers to organize in their own interests. Where, in his opinion, do economics end and politics begin? What is the theory of government and the functions of government? What does he expect the government to do for the people or for any class of the people? What is the duty of the government toward the farmers or the manufacturers or other classes of the community? Is it simply to prevent individuals in each class from picking the pockets of individuals in the other classes, or see that the individuals in one class do not brutally knock down members of the other class? I do not think so. The duty of this government is to adjust the relationship that exists between the different classes of this country, to see that one class is not unduly profiting at the expense of another.

The Farmers' party is here to-day because it has come to the point where it fails to see any dividing line between politics and economics. We are here as an economic group and not as a political group. We do not want political power; the aspirants to political power are opposite and to our right, not here. We are here as the exponents of certain economic principles, and that is what we stand for. We are not here in any narrow group sense; we are here with varied interests, but those interests all converge on the one principle of a proper adjustment as between the different classes that make up this Canada of ours. I would like to meet the right hon. gentleman on his own ground and ask him whether the manufacturers have not profited by going into politics. Why have other classes entered politics? Because they do not see any difference between their economic and their political interests. I suggest that there be a little more consistentcy in the definition of terms. We are living in the past when we think of politics as some sacred arena into which the ordinary people may not enter unless they take off their shoes at the gate. That belongs to the past—that policeman theory of government, that idea that the government has nothing to do with the real problems of the people.

It ill becomes the leader of the Conservative party to try to keep economics out of politics, because if any party were responsible for desecrating the sacred realm of politics by the introduction of economics, it was the Conservative party. When the Liberal government in England of the last century stood with arms upraised in horror at the invasion of economics into English public life it was the Conservative party that ruthlessly tried to bring it in, that tried to get rid of that theory of laissez faire and of the devil take the hindmost. The Conservative party in England tried to do that, while the Liberals were endeavouring to apply the policeman theory of government. We are not politicians in this group; you have noticed that many times. But we do pretend in a small way to be economists in a practical sense; that is, we know where the shoe pinches. You remember Kipling's story of the butterfly and the poor toad under the harrow. We have instances in this House of the butterfly giving good advice to the poor toad that feels every spike in the harrow. We do not pretend to be introducing radical notions into this House but we do

pretend to be bringing the actual conditions to the notice of hon. members and of the government. You experienced politicians, you statesmen, you people who have been walled up here for years living in a false atmosphere —we are trying to let daylight into you. We are accused of preaching blue ruin in this quarter of the House. Why, in the last century every man who tried to get a square deal for the public was called a blue ruin preacher. Some hon. members say they think it is a pity that we should preach blue ruin: I say it is a pity we should have to preach it. I was back home for a few days last week, and I called my executive together. A man of long experience stood up and said: "I can tell you from my experience that more than fifty per cent of my neighbours are hopelessly insolvent, and mind you, I come from a place that is called one of the gardens of the West, where farmers might be expected to prosper." The galleries of this House have ears, the reporters' gallery has ears, and I hope that the benches on the floor have ears, but there should be a difference in the way our plea is heard when we come with our tale of woe. It should not be received critically on the floor of the House here. It should be received rather sympathetically and with some insight into the motive with which it is given, because we do not speak these things to the public. We forget the galleries when we speak; we do not know they are there. We do not know the reporters' gallery is there. We are speaking to you, and we do not expect you to blurt these things out all over the world. We are reasoning with you because you are the people with power in your hands to remedy these things. Who else can we go to for remedy? You cannot expect us to let these things ferment in our minds in silence. This is the place where complaints should be made, and this is the place where complaints should be heard, and heard sympathetically, with a statesmanlike breadth of mind and spirit.

I am sorry to have detained the House. I know a lot of this might have been said at another time, but it will not now be said at another time, so there is no time lost.

Item agreed to.

Mr. ROBB: There is an item in the Supplementary Estimates we might take up.

Mr. STEVENS: I think the minister will agree that we have had a long and perhaps more or less profitable discussion to-night not very closely related to his estimates, but we have passed a couple of items and as the hour is late, I think it would be a gracious act for him to move that the committee rise and report progress.

Mr. ROBB: We will agree to that.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, the House adjourned at 11.45 p.m.

Monday, April 16, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST READINGS

Bill No. 106 (from the Senate), to extend the Right of Appeal from Convictions for Indictable Offences.—Mr. Sheard—for Mr. McQuarrie.

Bill No. 107 (from the Senate), to incorporate Montreal Finance Trust. Mr. Papineau.

Bill No. 108 (from the Senate), for the relief of Violet Gardiner.—Mr. Sheard.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

DRAWBACK ON MATERIALS IMPORTED

Mr. FANSHER:

1. What was the value of the raw materials imported into Canada during the past fiscal year for the manufacture of goods for export?
2. What was the amount of duty paid on these raw materials?
3. What was the amount of money returned to the importers in the way of rebates or drawbacks?
4. What was the value of the raw materials imported into Canada during the past fiscal year for the manufacture of goods for home consumption?
5. What was the amount of duty paid on these raw materials?
6. What was the amount of money returned to the importers in the way of rebates or drawbacks?

Hon. Mr. BUREAU:

1 and 2. Information not available.
3. $9,405,949.57.
4 and 5. Information not available.
6. $1,481,793.07.

INTERNATIONAL BRIDGE AT NIAGARA

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

1. Is the new International bridge of the Michigan Central Railway Company at Niagara Falls to be constructed by Canadian contractors, either in whole or in part?
2. If in part, what work is being carried on by Canadian contractors?
3. What are the names and addresses of Canadian contractors taking part in the construction of the bridge, and the amounts of contracts awarded each?
4. What is the total cost of construction of the bridge?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Plans and description of the bridge in question were approved by the Governor in

Council on recommendation of the Minister of Public Works as required in the case of navigable waters by section 248 of the Railway Act, and afterwards, as required by the same section, the plans were approved by the Board of Railway Commissioners and construction authorized.

The Engineering News-Record of March 1st, 1923, states that the contract had been awarded to the American Bridge Company for the steel work, which will require about 7,500 tons, contract price for which is about $116 per ton.

Abutments and other items of substructure, requiring about 11,000 cubic yards of concrete, are to be built under a separate contract as to which we have no information.

The Department of Railways understands that contract for the steel work was let after public competition in which Canadian firms participated.

TOPOGRAPHICAL SURVEY EXPENDITURES
1900-22

Mr. FAFARD:

1. What amount of money has the Topographical Survey expended in the Dominion during the years 1900 to 1922?

2. What amount of such money was expended, each year, in each province?

Hon. Mr. COPP:

1.

1900-01	$ 269,929.49
1901-02	371,529.77
1902-03	449,999.29
1903-04	749,930.51
1904-05	794,409.83
1905-06	599,780.01
1906-07	526,582.61
1907-08	768,243.94
1908-09	797,746.74
1909-10	754,437.85
1910-11	976,024.94
1911-12	958,329.56
1912-13	964,890.11
1913-14	1,051,685.78
1914-15	1,046,909.88
1915-16	1,043,158.57
1916-17	774,396.19
1917-18	579,870.45
1918-19	405,171.74
1919-20	558,080.31
1920-21	685,013.00
1921-22	591,400.54
	$15,717,521.20

2.

Year	Manitoba	Saskatchewan	Alberta	British Columbia	Yukon	N. W. Territories	Ottawa salaries of office staff	Office expenses
	$	$	$	$	$	$	$	$
1900–1901	37,890	42,037	55,657	19,813	39,708	13,143	47,182	14,499
1901–1902	41,906	46,113	122,793	18,377	65,339	1,632	49,823	25,547
1902–1903	56,149	109,596	101,591	39,019	57,277	.....	63,995	22,372
1903–1904	16,827	322,614	210,311	29,568	44,948	.....	83,338	42,325
1904–1905	80,026	180,048	337,088	34,186	35,467	.....	87,879	39,716
1905–1906	37,442	92,674	255,710	48,165	33,055	.....	104,433	28,301
1906–1907	125,206	71,194	164,392	26,793	10,848	.....	86,364	41,786
1907–1908	120,947	171,739	238,498	39,815	19,231	.....	135,182	42,831
1908–1909	114,721	138,868	333,223	63,122	22,157	.....	68,869	56,787
1909–1910	92,474	225,744	288,689	68,880	18,685	.....	12,655	47,311
1910–1911	64,807	235,620	470,419	117,950	11,715	477	10,951	64,086
1911–1912	84,167	265,609	418,295	94,222	30,094	.....	11,693	54,249
1912–1913	177,445	234,763	348,444	89,663	25,424	3,506	10,770	74,876
1913–1914	171,786	185,786	444,246	110,084	19,154	17,134	11,677	91,818
1914–1915	188,457	117,620	543,313	91,478	23,605	.....	25,472	56,965
1915–1916	145,292	123,747	489,572	174,661	16,653	.....	30,116	63,118
1916–17	77,173	181,890	283,791	96,873	12,489	.....	32,225	89,955
1917–18	75,773	138,172	171,127	97,050	8,601	.....	31,806	57,341
1918–19	40,983	125,008	120,955	43,224	4,569	.....	32,103	38,330
1919–20	78,838	182,787	160,462	54,975	2,499	.....	46,824	31,695
1920–21	159,242	142,859	251,793	38,433	.....	.....	50,174	42,512
1921–22	102,422	122,207	115,012	60,348	.....	77,114	51,945	62,353
	2,089,973	3,456,695	5,925,381	1,456,699	501,518	113,006	1,085,476	1,088,773
Total	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	15,717,521

Department of National Defence—
Militia Service—

1. No expenditure up to 1902-1903. From 1903-1904 to 1921-1922—$518,284.00.

2. Expenditure on account of each province approximately as follows:—

Year	Ontario	Quebec	New Brunswick	Nova Scotia	Manitoba	Total
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts
1899–1919						
1900–1901						
1901–1902						
1902–1903						
1903–1904		3,583 50	3,583 50			7,167 00
1904–1905	11,246 00					11,246 00
1905–1906	14,518 00	1,000 00				15,518 00
1906–1907	15,760 00	2,000 00				17,760 00
1907–1908		23,716 00				23,716 00
1908–1909	12,403 00	12,403 00				24,806 00
1909–1910	17,355 00	5,785 00				23,140 00
1910–1911	2,626 00	23,634 00				26,260 00
1911–1912	6,178 50	18,535 50				24,714 00
1912–1913	8,763 75	22,785 75		3,505 50		35,055 00
1913–1914		35,153 10		3,905 90		39,059 00
1914–1915		35,038 00				35,038 00
1915–1916	2,544 00	22,896 00				25,440 00
1916–1917		21,274 00				21,274 00
1917–1918				31,406 00		31,406 00
1918–1919				31,082 00		31,082 00
1919–1920		4,052 20		36,469 80		40,522 00
1920–1921	6,768 75	31,587 50		6,768 75		45,125 00
1921–1922		25,971 40			13,984 60	39,956 00
	98,163 00	289,414 95	3,583 50	113,137 95	13,984 60	518,284 00

This includes costs for reproduction of maps.

No expenditure made on remainder of the provinces.

SURVEYS IN PRAIRIE PROVINCES

Mr. FAFARD:

What amount of money was expended in the provinces of Saskatchewan, Alberta and Manitoba for surveys of base lines, township lines and subdivision lines; also for surveys of lakes and rivers, during the years 1882 to 1922?

Hon. Mr. COPP:

Province	Base-lines, Meridians, and Block Outlines	Township, Outlines, Subdivision & Resurveys	Lakes, Rivers, Etc.
Manitoba.... ...	$ 468,438	$1,442,231	$ 83,739
Saskatchewan. ..	550,912	2,869,330	328,270
Alberta...	1,167,514	4,448,362	195,481
Total..	$2,186,864	$8,759,923	$607,490

Department of Public Works—

Saskatchewan and Alberta..	$54,498 53
Manitoba....	40,647 21
	$95,145 74

Expended on surveys of lakes and rivers.

COMPLAINTS AGAINST BREWERIES

Mr. BROWN:

1. Have any complaints been received by the government from any of the provinces during the calendar year in regard to breweries using the privileges granted them by license, to violate the liquor laws of the province?

2. If so, in regard to what breweries?

3. Is it the policy of the government to continue licensing the breweries so complained of?

4. What action is being taken in regard to the breweries complained against?

Hon. Mr. BUREAU:

1. Copies of convictions for infractions of provincial laws have been received.

2. Not deemed advisable to disclose the names.

3. Under consideration.

4. Answered by Number 3.

LIQUOR WAREHOUSE LICENSES IN BRITISH COLUMBIA

Mr. CLARK:

1. How many excise bonded warehouse licenses for the keeping of intoxicating liquors in the province of British Columbia have been issued since the beginning of the year 1920?

2. Who are the licensees and what are the dates of issue of such licenses, including any renewals thereof?

3. In what cities or towns respectively were the warehouses situated in respect of which such licenses were issued?

4. Is it the policy of the government in dealing with applications for such licenses to require the approval of the attorney general, or the provincial government, or a member thereof, before issuing such license?

5. Are such licenses renewable annually? If so, is similar approval of the attorney general or other provincial authorities required for such renewal?

6. Was such approval given in the cases of the granting or renewal of such licenses? If so, by whom?

Hon. Mr. BUREAU:

1. Four.

2. & 3. (1) Liquor Control Board of British Columbia, Vancouver—Date of Issue September 19, 1921,—renewed April 1, 1922; (2) Canadian Pacific Ocean Service Ltd., Vancouver—Date of issue February 27, 1919, April, 1920, April 1, 1921, April 1, 1922; (3) Calgary Export Co., Vancouver—Date of issue January 22, 1921—renewed April 1, 1922; (4) Liquor Control Board of British Columbia, Victoria—Date of Issue July 8, 1921—renewed April 1, 1922.

4. Yes.

5. Yes.

6. Yes—Attorney General of the province and Chairman of British Columbia Liquor Board.

LUMBER IMPORTATIONS FOR WELLAND CANAL

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River):

1. Did the Montreal harbour board order 5,000,000 feet of lumber from the United States during 1922 for use on construction work in connection with the Welland canal?

2. If so, why was not this lumber ordered from British Columbia?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. No.

2. See answer to No. 1.

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. No lumber for use on construction work in connection with the Welland canal was purchased by the Montreal harbour board.

2. Answered by No. 1.

GRAIN ELEVATOR COMMISSION

Mr. COOTE:

1. Was there a grain elevator commission appointed by the government in the spring of 1922? If so, what was the purpose in view?

2. What were the names, addresses and occupations of the members of this commission?

3. Have they made a report to the government?

4. If so, has the report been published?

5. If no report has been made, when does the government expect to receive a report from the commission?

Hon. Mr. ROBB:

1. No.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. Answered by No. 1.

4. Answered by No. 1.

5. Answered by No. 1.

MONTREAL HARBOUR MASTERS

Mr. DESLAURIERS:

1. Are the Montreal harbour masters, appointed by the Montreal Board of Trade, paid by the government?

2. If so, what are their respective salaries?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE:

1 & 2. The harbour masters for the harbour of Montreal are not appointed by the Board of Trade or paid by the government.

PARK AND DAVIS COMPANY "METAGEN"

Mr. DESLAURIERS:

1. Does the product known by the name of "Metagen" put up by the Park and Davis Company contain vitamines as advertised?

2. If not, will the use of this product be prohibited by the government?

Hon. Mr. BELAND.

1. Biological tests have shown that "Metagen" contains vitamines.

2. Answered by No. 1.

CLOSURE RULES

*Mr. MEIGHEN:

Is it the intention of the government to recommend to Parliament repeal of the closure rules adopted in 1913?

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I may answer this question orally by saying no.

WHEAT SHIPMENTS TO GREAT BRITAIN

Hon. Mr. MANION:

1. How many bushels of wheat were shipped from Canada to Great Britain in the years 1912, 1913, 1919, 1920, 1921, 1922?

2. How many bushels of wheat were shipped from Canada to the United States, to France, to Italy, to Germany, to Belgium, and to Holland, in the same years?

Hon. Mr. BUREAU:

1 and 2:

EXPORTS OF CANADIAN WHEAT TO COUNTRIES SPECIFIED, DURING THE FISCAL YEARS ENDED MARCH 31, 1912 1913, 1919, 1920, 1921 AND 1922

Country	1912	1913	1919	1920	1921	1922
	Bushels	Bushels	Bushels	Bushels	Bushels	Bushels
United Kingdom	60,343,037	77,722,465	37,317,648	51,426,131	29,294,612	92,498,351
United States	997,662	9,834,530	1,992,409	6,661,588	42,324,894	16,592,797
France	.....	45,469	1,235,509	5,045,000	5,051,461	1,111,752
Italy	.....	.....	1,039,273	2,757,174	21,048,458	10,298,424
Germany	890,003	777,614	.....	.....	1,832,739	1,219,257
Belgium	1,696,953	3,072,736	.....	4,198,288	14,069,843	4,069,245
Holland	429,485	1,162,636	.....	.....	6,976,125	2,585,885

JAMES RUSSEL

Mr. HANSON:

1. Was James Russel, of Newcastle, New Brunswick, employed at any time by the Fisheries branch as warden on the River Miramichi?
2. If so, when was he discharged from the service, for what reason, and was any official investigation held in connection with his removal from the service?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. He was employed as a temporary fishery guardian.

2. February 21st, 1923, as work on which he was employed was then finished. There was no investigation nor was there any reason for one.

SMELT FISHING REGULATIONS

Mr. HANSON:

1. Is it the intention of the Fisheries branch to revise the regulations regarding the taking of smelt from Canadian waters?
2. If so, what changes are contemplated?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE:

1 and 2. No changes are at present under consideration.

CONTRACTS AWARDED TO DEMERS, OF QUEBEC

Mr. PARENT:

1. Have contracts been awarded one Demers, of the city of Quebec, by the Post Office Department?
2. If so, on what date and for what service have said contracts been given?
3. Were tenders received for the said work? If so, from whom?
4. How many days, if any, elapsed between the receipt of tenders and the notification to the successful tenderer?
5. Who were present when the tenders were opened?
6. At what price were the contracts given?
7. Has a person by the name of Nolin put in a tender?
8. If so, what price did the said Nolin quote for the said service, and on what date was his tender received?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM (for Postmaster General):

1. Yes.

2. (a) 29th April, 1921, Quebec post office to railway stations and wharves; (b) 29th April, 1921, Quebec street letter boxes; (c) 29th April, 1921, Quebec parcel post delivery.

3. Yes. (a) Amedee Demers, (b) Amedee Demers; (c) Amedee Demers and James M. Norton.

4. Tenders for all three services were due at Post Office Department on 29th April, 1921, and instructions awarding the contracts to the lowest tenderers were issued the same day.

5. Two responsible officers of the department.

6. (a) $13,000 per annum; (b) $16,000 per annum; (c) 60 cents per hour.

7. Yes.

[Mr. Bureau.]

8. (a) $7,800 per annum; (b) $15,500 per annum; (c) 75 cents per hour.

These tenders were irregular and furthermore were not received at department until 30th April, 1921.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

MR. JOHN HAYES

Mr. IRVINE:

For a copy of all correspondence, documents, letters, telegrams passing between the postmaster of Calgary post office and the Postmaster General's department, in connection with Mr. John Hayes.

NATIONAL RAILWAYS—LIQUOR TRANSPORTATION

Mr. STEVENS:

For a copy of all correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents passing between the Right Honourable the Prime Minister, the Honourable Minister of Railways, and H. R. Grant of Sydney Mines, Nova Scotia, or other persons, having reference to the transportation of liquor, over Canadian National Railways or other lines under the control of the Canadian National Railways, into the province of Nova Scotia.

CANADIAN GOVERNMENT MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. STEVENS:

For a return showing the earnings and expenditures of the following vessels on the trips set forth below:—

1. Canadian Winner, leaving Vancouver August 8, 1922, for the Orient, returning October 12, 1922;
2. Canadian Inventor, leaving Vancouver September 28, 1922, for the Orient, returning November 20, 1922;
3. Canadian Britisher, leaving Vancouver May 13, 1922, for Australia, returning October 4, 1922;
4. Canadian Traveller, leaving Vancouver July 13, 1922, for Australia, returning December 1, 1922;
5. Canadian Farmer, leaving Vancouver July 18, 1922, for California points, returning August 12, 1922; also from Vancouver, August 14, for California points, returning September 13, 1922.
6. Canadian Observer, leaving Vancouver July 7, 1922, for California, returning August 23, 1922; also August 8, 1922, for California points, returning September 24, 1922.

MR. W. H. TRUEMAN

APPOINTMENT TO THE BENCH

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. HANSON: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin) I would ask the Prime Minister whether the report published in the press to the effect that Mr. W. H. Trueman, K.C., of Winnipeg has been appointed a judge of the Court of Appeal of Manitoba is true?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The report is correct.

CATTLE SHIPMENTS

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. FORKE: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) the following question: I notice an in-

terview in Saturday's Manitoba Free Press given by W. H. Forster of England, who came to Canada from England to purchase cattle. He intended purchasing about 2,000 head; he found when he came that all available space for ocean shipments had been contracted for.

It had been broadcast in England that Canada would have for sale this spring about twenty-five or thirty thousand head of cattle suitable for the British trade, and that the ocean freight would be about $15 per head. Now when a purchaser comes here, he finds all, or nearly all, space contracted for, and the ocean rate is $22.50 or $25 per head.

In view of the fact that the department has been urging farmers during the winter to have cattle ready for the market, had the department any knowledge that a condition such as exists might occur?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Mr. Speaker, it is difficult offhand to answer all these questions.

Mr. FORKE: It is just one question.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: But the answer to the one question does not do justice to the subject generally. My deputy is preparing a statement for the press that covers the whole question; it gives the sailings of all the steamers for the next four weeks from Montreal and St. John and shows that there will be a shortage of space for the first two weeks in May, that on the third week space will be equal to the demand, and that on the fourth week it will be greater than the demand. At the present time the space available is less than the demand. In a general way we had some information with regard to the number of cattle that would be shipped, but it was very difficult to get any exact figures. With the information furnished to us we have kept the shippers in Montreal acquainted with the requirements of this movement. That is all I can say in a verbal statement.

Mr. FORKE: Is the minister aware of the fact that by the end of May the proper time for the shipment of this class of cattle is nearly past and space will be of little benefit to the shippers after that date?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Does my hon. friend think we should carry shipping space in our vest pocket ready for immediate requirements? There were two schools of thought apparent in Canada in connection with cattle shipments to Great Britain after the removal of the embargo: One was to deprecate the removal and to point out that there would be nothing much going over anyhow; the other was to exaggerate the movement. Between the two it was pretty difficult for us to size up the situation. We kept the cattlemen fully supplied with information we gathered in regard to the situation. You cannot restore a trade that has been suspended for thirty years and expect to find everything ready for its resumption without some disturbance. Therefore it is quite natural that there should be a shortage of space for a brief period, but, as I have already indicated, in a few weeks there will be more than sufficient accommodation to meet the demand.

THE BUDGET

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I rise to ask my hon. friend, the Minister of Finance, whether he is going to fix this coming week for the introduction of the budget?

Mr. FIELDING: It would be a great joy to me if I could fix the date for this week, but I am afraid it will have to be postponed. I hope it may be during the coming week, but I do not desire to be too definite. I am almost as anxious as my hon. friend to have it off my mind.

Hon. F. B. CARVELL

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. COOTE: Mr. Speaker, I would draw the attention of the Prime Minister to a despatch in the local papers from Vancouver dated April 10th, stating that a letter of protest has been sent to the Prime Minister by the Vancouver Board of Trade in which it characterizes recent statements of Hon. F. B. Carvell, Chief Commissioner of Railways, regarding the attitude of the province of British Columbia toward the freight rate question as showing disregard for the ethics of his position. Has the Prime Minister received this letter? If so, will he be good enough to lay it on the table of the House for the information of members?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Speaker, I have received the letter to which my hon. friend refers and shall have pleasure in laying it on the Table before the House rises.

Mr. COOTE: Will the Prime Minister also be good enough to secure a copy of the letter sent by Mr. Carvell to the associated boards of trade in British Columbia, which is referred to by the Vancouver Board of Trade?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I will not make a definite promise, but I think I can secure a copy of the letter, and if so I will have it placed on the Table with the other communication referred to.

SUPPLY—SALES TAX

On the motion of Hon. W. S. Fielding (Minister of Finance) for Committee of Supply:

Mr. JOS. T. SHAW (Calgary West): I want to take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, of bringing to the attention of the House the application of the existing sales tax in so far as it affects public libraries. I am impelled to take this action at this particular time because I read in the public press that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) is not averse to receiving suggestions from outside deputations with regard to the approaching budget, and it occurred to me that perhaps he might not be unwilling to view with favour suggestions made by members of this House.

Under the operation of the existing sales tax public libraries are subjected to a 6 per cent tax on books imported from foreign countries. And may I say at the outset that the majority of our books are imported? If these books are not imported directly they may be purchased, as they often are, from Canadian wholesalers, in which event a sales tax is charged the library of some 2¼ per cent; but in the price charged by the wholesaler is included the price which he must pay by way of sales tax, totalling 3¾ per cent. Therefore, in any event the library must pay a sales tax of 6 per cent on its purchases.

Another factor that is of great importance to public libraries is the matter of bindings, which they use very considerably. Bindings are subject to a sales tax of 4½ per cent. Now, it is rather a strange coincidence that while libraries have been exempted so far as their purchases are concerned from the operation of the customs tariff, they have not been exempted from the sales tax in their purchases of books and bindings. The operation of this sales tax, as I have indicated, constitutes a very grievious burden to public libraries. There is, as must be matter of common knowledge, an increasing demand on public libraries to-day, and it is also a fact that these institutions are receiving decreased appropriations. In the city from which I come we have a very efficient tax-supported public library officered by a very capable official indeed, a library which serves not only our city but a very large surrounding country. In the city of Calgary alone the operation of the sales tax during the present fiscal year will mean the payment by that library of about $1,000. During the year also there has been a decrease in the appropriations for this library totalling $2,000. In the western provinces the operation of the sales tax will mean approximately $10,000 to public libraries, of which amount $7,000 represents the tax on the purchase of books alone.

I hold in my hand a letter from the Inspector of Libraries for the province of Ontario, and I should like to indicate his views in connection with this matter. Referring to the libraries in Ontario, he says:

> Our libraries expended in that year $164,185.

That is, the year 1921. Continuing, he says:

> The sales tax is a heavy burden on our libraries. The prices of books have increased tremendously since before the war, and the libraries' incomes are decidedly limited. The Dominion government has always recognized the general public service of public libraries by permitting imported books to come to the public libraries free of duty. Surely the sales tax should be removed when it is in the general public's good that it should be removed. The Ontario legislature bases its grants largely on book purchases, and we find that our grants are not as effective by reason of the tax that is imposed?

It is apparent, therefore, to anyone who ponders the situation for a moment that the tax-supported public libraries find themselves ground between the millstones of heavy federal taxation on the one hand and a decreasing appropriation on the other, the latter due primarily to the financial stringency. While the tax does bear very seriously upon the individual library, I think it can fairly be said that the aggregate amount received by the government, so far as the application of the tax to libraries is concerned, is very insignificant indeed.

The special objection which I have to the particular tax that I am referring to is that it constitutes a tax upon taxation. This is a case of double taxation, and falling as it does upon a tax supported institution, it bears very heavily indeed. Strange to relate, when the statute was drawn the provincial libraries were specially exempted, but other public libraries, equally tax-supported, were not favoured with exemption. Under these circumstances I am asking the House in the form of a resolution to indicate that this tax should be removed, in its application to public libraries in so far as it affects the purchase of books and of binding supplies.

I know that I shall be met with one or two arguments. It will be suggested. I doubt not, that the matter should first be taken up with the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) or the Minister of Customs and Excise (Mr. Bureau). But the library officials last year did take the matter up not only with the Minister of Finance but with the Minister of Customs and Excise, and they did not accomplish their desire. It will be urged, also, I assume, that to move an amendment when going into Com-

mittee of Supply constitutes a vote of want of confidence in the government. I have not any desire by this vote to indicate any such want of confidence so far as this particular item is concerned. I do want to suggest however, that there has not been any other opportunity to bring this matter to the attention of the House. Had I brought it up by way of private member's resolution I should have been met with the suggestion that it constituted in effect a subtraction of the public revenue and consequently would not be legal under that head. Bringing it up at this time, I may be met with the suggestion, as I have said, that it is a vote of want of confidence. Well, it is about time that hoary tradition was dispensed with; and I notice that in the Mother of Parliaments itself, the most transparent technicality has lately been taken advantage of in order to obviate the application of that rule. Then again, it may be urged, "Why not bring it up in the budget debate?" But if ever there was a time for pious platitudes, surely it is when the budget is under consideration, I do suggest to the government that this is the time and this is the place to bring to the attention of parliament a matter which to my mind is of vital significance to our public libraries and also to the reading public.

But I may be met further with the argument: "Why pick out this particular item? Why single out the sales tax in its application to public libraries? Why not deal with a dozen other things?" Well, I want to say at the outset that the tax in its effect upon libraries is particularly vicious, particularly harmful. It is, as I have pointed out, a tax upon taxation; it is in a category by itself so far as sales tax is concerned. And not only that: while I have very serious objection to the sales tax in many directions, I sometimes think it is much more desirable to attack the enemy in detail rather than by making a frontal attack. I feel that it is going to be a great many years before we shall have in vogue in this country a proper, scientific system of taxation. No effort has yet been made to delimit, if you like, the various fields of taxation—Dominion, provincial, and municipal. Consequently I must take this opportunity of presenting to the House a resolution dealing with this particular matter. I move in amendment:

That all the words in the resolution after the word "that" be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

Whereas public libraries are necessary and valuable educational institutions not existing for profit and supported by public taxation,

And whereas, on account of the increasing demand for library facilities and the difficult economic conditions prevailing, public libraries in Canada are experiencing the greatest difficulty in financing their reasonable requirements,

And whereas the application of the sales tax on the purchases of books and book-binding by public libraries constitutes a heavy financial burden, limiting the usefulness and impairing the efficiency of such public libraries,

Therefore be it resolved that this House deems it advisable that public libraries in Canada, supported by public taxation, be exempted from the operation of the sales tax in so far as the same affects the purchases of books and book-binding by such public libraries.

The amendment is seconded by the hon. member for McLeod (Mr. Coote).

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, on the question of non-confidence to which the hon. gentleman has referred I am reminded of the old lines, "It was all very well to dissemble your love, but why did you kick me downstairs?" I do not want to dwell on the question of non-confidence. I think I have a better reason for asking my hon. friend not to press his motion, or if he is to press it, for asking the House not to accept it.

With what he has said as to the importance of public libraries, the desirability of encouraging them and the hard times they are perhaps having, I am sure I can heartily sympathize, as I am sure most members of the House will, but that is by no means a conclusive reason why we should adopt this motion. I am not at the moment expressing any opinion whether it is or is not desirable that we should exempt public libraries from the sales tax. This is but one of twenty questions which are being presented to the government by hon. members on both sides of the House. I am sure I am probably within my facts when I say that I see before me on the two portions of the opposite benches at least a score of gentlemen who have done me the honour of calling upon me to impress upon me some particular thing in which they would like some reduction of taxation or some exemption from the operation of this or that tax. One gentleman here on this side of the House makes a habit of urging the exemption from the income tax where there are a certain number of children. Another hon. member brings forward some particular thing in which he is sincerely desirous of having a change, and no doubt they could all make a measure of popularity if they would get up in this House and become the champion of this or that particular thing. But why should we select among these fifty or more things—perhaps I had

better be moderate and say among the twenty or more changes proposed—why pick out of the basket this particular thing and ask the judgment of the House upon it this afternoon? I fail to see the reason. I had a large deputation the other day urging very strongly that in the matter of income tax any man who contributes to charity or religion or any of the various noble causes which we are all asked to help should not be taxed on what he contributes for that purpose. That is perhaps as strong a case as my hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. Shaw) brings forward, but all who have these things in mind have been content to make their case and await the moving of the waters. I know of no reason why this particular case or fad, if I may dare call it that, and not offensively, for fads are good things at times, should be selected for us to vote upon to-day. If it is good policy to do that, then hon. gentlemen opposite—I am not designating any member—who have come before me and asked that a particular tax be abolished ought to get up and move in the same way and somebody else move for income tax exemption where there are children. Each of these things may be important in itself, but I submit to the House there is no good reason why we should pick out this particular thing and ask the House to pass judgment upon it this afternoon.

The sales tax is not a particular baby of my own. It was a system, and probably a necessary system, established by the former government. I have had the unpleasant duty of increasing the amount of it. That is my crime in the matter. When the late government devised the tax I know that they made many exemptions; some people think too many; I know there is something to be said against exemptions. But the late government did make a very liberal list of exemptions. They considered public libraries I have no doubt, and no doubt thought that taken all in all libraries could stand the tax as well as many other things. I am not declaring against the judgment of the hon. member for Calgary. I am asking him to consider whether it is wise to ask the House to select this particular one out of the many questions, anticipate the budget, and ask for a vote upon it now. I do not think that is fair. I do not think either party in the House should accept the motion.

Amendment negatived.

SUPPLY—SPECIAL DELIVERY LETTER POSTAGE

Hon. CHARLES MARCIL (Bonaventure): Before you leave the chair, Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the Acting Postmaster General (Mr. Graham) to a matter concerning which I should have spoken when the House was in supply, but being occupied in a committee of the House I was unable to do so. It is regarding the special delivery of letters, on which a stamp of twenty cents has now to be placed. Many complaints have reached me from Montreal on this subject, and I would like to call the attention of the acting minister to the matter so that he may investigate it.

When the special delivery was originally devised, the postage was fixed at ten cents; it is now twenty cents, in addition to the three cents ordinary postage. That makes twenty-three cents for a special delivery letter. Last Thursday I had occasion to send a special delivery letter to Montreal, placing twenty cents postage on it. The letter was wrongly delivered, but I am not complaining of that, as the address might not have been as perfect as it should have been.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would ask hon. gentlemen to kindly refrain from conversation while the hon. member is addressing the House.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): Montreal is now a very large city and it includes many outlying municipalities. When a special delivery letter, bearing a twenty-cent stamp in addition to the usual postage stamp, is brought into the post office it is handed over to a boy who is paid eight cents to deliver the letter in any part of the city which is served by the Montreal general post office. The government has received twenty-three cents from this letter and pays only eight cents to the messenger for its delivery. By common knowledge in the Montreal post office these messenger boys are the worst paid in the service, and I would ask the minister even if he cannot reduce the taxation on letters to at least give some encouragement to these messengers and grant them a better remuneration than they are receiving at the present time. Because these boys may have to go, in the course of their journeys, to almost the extreme end of the island of Montreal to deliver one of these letters for eight cents; they spend practically the best part of the forenoon and afternoon and are even employed late in the evening, at this work. If the ordinary postage rate is going to be reduced, at any time, from three to two cents, I would ask the government to consider whether it would not be possible to revert to the old rate of ten cents for special delivery letters from the present rate of twenty cents, and thereby increase the use of this facility which is not as well resorted to at the present time as it used to be in the old days. I hope the minister will give his atten-

tion to these matters and see if something cannot be done along the lines indicated to improve the service.

Mr. GRAHAM: I will bring the facts stated by my hon. friend, as well as his request, to the notice of the department so that they may receive full consideration.

Motion agreed to and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

SUPPLY

IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION

Immigration contingencies and general expenses, including grants to immigration and colonization societies, or associations, as may be authorized by the Governor General in Council, $1,850,000.

Mr. STEVENS: I understand the minister has some information to give the House after long and deliberate reconsideration of his rather precipitate action in the first place. I heard with a good deal of satisfaction that he had indeed made some modification, some change, in his intention. Without going further into any criticism I would like to hear what the minister has to offer on the subject.

Hon. CHARLES STEWART (Argenteuil) (Acting Minister of Immigration): Mr. Chairman, there are two items still to be passed in the estimates for immigration, one dealing with immigration contingencies. I take it that my hon. friend does not desire that we should cover any old ground in connection with the matter but that the information should deal with this item.

Mr. STEVENS: I was hoping and expecting for some decidedly new ground.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I do not know how I could introduce any new ground. The estimates themselves are before the committee, and I shall give explanations as to this particular item. I may say that in the matter of publicity in Great Britain we have increased our expenditure from $77,000 to $303,000, and in the United States from $245,000 to $372,000. I propose to give an explanation of these items. For newspaper advertising in Great Britain we expended in the ten months of last year for which we have returns the sum of $5,302.62. We propose to spend this year $60,000. On pamphlets, booklets, maps, etc., we spent $58,000 for the ten months, and we propose spending $172,000 this year. We are increasing our expenditure for lectures and attendance at shows from $8,000 to $50,000, and our expenditure on exhibition motor cars from $4,000 to $15,000. The department has had one motor car going about with exhibits of Canadian products from town to town, accompanied by lecturers. The results that we have received from this form of advertising have been so good that we intend to equip and put another car on this work.

Mr. TOLMIE: How much of the appropriation is for the British Empire Exhibition?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No part of this appropriation is for the British Empire Exhibition.

Mr. TOLMIE: There will be a special vote for that?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes, a special vote. The remuneration to journalists and special writers last year was $1,281. The expenditure proposed for the same purpose this year will be $6,000, making a total expenditure for these various purposes of $303,000.

We spent on newspaper advertising in the United States in eleven months of last year the sum of $125,447. We propose to spend $200,000 this year. On advertising pamphlets and booklets we spent $100,000 in eleven months of last year; this year we intend to spend $155,000. The expenditure on publicity bureau and special writers in eleven months of last year was $19,124. We intend to spend $17,000 for the same purpose making a total of $372,000 for these different purposes in the United States. For the getting out of sundry publications, to be mailed out of Canada but to be printed in this country, we spent in eleven months of last year $3,000; we intend to spend $10,000 this year. For the preparation of motion pictures and photographs for publicity purposes we spent $2,000 in eleven months of last year; we will spend $20,000 for that purpose this year. Office and travelling expenses at Ottawa and Winnipeg for the ten months of last year involved an expenditure of $3,926.89. We have appropriated $7,500 for that purpose this year. Special writers, for eleven months, $1,470; we propose to spend $4,000 this year. Newspaper advertising in Canada, required $374 last year; this year we will spend $5,000. On foreign and continental work we will spend $35,000. This is practically all new work; we had no vote for that purpose last year. This year we propose to spend $20,000 on pamphlets and booklets, and for publicity purposes in northern Europe, other than literature, $15,000. For newspaper subscriptions—these are newspapers sent out to our immigration agents—we propose to spend $3,000, and incidentals unforeseen $3,500, making a total publicity expenditure of $760,000 all told.

There is an item of $25,000 for general printing done by the King's Printer for the service outside of Ottawa. This is to provide for the

printing of books, manifests, cards, indexes, forms, letterheads and questionnaires for the use of the various immigration agencies and detention hospitals, immigration halls and boundary inspection halls at points all over Canada. The expenditure in 1921-22, was $21,600, and for the eleven months ending February 26, 1923, $9,860.

Then there are some customs inspectors who are paid out of this vote who perform inspectional duties at the boundary. They are paid by the Immigration department, and the payments range from $50 to $300 per annum. These inspectors are at various places along the northern boundary where there is very little traffic over the line, and consequently receive a small remuneration from the Immigration department. Others are at points where there is heavier traffic, and receive a better salary. There are only two men on the paylist receiving $300 per annum. The majority receive $100, and quite a few $200 per annum. I have a list of the names of the custom house officers who perform these services. For general stationery supplied by the King's Printer for the service outside of Ottawa there is an item of $10,000. This item is to provide for the general stationery and supplies required at the various agencies, seaport offices, detention halls and boundary inspection offices, supplies consisting of typewriting machines, writing paper, envelopes, pens, pencils, fasteners, ink, travelling bags, etc. The item of contingencies and miscellaneous expenses in Canada, including salaries of temporary employees, amounts to $140,000. The largest portion of this item is to provide for the salaries of temporary clerks at Ottawa, stenographers, inspectors, guards, matrons, labourers and charwomen, at our various agencies, offices and boundary inspection points outside of Ottawa. For the salaries of the 110 customs officers I have mentioned and 4 p.m. immigration inspectors along the line between Canada and the United States we paid from $50 to $300 per annum for extra service. I am reading the same item as I read a moment ago in respect to the customs officers. My memorandum with regard to this item reads:

It provides also for the travelling expenses of investigating officers, for legal expenses in connection with the rejection of immigrants and other miscellaneous and incidental expenses, not chargeable to any specific service.

We spent on this service $125,000, and we are asking for an increase of $15,000 making $140,000.

Postage, telegrams, cablegrams, telephone express and freight charges in Canada, $25,000. This is to meet the cost of postage on parcels and letters addressed to points outside of Canada; for cablegrams, telegrams, long distance telephone tolls, freight and express charges on books, manifests, forms, stationery supplies, immigration literature and maps, etc., shipped to points in Canada and outside of Canada.

Inspection of British immigrant children, $15,000.

This is to provide for the cost of inspection of children emigrating to Canada under the auspices of the various homes and societies in the British Isles, these children being placed in Canadian farmers' homes. The cost of the first inspection is borne by the Canadian government and the cost of all recurrent inspections until the child has attained the age of 16 is recovered by the department from the British government.

There is a little change in this connection this year inasmuch as we are voting a sum of $200,000 which will be a grant for the purpose of paying the passages of these children. Formerly the British government contributed to some extent towards the cost of this expenditure, but their contribution will now cease, and we will have to bear the expenditure ourselves.

Mr. MANION: What arrangements are made for the children on this side of the water?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): So far we are utilizing the various organizations that have been engaged in this work. I gave a list of them when the vote was going through. In most cases though not in all, they have foster homes already located for those children. We are making inquiry as best we can, and as soon as possible after the child is settled we will make an inspection to ascertain the desirability of the home and what success is being made with the settlement of the child in the particular home.

Mr. MANION: You continue making inspection from time to time in this connection?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes, if possible, twice a year.

Mr. GOULD: The minister spoke of special writers. What jurisdiction or supervision does the department exercise over these special writers?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): They are people who write special articles for advertising purposes which must pass the officer of the department who is in charge of publicity, Mr. Stead. They are all scrutinized before being sent out. We pay for those articles because they are written attractively, with a view of bringing settlement to the country.

Mr. GOULD: The reason I asked the question is that I would suppose that the articles are based on facts and figures supplied by the Department of Agriculture. Is that the basis upon which the articles are written?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The articles may be the experience of the writer himself not of necessity based on facts furnished by the department, because very frequently these articles are made very attractive for the purpose of publicity. Hon. members will notice that this amount was included in the publicity vote. The next item is:

Seaport agencies and detention hospitals and halls expenses, $85,000. This is to cover the cost of administration and maintenance of agencies and offices at the various seaports: St. John, Halifax, Quebec, Montreal, Vancouver, Victoria, New York, Boston. It also provides for the equipment, administration and maintenance of immigration detention hospitals and halls at St. John, Halifax, Quebec, Montreal, Vancouver and Victoria. The above expenses consist of cost of uniforms, telegrams, cablegrams, telephones, freight and express charges, wages of cleaners; travelling expenses of officers attached to these agencies; laundry, charwomen for the cost of board of immigrants temporarily detained for medical observation on account of minor contagious diseases, etc.

So far as detention while under medical inspection is concerned most of these charges are recovered, because in nine cases out of ten it is the fault of the medical officer on board the ship that proper inspection had not taken place prior to embarkation, and in every case in which that occurs the steamship companies are required to pay the cost while the patients are detained for medical attention in those hospitals, or until such time as they return to the country from which they came. This amount is about the same as we have had in former years. The memorandum continues:

In land agencies and maintenance of immigration halls in the West, $20,000.

This item is to provide for the expenses of our various inland agencies throughout Canada, and for the maintenance of immigration halls at certain points in the West, and especially at our agency at Winnipeg. These expenses consist of cost of uniform, telegrams, telephones, freight and express charges, wages of cleaners, food for deports and immigrants temporarily detained in the immigration buildings, laundry, pillows, blankets, and other expenses necessary for general upkeep and maintenance.

The expenditure for 1921-22 was $12,696 and for the eleven months ending February 28, 1923, $12,485.

Deportation expenses amount to $50,000. This is to cover the travelling expenses of the deportation officers, the cost of uniforms, and meals for deports on train, rail and steamship fares, in cases where the railroad and steamship companies are not liable for free transportation. The increase is due to the fact that by agreement with the Department of Health aliens convicted under the Opium and Narcotic Drug Act and ordered to be deported have to be handled by this department under the provisions of the Immigration Act. Up to last year it was not the duty of the Immigration department to do this work but now all persons convicted under the Narcotic Drug Act and who are to be deported are handed over to the officers of this department. Frankly, I sometimes think that this is rather the duty of the Dominion police than of the Immigration department. However, for the time being we are performing this service.

The next item is $50,000 for boundary inspection expenses. It is to provide for the cost of uniforms of boundary inspection officers as well as to pay for meals, lodging and travelling expenses, for relieving inspectors and for overtime on Sundays and statutory holidays. It also provides for the incidental upkeep of offices on the boundary line between the United States and Canada. In 1921-22, we spent $42,785.06 and for the eleven months ending February 28, 1923, we expended $51,-955.62. We therefore expect to get along with a little less this year than we did last year.

For contingencies and general expenses in the United States the vote is $180,000. This item is to provide for the expenses of nineteen agencies maintained and operated in the United States. These expenses consist of rent of offices, furniture, typewriting machines, postage, telegrams, telephone messages, freight, express charges, light and fuel, stationery supplies, printing envelopes, cards and letterheads, and temporary assistance, and to provide for the salaries of fifteen new field men. The expenses in connection with this field work are estimated to be in the neighbourhood of $50,-000 for the year. I have some doubt as to two items here, this and the next one. When the items were inserted I did not know what difficulties would be encountered in the appointment of these agencies. What I intended to do was to revive the old system of getting farmers who had been successful in Canada to go to the United States and Great Britain and lecture during the winter months, but our Civil Service Act makes it somewhat difficult to carry out appointments of this kind. They would not be permanent, and you could scarcely call them temporary. So that there is considerable difficulty in making such appointments, and I intend to cut down the amount in connection with this work so that we shall need only three or four lecturers to go to the Old Country; and I shall abandon my intention of sending any to the United States.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Would it not be difficult to get farmers who are successful to go abroad?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Not at all, any number of them. We are asking for

$50,000 for field work in the United States, and $75,000 for Great Britain.

Then there is an item for contingencies and general expenses on the continent. This is to provide for expenses to be incurred in connection with equipment and maintenance of seven or eight officers in Europe to vise passports and see to the inspection of immigrants coming to Canada. The expenses will include rent, furniture, fuel, light, taxes, uniforms, inspection, freight and express charges, postage, telegrams, cablegrams, telephone service, salaries of temporary employees, typewriting machines, stationery and supplies, books, letterheads, travelling expenses, etc. I might say that this is entirely a new service which is being carried on on the continent of Europe. We have offices located at Antwerp and Warsaw, and we hope to be established in Prague. Our officers will travel to three or four other points to make inspections of people embarking on steamships and to advise them as to whether or not they are likely to be accepted in Canada on inspection. We do not, of course, guarantee that they shall be permitted to land, but we see to it that they shall have a fair idea as to whether or not they will be admitted. We are rapidly getting past the point where we find it necessary to reject people on account of the occupational test. Indeed, that difficulty no longer exists in regard to the northern countries of Europe, and not at all so far as Great Britain and the United States are concerned. This work is intended to apply only to people on the continent of Europe outside of the territory I have mentioned. We shall admit from the continent only domestic servants, farm labourers and those who can engage in farming; in other words, those who can buy farm lands. Our object is to obviate what has occurred in the past and has caused a great deal of hardship to people who upon landing at St. John, Quebec, or any of the other ports of Canada, find that they are not permitted to enter the country. I am told that on one occasion there were as many as 2,000 persons kept in detention and sent back to the country of their origin because they could not be permitted to land under the regulations. Last year, on the other hand, we never had at any one time more than five, and I hope that that condition will continue. This vote of $100,000 is an entirely new one and is experimental; and if we find that it is not warranted, then, of course, we shall withdraw the officers. I do think, however, that it will be of great advantage in preventing people from coming to Canada who have no chance of getting in. Such people might otherwise be unable to obtain adequate information regarding the conditions and the regulations, and we shall at least see that they do not make an unnecessary trip across the ocean.

The next vote is also a new one. It is one which I dealt with when speaking to the House on a previous occasion. It is to provide for the work of repatriating Canadians who left eastern Canada particularly. We have not been active in the eastern field, having had agencies only at Boston and Manchester. We are asking for a vote of $20,000 for the purpose of repatriating those Canadians who have left eastern Canada, as we think a useful work could be done in endeavouring to bring these people back into this country. This is to provide for the salaries and travelling expenses of colonization agents and to meet the necessary expenditures involved in connection with the work of bringing back into Canada those people who have gone abroad, especially French-Canadians. The expenses consist chiefly in travelling and living expenses of those engaged in this undertaking, and also provides for halls for lecture purposes, etc. It is intended to make a special effort in this field during the year 1923-24. The next item relates to the Women's Immigration Division. We are asking for $15,000 to provide for the expenses of conductresses on trains of parties of girls coming to Canada to engage in domestic service, and also to pay for salaries and uniforms for these women officers and to provide grants for women's hostels maintained in the principal cities in Canada, for temporary assistance and welfare of immigrant women, and for a per diem allowance of $1.50 to these free hostels for accommodation accorded by them to women immigrants coming into Canada to engage in domestic service, such free accommodation not to extend in any case over more than forty-eight hours; also for travelling expenses of women officers and of ladies attending the annual reunion or convention of the Canadian Council of Immigration. Then we have grants to immigration or colonization societies. We propose to increase the grant to the Salvation Army by $10,000, as they intend extending their work very materially in connection with domestic servants. To the Scottish Aid Society we are making a grant of $5,000. This is a new organization working in the north of Scotland, headed by the Reverend Father Macdonald, and supported by such prominent men as Mr. Burns and Mr. McBrien. Father Macdonald has been actively engaged in this work for a

number of years. To the Union Nationale Francais we are continuing the grant of $1,000. Therefore I am asking for $4,000 in this connection that is not allocated and for $100,000 for the Canada Colonization Association.

Mr. STEVENS: Will the minister be good enough to let us have any more information than he may have on that particular subject?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I think I gave the committee when the matter was under discussion before the names of those connected with the organization. Lest I forget, before leaving the matter of publicity, there is one very important feature that I must mention. We have an arrangement both in Canada and in Great Britain under which the transportation companies and the government have formed a publicity committee. This committee is for the purpose of preventing overlapping and getting full value for the expenditure on publicity, and to this end various fields of advertising are allocated to particular parties. This committee will co-ordinate our whole publicity campaign. In Canada the committee is headed by Mr. Stead, who is our chief publicity officer, and in Great Britain by Mr. Obed Smith, our superintendent of immigration for Canada in London.

I think I covered most of the field the other day in connection with the Canada Colonization Association. One of the features my hon. friend objected to was the commissions that were to be taken by the association. I may say that 5 per cent goes to the local agent in the United States, who is paid no other salary; and 2½ per cent goes to the local agent in Canada who secures the listing and the necessary information surrounding it. So that in all only 2½ per cent of this commission will go to the association. I told the committee that Mr. Everett, the manager of the organization, will confine the association's efforts almost entirely to the United States. I am advised that they have collected in all from their subscribers $160,000. They assure me that their subscriptions will still continue. They have a budget of some $15,000 per month, which includes the following salaries: vice-president, $500; secretary-treasurer, $500; general manager, $1,000; secretary to the general manager, $175; office manager, $250; sales manager, $416; manager of listing bureau, $291; four stenographers, $371; office boy, $60; office rent, $311; attorney's fees, $200; stationery and printing, $1,000; office supplies, $83; descriptive literature, $416; general advertising, $500; one field man, $275, his travelling expenses, $833; filing clerk, $100; postage and express, $416. Those expenses are for the Winnipeg office. For the St. Paul office the expenses per month are: superintendent of agencies, $500; office manager, $416; two stenographers, $225; one book-keeper, $125; office boy, $60; rentals, $100; office supplies and blank forms, $250; newspapers and magazines, $500; descriptive Canadian literature, $833; salaries of five field men, $1,375; travelling expenses, $1,458; railway fares and concessions, $1,200; postage and express, $250.

Mr. MILLAR: Who is to appraise the value of the land to be occupied by these settlers?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I will give the information shortly. In order that we may have an understanding of the matter I will read the following list of tentative proposals made at the time:

1. The association agreed to continue to list and offer for sale lands along existing railway lines on their thirty-two year payment plan at 6 per cent interest.
2. Lands and location to be subject to inspection to determine suitability and fix maximum prices—this to be undertaken either by the provincial or Dominion government.

In answer to my hon. friend I may say that the Manitoba government have expressed their willingness to undertake this work. This is not true of the other two prairie provinces and it would have to be undertaken by a representative of the Soldiers' Settlement Board. In 50 per cent of the cases this board already have the values fixed upon lands adjacent to the railways, because I do not think it would be good business to permit the sale of lands at any distance from the railways, particularly where we are giving government assistance in the way of helping any organization to perform this service.

Mr. MILLAR: Who fixes the value of the 50 per cent, the Canada Colonization Association?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I fear I did not make myself clear to my hon. friend. At the moment almost 50 per cent of these lands within ten or twelve miles of the railways are already listed by the Soldiers' Settlement Board. If they have not been inspected by the officials of the board, they at least have a fair idea of their values and they could readily fix the maximum values. But in the case of Manitoba, if the provincial government assume that duty it will not be performed by the Soldiers' Settlement Board. But the point is that the company are willing to submit their listings to the government officials for the purposes of inspection as to maximum value and adaptability for settlement. This is important, because lands which are some dis-

tance from the railway could be sold more cheaply than those in its immediate vicinity. Then, we have large areas of free lands that would appeal to some people, lands which are a long distance from the railways. But the idea is to get settlers on lands that are contiguous to the railways, and also to prevent the foisting of poor lands upon people who have not had very much experience in that connection.

Mr. GOULD: This is a hypothetical case: suppose an individual in one of our villages in the West wished to go on the land; would the same conditions apply as to the Canada Colonization Association, percentages and so on?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I do not know that I can answer my hon. friend in that respect, because the service is an outside service rather than one for people living in villages in this country who might be desirous of going on the land. But I can quite see the desirability of their securing a contract of this kind, at 6 per cent.

Mr. GOULD: Five.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The provision is for 6; it is doubtful whether that figure could be reduced. But I do not think the association should be entitled to receive the same remuneration from the individual who is in the country and who walks into their office as they receive in the case of those whom they have to bring into the country.

Mr. GOULD: The reason I ask the question is because I believe that the department should place restrictions in this respect in the agreement with the Canada Colonization Association. If no such restrictions are provided, I believe they should be.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): That is a perfectly reasonable suggestion—that a Canadian citizen in a town or city who desires to go upon the land and take advantage of this long term payment plan should be able to do so at reasonable cost.

Mr. THURSTON: Why confine it to cities? It might be a farmer from an eastern province who wished to take up the land.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Suppose we say Canadian citizen.

Mr. GARDINER: When were the values of these lands determined by the Soldier Settlement Board?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): They have been operating now for over three years, and they have been placing these values right along ever since. If any information is found not to be authentic a reinspection would have to be made.

Mr. GARDINER: This is an important point. A valuation placed on a piece of land some three or four years ago by the Soldier Settlement Board might not be a real indication of the value of that land to-day.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Not if it was made three years ago—I agree with my hon. friend, because land was then selling at a higher rate than we do now. But no matter how much we may disagree about the Soldier Settlement Board or about its success, we know that after they became familiar with the valuation of land they valued it pretty closely. There has, of course, been a considerable drop in the price of land during the last three years. The memorandum continues:

> 3. The association agrees that all moneys received from subscribers, commissions on sales of land, or government grants, will be utilized to carry on settlement work.
>
> 4. The association agrees to furnish to the Department of Immigration monthly reports of their activities and a list of all lands sold and where located.
>
> 5. The association agrees to continue to employ a firm of chartered accountants, subject to the approval of the Minister of Immigration, to make monthly audits to accompany reports from the association, and that the books and financial statements will at all times be open for government inspection.
>
> 6. The Minister of Immigration to be satisfied from monthly reports that satisfactory progress in settlement is being made, and that the continuance of financial support by the subscribers will be maintained; and these reports shall be the basis upon which he shall authorize payments of the proposed grant of $10,000 each month.

That is, briefly, the plan adopted by the government in connection with the grant to the Canada Colonization Association.

Mr. BOYS: Would the minister inform the committee what he was reading from just now? Is that a written proposition that the association makes to the department, or what is the idea?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): It is the proposition that was discussed tentatively with the association when the grant was requested, though not so fully in detail. The arrangement made at that time was that the government should be assured that the association was being supported by its subscribers. There was no question in my mind at least as to the advantages of the scheme of settlement proposed by the association, but it was desired that there should be an assurance that the association was being supported by private individuals who went into this scheme for the patriotic purpose of settling lands in the vicinity of the railways. Every hon. member will

admit that the question of dealing with privately-owned lands so far as settlement is concerned is a difficult one for any government. However, the idea that was had in mind when this matter was discussed was as I have stated it; it was desired that the government or the department should be safeguarded by the provisions contained in this memorandum.

Mr. STEVENS: Is there any written contract or agreement between the department and the association?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No. We have no contract with the Salvation Army. Indeed, I do not know that the government would be wise in entering into such a contract with any organization. I make this statement to the committee in order to assure it that on the fulfilment of these provisions I shall be authorized to pay out the money and not otherwise. If patriotic citizens put up their money for the purpose of doing this work, it seems to me that they should be treated the same as any organization to which we give grants. As I have stated, upon these suggestions which I have read I shall be guided in the payment of any funds to this organization.

Mr. MacLAREN: I have a communication from one who is familiar with the organization of the immigration officers of the Dominion in Great Britain. He states:

> There are now thirteen offices of the department over here, including the London office, with nine officers in charge, and four new ones to be appointed. With two exceptions I understand all are western men, while one other has no Canadian residence.

I wish to ask the minister if that is a correct representation.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): He states that the offices are manned by western men?

Mr. MacLAREN: That is not the statement. He says:

> There are thirteen offices of the department over here, including the London office, with nine officers in charge, and four new ones to be appointed. With two exceptions I understand all are western men, while one other has no Canadian residence.

I take it that his meaning is that all are western men with one exception.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I could not give the particular province from which our agents in Great Britain come, but I do know this, that one of the most recent appointments was from Nova Scotia, that of Mr. Murphy who is working in Aberdeen. Mr. Obed Smith, I presume, was an eastern man, although when he went over he went from Winnipeg, I believe. My hon. friend will also recollect that we have one new man who has come from New Brunswick just recently. He was working for the New Brunswick government and has now been taken into our service in Great Britain. There are two new appointments pending and one of the men, I understand, though I have not been informed definitely, comes from Vancouver. They are coming before the Civil Service Commission for final examination within a few days. They are both returned men, majors, I think; so they will both be Canadians, but I suppose we shall be guilty of appointing a westerner again inasmuch as one of these men comes from Vancouver.

Mr. STEVENS: Scandalous!

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): These are the only two vacancies.

Mr. MacLAREN: I quite understand that the minister is favourable to appointing these officers so that the various portions of Canada shall be represented, but I believe that at the present time a very large number of the offices in Great Britain are filled by officers who come from the West. This letter is dated the 3rd of April, and I would be glad to hand it to the minister at any time if he cares to see it. At that date my informant was in a most favourable position for knowing the conditions. There is one other part of this letter I should like to read, because he is thoroughly conversant with the subject of immigration, especially as it affects the East, but before quoting further I should like to refer to the minister's observation that one of the new appointees came from New Brunswick. I think if the minister will recall what has taken place, the facts are, and the discussion in the House will show it, that the official to whom the minister referred has not been appointed, or rather he was not appointed at the time of the discussion in the House, and I have not heard of his appointment subsequent to that time; but rather he was there appointed for two periods of sixty days. There was some technicality in the act which prevented his appointment, and I believe still prevents it. At the present moment I am unaware of any official in Great Britain who is familiar with New Brunswick. I may be in error, but I think that is correct. The other portion of his letter which I wish to quote reads:

> I feel convinced that many of those who go West, especially married men with a young family, and who do not find conditions to their liking would settle down and make good in one or other of the Maritime provinces, but if you do not have anyone over here from these provinces to place before these people information concerning the East, I do not see how we can expect to obtain our share of settlers.

I do not think that what he states is anything different from the views we hold ourselves, but it is satisfactory to know that one on the ground and familiar with the subject of immigration takes exactly the same views as we have already had the opportunity of placing before the House and before the minister.

Mr. McMURRAY: In rising to discuss the issue to-day I prefer to deal more with the general question of immigration rather than with any particular item. I had the misfortune of being indisposed during the major portion of this debate, but I have read with care the contributions to the debate by the various members taking part in it. I have no apology to offer to the House for discussing at some little length, although it may be tedious, this question of immigration into Canada. It is undoubtedly the paramount question, of transcendent importance to this country. Considering the economic circumstances and financial conditions in which Canada stands to-day this is a very, very important question going really to the root of our economic existence, being second only in importance to that of confederation itself. Therefore the subject is worthy of long and careful debate. I spoke on this question last year at some length, and I propose to speak on it at some length again to-day.

What are the problems that are facing this government? When the government came into power the question of constitutional liberty was at stake. That was disposed of by the accession of this government to office, but on coming into office the government was faced with outstanding problems of an economic nature. This government has a business proposition to meet. There is a tremendous indebtedness hanging over the heads of the people of Canada to-day, amounting in the total to something like four billions of dollars That includes the national debt, provincial and municipal indebtedness. It does not touch the individual indebtedness, the money owed by the various citizens of the country.

The second great economic problem facing us is the railroad problem. Last year we went back some seventy-two or seventy-three million dollars on that account. This year in spite of a wonderful harvest in western Canada that probably saved the railroads, we went back some sixty million dollars.

The third great problem, which is subsidiary to the other two, is to alleviate the burden of taxation on the shoulders of our citizens and to give to this present generation in Canada a fair and moderate means of living. There is no question that the whole world to-day, the citizens of every country are groaning under a heavy burden of taxation. We in this country must expect no odds. Whatever advantage we may take of the circumstances, we shall still have to bear a very heavy load. The cost of the war must be paid and we in this generation must pay our share of it. This country faces a tremendous problem, as great a problem as Canadians ever faced.

The building of the Canadian Pacific railway in Canada was something that tested the metal of our people. To-day Canadians have a real and genuine test to undergo. I do not know how this burden of taxation can be relieved—how our people can be relieved from the heavy burdens that rest upon them, how industry can be relieved from heavy taxation—unless, by some means or other, there is created in this country a large amount of wealth that can be taxed. You can pass acts of parliament but parliamentary enactments will not create wealth; wealth can only be created by the application of labour to our natural resources. That must be done if we of this generation are to escape the tremendous burden that rests upon us. Supposing there had been a crop failure in western Canada last year—western Canada that has contributed six or seven hundred millions of dollars to the general body of wealth in this country? Had there been a crop failure last year our position would have been immeasurably worse than it is to-day. That may come, probably will come—we cannot expect a bountiful harvest all the time—and if it should come our position would be bad. The only way that we can possibly meet the situation is by creating wealth in this country.

The natural resources of Canada are great. It is almost tautological to repeat of what these resources really consist. There is land in this country of great fertility; there are some two hundred million acres suitable for agriculture that are as yet untilled. We have vast forests, which are yielding us to-day some $200,000,000 per annum. As to mines we are, as yet, only on the fringe of their development. The stage is set in Canada to-day to take care of a population of thirty millions. We have the railroads, we have the telephones, we have the telegraphs, we have the shipping lines, we have the canals, we have the elevators built far beyond the needs of our present population. Why? Because we are a widely scattered people. This National railway of ours, which showed a deficit this year of $60,000,000, has contiguous to it a great area of fertile country. It runs, probably, through the best area of fertile country served

by any transcontinental railroad on the American continent. Between the city of Winnipeg and the city of Edmonton, within a distance of ten miles on each side of the railroad, there is asserted by competent authorities to be some ten or twelve million acres of untilled arable land.

Mr. GOULD: Will the hon. gentleman elucidate a little further his point as to the elevators being beyond the needs of the country at the present time?

Mr. McMURRAY: I will come to that later on. In northern Ontario there is asserted to be in the clay belt some twenty-five million acres of arable land. Those who have not seen that district would be well repaid by travelling over the railway which passes through it. Last year I went up into that country at the close of the session, and I saw white clover covering the hills down to the railroad track for miles. Where that clover flourishes agriculture will also thrive. The Canadian Pacific railway, which has grown to greatness on account of the land immediately adjacent to it and by reason of the development of the west, runs through a country which is comparatively poor compared with that which is traversed by the Transcontinental railway. The clay belt through which the latter railway runs will, in years to come, prove to be agricultural land of fine quality. North of lake Superior the Canadian Pacific passes through a rocky country. In the far West the land through which that railway runs is more or less drought stricken. On the other hand, the Transcontinental and Grand Trunk Pacific run through a country which is well wooded and well watered.

Where is the solution of the problem which confronts us to be found? If we have these resources, and no one can deny that they exist, what is it that we lack? We are simply short of man power to create that wealth of which I have spoken. Have we come to such a position in Canada to-day that we cannot bring together the two forces that are necessary to create that wealth? We have great natural resources, with all the appliances necessary for their development, and the man power can be got from the teeming populations of Europe. Can we get that man power that we need so much? Undoubtedly we can. The United States has had to close her doors against immigration—immigration that built up Canada in the past. In the last analysis Canada was built up by immigrants; we are all immigrants or the descendants of immigrants. In the cities of Canada to-day there are hundreds, yes thousands, of men versed in agricultural pursuits who could go on the land and work it if a proper policy were inaugurated to enable them to do so. Shortly before I came away I addressed an audience in my own constituency and spoke upon the question of immigration, a question of deep interest to those people, and a man rose in the meeting and said "There are two or three hundred of us here." Those people were Germans of the very sturdiest and finest stock of agriculturists that Canada ever had. He went on to say "If we were given that chance we would go out and we could make a success of farming. One thing we are short of is capital." I think you could go through the cities of Canada and gather together men and women who to-day are merely existing, who are agriculturists by profession but are to-day competing with labour in these urban centres, who would be glad to go on the land where they could produce wealth to the advantage of themselves and to the advantage of Canada as a whole. As a result of the Great War and the dislocation of economic and industrial affairs in Europe I believe there are to be found there to-day men and women of good calibre, the very best types that the countries of Europe have, agriculturists by profession, who have been broken, probably ruined, as a result of the great conflict. If these were brought to Canada they would be a great acquisition to the country.

What may we expect immigration to do for Canada? What did immigration do for Canada in the past? In the early years of the history of Ontario immigration, in the course of fifty or one hundred years, turned a wooded wilderness into a wonderful land. Many of the early settlers who came to the province of Ontario were disbanded soldiers of the agricultural immigrant type. Irish and Scotch soldiers who formed a large percentage of the British army. They came from peasant stock, they cleared the land; they remained where they settled; they never talked of leaving Canada; they built up a great province. The same is true of the provinces of Quebec, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island. Whenever we brought the real agricultural immigrant to this country he stayed. The settlers who have not remained in this country, in my opinion, were not of the real agricultural type.

What did immigration do for western Canada? When Clifford Sifton became Minister of the Interior and took charge of immigration in this country it was as if a wizard had waved its wand over the land. In western Canada everything was in a state of stagnation. In the eastern parts of Canada, including cities, a similar condition prevailed. In a few years

immigration began to pour into this country. The country seemed to spring to life. The prairie that was untilled and uncultivated began to turn into fields of grain. The cities of Canada began to grow and I tell you, Mr. Chairman, it was as a result of that policy and that policy alone, that the cities of western Canada were built up, and that the great grain industry of western Canada was developed, the growth of which is one of the marvels of the world. When Clifford Sifton commenced his immigration policy the province of Saskatchewan was producing some 5,000,000 bushels of wheat; to-day she is producing nearly 300,000,000 bushels—a marvellous thing—and based solely upon the immigration policy. The harbour of Montreal was choked with grain vessels last year solely because of that immigration policy. There is a real connection between that immigration policy and the growth of the great manufacturing cities of Ontario and Quebec. We need an immigration policy to-day far more than in the days of Clifford Sifton. At that time we could pick and choose. We were not burdened with debt. We were not under financial difficulties. We had a great country. We merely needed it opened up for the creation of wealth. But to-day we need more than that. We stand in such economic peril that an immigration policy is an economic necessity, and we are not in a position to-day to say that we will pick and choose. What we want to-day is a man who can make his way in the country. His passport must be his capacity to get through. As James Fitzjames said when challenged by the Highland chief:

> My pass in danger tried
> Hangs in its sheath and by my side.

The qualification of the immigrant into this country is his capacity to earn an honest living and to wrest it from the soil by toil and labour What has been happening in regard to immigration in this country in the last few years? To-day I am expressing my own ideas. I am not speaking in condemnation of the government, but I must say immigration has fallen away and fallen away badly. At the outbreak of the war there was an immigration of some 380,000 a year. In the year ended March, 1921, there was immigration of 148,000, and in the year ended March last the figure was 89,000.

Now, what is the policy of other nations situated as we are? New Zealand, Cape Colony and Australia have adopted a genuine policy of going to Great Britain and Europe, securing immigrants and settling up and developing their country. To-day the immigration of Australia is its biggest feature. There is a national spirit behind it, and it is backed with the national wealth. I think that should be the policy of this country. That is the policy that has the good will of the
5 p.m. Canadian people behind it, and that is the policy into which we should put our money.

If I were passing any criticism on the particular items under consideration. I would say they are too small. They should be multiplied by ten, and that the great desideratum for the consideration of this government, should be the creation of wealth in this country that will protect us and our children from the hardships under which we and they must exist. To the men of eastern Canada, of Montreal, Toronto, Hamilton, London, I would say that their manufacturing and commercial existence are at stake if wealth is not created in their great markets of western Canada. Anything that is injurious to that great market of eastern Canada, the great market being western Canada, reacts directly and instantly upon the manufacturing and commercial centres of eastern Canada, and it should be the policy of eastern Canada to do everything in its power to make conditions so that wealth can be produced readily and easily on the plains of the West. I would say to the people of western Canada, and to their representatives in this House, that unless you bring more people into this country to create a larger body of wealth to help to bear your burden, you cannot expect to get a reduction in tariff. How can you expect to get a reduction in railroad rates? This indebtedness of Canada must be met. It cannot be repudiated. If you do not create that body of wealth, if you do not bring more shoulders to bear the burden, then you yourselves must bear it. It is in vain to think you can throw it down and repudiate it. If you want lower taxes, then there is only one solution—bring in the thousands of immigrants that can be added to the population of western Canada. Let them till your fertile land, let them help to bear your burdens. We are not bringing these people here as servants or slaves. We are bringing them to a country where the national burden individually per capita is probably much lower than in any other country in the world, the United States being the only country I can think of where the national burden per capita is lower than in Canada. The majority of these immigrants are coming from a place of dire distress to a country not where money can be conjured up or created, but where honest, hard toil is rewarded fairly well, where they and their countrymen and countrywomen before them have done

well and where they can do well, and can create a competency to provide for their ultimate comfort, well being and happiness.

Mr. CAMPBELL: How does the hon. member propose to settle all the thousands of people on the land unless they have the money to buy it? When the hon. member speaks of the power behind the immigration policy, the national wealth, does he suggest the financing of these people in the purchasing of the land?

Mr. McMURRAY: If the hon. member will be patient I will try to come to that in due course of time and will illustrate what I think could be done. Probably the hon. member will not agree with me, and probably few in the House will agree with me, but I am taking the opportunity of putting my ideas forward on a question that I think is of paramount importance to the whole of Canada and of transcendent importance in western Canada.

Who should these immigrants be? In my opinion the immigrants that should be brought to this country ought to be in the first instance agriculturists? I would not close the door to any immigrant who has the hardihood and the courage to cross the ocean to come to this country, but I would make a strong bid for men and women who can develop the resources of the country. And who are they? They are the sort of people who in the past made a success in Canada; they are the people who bettered their own conditions and therefore proved valuable and useful settlers in Canada. I am going to deal largely with western Canada, because it is of western Canada that I know most, having lived some twenty-six years on its plains. In the early days I drove over most of it on horseback and buckboard and I knew its people of the old time. I know the old time rancher and the large grain grower, and I know the people who have lived in the cities of that part of the country as well as the men on the frontiers. It is therefore of the development of that West, which I have seen unrolled like a panorama before me during some twenty-six years, that I wish to speak to-day.

I will deal, if I may, with the question of the financial conditions existing in western Canada as set forth at considerable length by some of my Progressive friends in this House. The hon. member for Yale (Mr. MacKelvie), speaking in this House the other day, suggested our keeping away from the people of central and southern Europe. The majority of us who have lived in western Canada, and I believe the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Forke) particularly will join me in an encomium of those people of southern and central Europe for the contribution that they have made in labour and toil to the development of that part of our Dominion. The policy of Sir Clifford Sifton brought to western Canada the Ukrainians, many of whom came in their sheepskin coats and in their quaint European dress; and to-day in the University of Manitoba 20 per cent of the students are the descendants of those people of central Europe. The same is true in regard to the Agricultural College in Winnipeg, and I believe the same truth holds in Saskatchewan. I had the pleasure of travelling on the train with a leading educationist of Saskatchewan and he told me of two boys whom he had taught in a small schoolhouse near the town of Yorkton and both of whom are Ukrainians and to-day, university men. We have numbers of lawyers among these people, and the professions are filling up with them. They make good Canadians; they are the very best citizens; and I have never known in the hard two or three years that we have passed through in recent times of any of these people asking charity from municipality, provincial government or Dominion government.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Has the member for North Winnipeg consulted the statistics of the Social Bureau of Winnipeg?

Mr. McMURRAY: I have looked over those statistics, and the men we call "foreigners" were largely conspicuous by their absence.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I agree with the hon. gentleman in a general way, but a certain percentage of them undoubtedly sought relief.

Mr. McMURRAY: What I said was that I had not known of any of them who had done so. These people were settled in western Canada in some of the very poorest parts of the country, as my hon. friend for Springfield (Mr. Hoey) can bear me out. In his constituency they were settled in low swampy land out around Beausejour. The land was drained, the trees cut and the place was developed. Crops were produced and that section of the country was turned practically into an agricultural garden. This year I was near the town of Neepawa and along the mountain the grain was turning golden for miles and miles, so that one beheld a beautiful agricultural scene. That land was owned by Ukrainians who came to the country practically without a dollar; but by patient and diligent toil they built up a paying industry for themselves. A collector for a large machine company told me that he was able to collect far more money from these Ukrainian people than he could from the English,

Canadian and American settlers. He could get ten times as much from these people, and apparently they were prosperous. They live simply, they are close to the soil, and so they create wealth. That is the story of the Ukrainian. You can find them between the lakes and north of Winnipeg where they were put into a country of wilderness, of swamp and poplar and stony ridge, a country in which I do not believe any people, even the sturdy French-Canadian frontiersmen could have lived under the circumstances. But these people have lived there, and it was a great mistake, in my opinion, that they were ever compelled to settle in that part of the country. It was a loss to Canada, and a waste of energy and time to put them in a country that should have been kept as a national preserve for wild animals instead of for these poor people to labour in. But they have made good, and men in this House can bear me out when I say that wherever these people have gone they have proved successful as settlers. Near Edmonton there are great settlements of them, and they are doing well. I have met many of them, and I want to deal later on with the case of one or two of them by way of illustration. Take also the Germans. I remember Germans north of Indian Head, away across the Qu'Appelle valley, bringing down loads of wood on their sleighs over a haul of thirty or forty miles, and selling it for a few dollars, and hauling their grain over the same distance. Nothing but hardihood and courage and strength of physique could have accomplished this. They made good, however, and to-day are prosperous. I refer to Lemburg and the surrounding districts. Take also the case of the Mennonites. These people have made a garden out of southern Manitoba, and it is a crying shame that a policy of bigotry should have driven from this country some of the best agricultural settlers Canada has ever had.

Mr. BROWN: They are going to stay there.

Mr. McMURRAY: I sincerely hope so.

Mr. LEWIS: Where, in Mexico?

Mr. BROWN: No, in Manitoba; only a few of them are going.

Mr. McMURRAY: These people came to Canada away back in 1872, and undoubtedly they had an assurance that they would be protected so far as certain of their tenets were concerned. That pledge, I believe, was absolutely and foully violated, and these people out of their strength of conscience and high resolve, which qualities, whether we agree with their tenets or not, we must admire, felt themselves obliged to leave. They had the courage to leave the land which they had converted into a garden, rather than break faith with those things which they valued more than wealth itself.

Mr. LEWIS: Does the hon. member think it bigotry on the part of our government to insist that immigrants shall conform to our educational laws? And does he think it a wise policy to bring people here who will not conform to such laws?

Mr. McMURRAY: I believe it is the bounden duty of our government to keep its compact. I think that duty is higher than any other.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What compact was violated?

Mr. McMURRAY: The compact violated was this: Our government sent representatives to these Mennonite people in Russia to induce them to come to Canada. One colony came here, and another went to Kansas. Those who went to the United States settled there on the understanding that they would have to conform to the school laws of the country. The colony that came to western Canada settled there under this compact—that they were not to be called upon for military service, that their religion should be preserved to them, and that they were to be at liberty to educate their children in their own way. Undoubtedly that compact with the Mennonites was made by the Canadian government. A policy of education in western Canada, dominated very largely by one man, forced a large section of those people either to educate their children in the public schools or to leave Canada. I may say that one-half of the Mennonite colony had pretty well dropped their own school system and were quite willing to adopt the Canadian system, in fact ten or fifteen years would have settled the whole trouble. But some men are impatient, they seem to think that a nation can be made in a day, and that immigrants can be persuaded to surrender their Old Country ideals in favour of Canadian ideals within a very short period of settling here. Well, rather than have our public school system forced on them these people left Canada.

Mr. LEWIS: Did the supposed agreement entered into by the government with these Mennonites apply to all of them or only to a certain section that came in a good many years ago? Moreover, has this government

any right to interfere with provincial jurisdiction over education?

Mr. McMURRAY: My hon. friend is diverting me from the thread of my argument. I am not here to discuss whether the provincial government acted rightly or wrongly. I may tell him, however, that education is in the jurisdiction of the provinces.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman made a serious assertion: he said that a solemn compact had been foully violated. I know what the compact was, if you may call it that, having read it, and although the alleged interference with it was at the hands of governments that certainly were not Conservative—they were Liberal—I think his language is wholly too strong. Undoubtedly there was no violation of this so-called compact, by the government of Canada.

Mr. McMURRAY: Under a Liberal government I can hardly understand there being a violation of any compact. But that is as I understand it. My right hon. friend is entitled to his opinion, but until I am shown something to the contrary I shall adhere to what I have said. A prominent educationalist of Saskatchewan told me recently that night schools are being attended by these men up to thirty years of age. I know in the city of Winnipeg these foreign people eagerly seek these educational opportunities. In my constituency I was simply astonished when I became acquainted with these people to find all sorts of halls of learning among them—musical institutions, debating clubs, cultural clubs, surpassing anything that we have among the native born in the city of Winnipeg. In that city—and the hon. member for Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth) no doubt will bear me out—the Ukrainians have a labour hall that cost them some $50,000. Other Ukrainians have built two large educational insitutions to educate, not their boys and girls, but their grown-up people. They also publish newspapers. As a result of this educational work these people readily become Canadians and are proud of the name. So I would say to the government: Make your immigration policy a wide one, make it an energetic one, throw open your gates and let those who have the hardihood to come to our shores enter and help, and those I have mentioned have helped in the building up of this country.

My hon. friend for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Marler) spoke of the growth of the United States immediately after the Civil War by reason of their immigration policy. To-day we need such an immigration policy in a much more marked degree than did the United States at that time. Our people are demanding immigrants. For the last two years I have talked with representative men whenever I had the opportunity upon the question of immigration, and invariably I found they were keen in demanding an energetic immigration policy. I think that is true of our business men, true of a large portion of our agriculturists, and true of many of our Labour leaders—of whom I have the highest possible regard and with whose aims and aspirations I sympathize—many of these leaders to-day are strongly in favour of a proper immigration policy. I think the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Forke) is in favour of an immigration policy, in fact I heard him state so in this House, and I wish he had been more emphatic, but still I think he appreciates that our economic salvation can come only through bringing to this country strong, willing and intelligent workers to develop our resources. By that way, and that way alone, we will get lower taxes and lower freight rates and ultimately lower prices for the commodities that we must consume.

During the course of this debate several members of the Progressive group have apparently taken the position that because of the high prices of the commodities they must use and of the low prices of the products of their labour our farmers in western Canada cannot secure a return sufficient to maintain them. I am glad that that assertion has been made by only a limited number of Progressive members. I am glad that certain members of that party differed, and differed widely, with what I consider were extreme, exaggerated and fantastic reports of farming conditions in western Canada. I appreciate particularly the remarks of the hon. member for Swift Current (Mr. Lewis) in his very able speech the other day upon this question. I know the district in which he lives; it is a district that for some years has been stricken hardly by climatic conditions. I know the type of people who have lived there—sturdy and energetic and intelligent. In spite of the conditions prevailing there, he was one of those whose mathematics did not lead him to believe that the less was greater than the whole; he saw western Canada as a whole and he gave a fair and faithful report of the conditions existing there. The hon. member for Strathcona (Mr. Warner) and the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Hoey) bore witness to the conditions prevailing in that part of the country; they did not back up or approve the extraordinary assertions made by some other hon. members in that respect.

Now, what is the actual condition in western Canada? Is it a fact that the sturdy, hardy, intelligent agriculturist cannot live there? I went to western Canada twenty-six years ago and into the vicinity of Regina. Times were as hard there as they possibly could be. There was no market for what the farmer produced. I myself have grown and sold the finest of stock there at 2¼ cents a pound. Wheat at that time was selling at 54 cents a bushel. In the period from 1890 up to 1911, only in one year, 1904, was the price of wheat in western Canada ever a dollar a bushel.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: What did the hon. member have to pay for binders at that time?

Mr. McMURRAY: We will come to that. We will deal with the wheat first; that is what we pay for the binder with. I give the prices of wheat per bushel in western Canada consecutively for the years from 1890 onwards: 90, 94, 74, 69, 54, 61, 68, 85, 69, 70, 88½ 67½ 68, 81.

Mr. DAVIES: Are these the prices at Fort William, or the prices obtained by the farmer in the country?

Mr. McMURRAY: These are the prices at Winnipeg—the price per bushel on the opening day of the market each month.

Mr. DAVIES: It would be safe to deduct 15 cents a bushel in order to arrive at the price actually received by the farmer. In fact, it is necessary to do that in order to be fair.

Mr. McMURRAY: Do that if you like; I am talking about what the West was built on before. Perhaps my hon. friend does not get the gist of my remarks on that point. The figures continue: 1904, $1.01½ and for the succeeding years: 76, 75, $1.03, 97⅜, 96, 98, and for 1913, 78.

Mr. GOULD: Are these the prices of No. 1 Northern wheat?

Mr. McMURRAY: Yes. These were the prices that prevailed; these were the prices that the men got who went there in those days who were successful and who have grown wealthy. The same figures hold in respect to oats, and in respect to cattle; I have the figures all before me, but it would be a waste of time for me to take them up.

Mr. GOULD: I suggest that my hon. friend might now make a comparison of the prices that these people paid for their binders or for their labour.

[Mr. McMurray.]

Mr. McMURRAY: I suggest that I make my speech in my own way; I will come to that in time. The hon. member will make his speech and I will make mine. These were the prices that prevailed in western Canada when there went into that country young men of Ontario, Quebec and the Maritime provinces—bright, intelligent men. They toiled there and in the course of time they became prosperous. They own sections, three-quarter sections, half sections, good buildings; they have been successful because they have been thrifty. The prices of the goods they had to purchase were high; freight rates were high—higher than they are to-day, but up to 1913 these men were prosperous. I have been down in California at a picnic and have seen two or three thousand of them—farmers of western Canada, wintering in California.

Mr. FORKE: Do not overdo it.

Mr. McMURRAY: I heard it was five thousand, but I will leave it at two.

Mr. THURSTON: Were there any other Canadians there but farmers?

Mr. McMURRAY: Oh, yes. These are the facts. Up to 1913 the West was prosperous. the West did well. It might surprise my friends if I told them that the per capita wealth of the men on the western prairies to-day is nearly twice that of any other part of this country.

Mr. BROWN: Do you take off the mortgage indebtedness?

Mr. McMURRAY: I take off all the mortgage indebtedness. In dealing with this question I speak with deepest sympathy for the people of western Canada—and I consider myself one of them. I have seen them go through their struggles. I have seen them as pioneers develop a wilderness into one of the most remarkable agricultural countries on earth. It is a truism that the character of a people is affected by their environment and by their occupation, that it is developed and moulded, as individuals and as groups, by the country in which they are located and by the labour that they must perform. The pioneer is always a sturdy and a courageous man and the western pioneer, going to that land with its wide open spaces, took on something of the bigness of the country. The copper did not exist in the West until the days of Timothy Eaton, and the drinks were three for two bits. Everything was done in a large way. Having taken a quarter section of land, the settler wanted more; he got a half section, and his very virtues of enterprise, ambition and bigness ultimately became his ruin.

What has produced the conditions that prevail in western Canada to-day? Is it the high prices that the farmer pays for the goods he buys? Is it the low prices of the commodities he sells? Is it the tariff? Is it freight rates? My Progressive friends know that last year freight rates was the paramount question with them. I recognized, sitting in the committee that was inquiring into the matter, that freight rates meant more to western Canada than any question of tariff or the high cost of goods. But is that the cause of present conditions in that part of the country? Or must you go back to that man whom I described and loved, the western farmer himself? I think you will. What happens? Remember up to 1913 he was prosperous.

Mr. FORKE: This is getting embarrassing.

Mr. McMURRAY: I intend to make it more so before I am done.

Mr. FORKE: It is this love stuff I object to.

Mr. McMURRAY: You must have got over it. You were not always that way.

Then immigration came. The settlers came in and the western man got more land. He bought and he sold, and he sold and he bought. He became a speculator, and we know that the western man assumed a load of debt without any thought of the consequence, just as lightly as a darky would throw a turkey over his shoulder and start off home on Christmas night. The western man contracted liabilities in a free and easy manner without regard for the consequences, like the Irishman who gave a promissory note and said, "Thank God, there is another debt paid." What has been the trouble? Speculation, too much credit. My hon. friends over there are backing a system whereby the farmer of western Canada can get more credit. I put it to them as individuals, and as a group, is it not a fact that too much credit has been the curse of western Canada? It has been the curse of the city man, I know. Has it not also been the curse of the agriculturist?

Then the war came, with high prices. The farmer of the West flourished, or should have flourished. It is true he paid high wages, but when you consider the price he got for his grain he never paid as low wages as he did then. What was the result? Further speculation. Let me give an instance, and this is a typical instance, not an extraordinary one. Each and all of us in the West can call a case to mind. Down near the town of Morris, some forty miles from the city of Winnipeg in a good section of the country a prosperous Canadian had 960 acres of land. He had it partially paid for. He had earned it himself from nothing. He decided, good soul, that he would rest, and he bought a house for some four or five thousand dollars in the adjoining town. He sold his farm to some American at a high price, sixty some odd dollars an acre, the farmer receiving a small payment down on it. His brother, who farmed a half section of land some five miles from the town, persuaded the farmer to buy his land. He did so, putting the money he got from his own farm into this house and buying 1,100 acres from his brother from the proceeds of the sale of his farm. Speculating in land, the whole three of them. The war ended, the prices fell. The farmer gets back his farm at Morris. The 960 acres, which were in good condition before the war, come back to him in a dirty and filthy condition. He is not in a position to work the half section he bought from his brother and work the farm too. He has his money in that house and his brother, of course, has lost on the 1,100 acres. There is an instance of two farmers in a prosperous condition wiped out by speculation.

Mr. GOULD: Immigration?

Mr. McMURRAY: The next thing I believe that would be the salvation of the western farmer and of western Canada is not the reduction of tariffs, but a personal economic salvation. It has got to go right back to the farmer himself.

Mr. LUCAS: Would not that apply to every class of citizen in Canada just as well?

Mr. McMURRAY: Absolutely. We have all got to get back to that. Is there bad farming in western Canada? About the worst, I think, in the world. I remember twenty-six years ago, and my hon. friend for Brandon and the hon. member for Lisgar and older members among the Progressives will remember too, how when the soil of western Canada was first farmed there grew up no noxious weeds—nothing but the rose bush came through. But to-day go from the city of Winnipeg down to Emerson on the east side of the river and you will pass through a sea, yellow and golden, not with the grain, but with the sow thistle. Weeds of every kind you will find in that district. There is land that will produce eight or nine bushels of wheat to the acre. Is there any tariff policy, is there any government that can save men from themselves who farm under such conditions?

Mr. JOHNSTON: I know that the hon. member does not want to give a wrong impression. From his statement it might be taken that the weed menace was wholly due

to bad farming. I do not think the hon. gentleman wants to convey that idea, that the weed menace is wholly due to poor farming methods.

Mr. McMURRAY: I would ask my hon. friend in reply, to what is it due?

Mr. FORKE: One crop methods.

Mr. McMURRAY: That is bad farming.

Mr. BROWN: If the hon. member has any method in his mind that will effectually combat sow thistle, I think it is a shame that he should keep it to himself.

Mr. McMURRAY: I will try and help my hon. friend out as I go along.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Was not some of that prosperity of the earlier days due probably to the mining of the soil, taking off the cream of it at that time?

Mr. McMURRAY: I am coming to that. The hon. member for Centre Winnipeg is very suspicious as to the real cause, and I am glad that he caught my point and bears me out that the farmer's condition in western Canada is due to farm mining. These weeds are a terrific menace to the country. There is no denying that a system of farming must be followed that will do away with them. So long as the farmer of western Canada grows crop after crop and summer fallows year after year, so long will that land be dirty and so long is he going to seek in vain for an economic return from his ill-guided labours. There is a depletion of that soil. In the spring of the year you have only to go out through the country, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, and you will see the air for a hundred feet—this may be an exaggerated case—simply filled with flying soil. You will find in places right even down there on the Mennonite reserve the soil piled up against the fences. In 1920 the Canadian Pacific Railway made a careful agricultural survey of western Canada, and estimated that the loss to the agriculturists of Canada that year by reason of weeds and soil thinning amounted to the stupendous sum of $200,000,000. There has been an agricultural survey made by the province of Manitoba which shows that a large portion of southern Manitoba and of southern Saskatchewan—from which my hon. friend for Assiniboia (Mr. Gould) comes—has been depleted by improper farming methods. The land has been robbed of its fertility .

Mr. GOULD: My hon. friend will not go into that district and say so.

[Mr. Johnston.]

Mr. McMURRAY: I had some trouble with coal miners out there some years ago; I do not know how I should find the farmers. Here is another thing: Can you farm for five or six months and rest the balance of the year? The farmer says that he is the only working man in the country; but those who grow grain very largely rest from the month of November until about the middle of April in the following year. What is there for them to do? On many of these grain farms a cow is a rarity, or at least two or three of them. That condition has got to change. Until that condition does change the cry that has gone up in this House—the wail from my hon. friend for Bow River like the wail of Rizpah; the lament of Rachel crying for her children and who would not be comforted—will continue.

Then there has been some extravagance—the rankest extravagance—on the part of the people of western Canada; and I do not differentiate for one moment between the farmer on the farm and the man living in the city. We have not yet had the iron driven so deeply into us that we have learned to forget the extravagance that existed before the war. There has been personal extravagance, there is municipal extravagance, and there is provincial extravagance. Take Alberta with an estimated expenditure this year of some fourteen millions; Saskatchewan about the same; and Manitoba even greater. I put it to my hon. friends opposite that the heaviest burden the farmer of western Canada bears today is the municipal taxation upon his land.

Mr. FORKE: For value received?

Mr. McMURRAY: For value received? But it is there. I know a little of what I am talking about. I farmed land in western Canada.

Mr. FORKE: You are more of a lawyer though.

Mr. McMURRAY: I farmed over one thousand acres. I farmed out there for some fifteen years. I was born on the land, I worked upon the land, and I know something about farming conditions out there.

An hon. MEMBER: You did not stay there?

Mr. McMURRAY: I did not stay there. But I am going to deal with the emigration of the Canadian from Canada and I will explain why I did not stay on the farm when I come to that branch of my subject. I repeat, the heaviest burden is the burden of extravagance—personal, municipal and provincial.

Now then as to the conditions that prevail in western Canada. My hon. friend for Bow River (Mr. Garland) and my hon. friend for Swift Current (Mr. Lewis) touched upon the conditions that prevail in certain localities. Undoubtedly there are places in western Canada where drouth has been a serious menace, where sturdy, sterling working people could not make it go, where even the sturdy European with his reduced system of living would be handicapped and possibly could not succeed. But the story that my hon. friend for Bow River has told of his locality does not apply to western Canada at all. It is an isolated instance and as the member for Springfield (Mr. Hoey) says "If you apply it to the whole of western Canada it is outlandish extravagance." I wish—in order that the members of this House may be truly and fairly informed upon conditions there, in the interest of those Progressive members themselves who have been fair in this matter, and above all in the interest of western Canada—to put the matter fairly and clearly before the public. There has been a decrying of one of the most fertile portions of this earth of ours; there has been a defaming of the sturdy men and women who have made western Canada and who are unequalled, or at least unsurpassed, by any other Canadians. It does greatly affect us in the West—the western men, big of heart and big of hand, sturdy and ambitious—to be represented in this House by men who wail and wail. The continual howling that has been indulged in has been overdone altogether. It is detrimental to Canada; it is detrimental to the people of western Canada; it is unfair and improper. I believe this thing started as a political cry. The people of western Canada protested against the tariff. That was all right but as a political cry it has been carried beyond the bounds of reason. It has become an obsession purely and simply with certain people; they remind me of what old Dodds said of his dog—he yelped when he tied him up and howled when he let him loose. To have to listen to this continual wailing in the House and in committee, I fear would have the effect of causing my hon. friend for George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs) to imagine he was listening to the wailing of his people when they were compelled by the Egyptians to make bricks without straw. There are many contented people in western Canada; many prosperous and well-to-do farmers. The West is not ruined or broken financially; the picture which has been drawn of it is totally unfair. I would like to give some figures concerning western Canada in order to show the general condition which very largely prevails there. When we hear such a loud cry of poverty, want and ruin from the West let me say that there are more telephones per capita in the province of Saskatchewan than in any other country of the world except Sweden. In the ownership of automobiles the province of Saskatchewan excels any other country with the exception of the United States, which it equals. My hon. friend for Bow River said they were closing up schools in the province of Alberta. Well, I want to tell him that in that province in 1921 they opened eighty-six new schools. In the province of Saskatchewan there were 61,000 automobiles. In the province of Manitoba there were 39,200 automobiles, 12,000 of which were owned in the city of Winnipeg, a wealthy city, and 27,000 owned by the farmers outside of Winnipeg, which, taking in the small towns gives a proportion of 1 to 18; in the practically purely agricultural province of Saskatchewan the ratio was as 1 to 12. The industries in western Canada grew from 1881 in 1915 to 4,535 in 1919, a remarkable growth in the space of four years. The employees in those industries increased in number from 29,000 to 49,000, and the product of those factories in the year 1919 was $307,000,000, or three times what it was in 1915. The per capita, or individual, wealth in the prairie provinces is $2,123, and in the East, from which we have heard no complaint or no prolonged cry, the wealth is $1,238, or pretty nearly one-half of what it is in western Canada. The field crops last year in the four western provinces amounted to 767,000,000 bushels valued at $455,000,000, and I defy any man in this House to show me a greater per capita production among any people on the face of God's green earth.

An hon. MEMBER: Who got the money?

Mr. McMURRAY: I will tell you who got the money. The farmers of western Canada paid a larger income tax than all the farmers of the rest of Canada, and the income tax of the farmers of western Canada in 1921-22 doubled the tax of the year before.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. McMURRAY: When the House rose I was discussing the causes of the depression in western Canada at the present time. I

argued, rightly or wrongly, that the major cause was the personal action of the farmers of western Canada, and in that regard I drew no distinction between the agricultural people of western Canada and the people of the cities. We were a free western people living in large open spaces and very readily took the opportunity of investment and speculation that presented itself to us there; and I allege that the cause of the condition in which many of the farmers of western Canada find themselves to-day is first and foremost bad farming, and secondly, personal extravagance, municipal extravagance and provincial extravagance. If you, Mr. Chairman, ever came to visit our western country you would be astonished at the magnificence of the public buildings there. In the city of Winnipeg we have public buildings far beyond anything that is fit and proper for a young and comparatively undeveloped country like Manitoba. We have a parliament building which, if it does not excel this magnificent structure in which we are seated this evening, is at least a very fair rival of it. It is splendidly furnished, and is of the very finest architecture. We have a court house which I am told is superior to anything in the British Empire. We have an agricultural college which, according to the information I have, and judging from the cost of it, has not its equal on the continent. We have also a deaf and dumb institute that is costly and marvellous and is beyond the capacity of the people of Manitoba to keep up. That story, Sir, as regards Manitoba applies to Saskatchewan and Alberta as well. We have gone into extravagance there, personally and publicly. I understand that farmers out in the West drive automobiles although they are unable to pay their taxes and supply the gasolene. Lastly, we went into speculation, and that has caught most of the farmers in the West. As a lawyer practising in the city I have drawn many deeds and agreements for city lots for farmers scattered far and wide over the prairies.

Now, as the cause is a personal one I do not despair at all and I think the people of western Canada do not despair either, because the solution is a story of their own personal economic salvation. This is a temporary thing in a way. After the Crimean war in old Canada and in the old province of Ontario many of the farmers found themselves stranded and in very difficult financial circumstances. Grain was high, as were all other prices, just as was the case during the late war. Farmers bought land for their sons, and they bought more land; and the result was that when the war was over they were stranded. The resulting condition was a temporary one that gradually righted itself, and from that time on the province of Ontario has flourished steadily.

The same thing I contend holds in the West. We are to-day in a period of transition in agricultural matters in western Canada. Some ten or twelve years ago the large ranch with its thousands of cattle disappeared. It was unprofitable, uneconomical, and it had to go. The large grain farms of western Canada are also going; there is a transition in process there. There is going to be no more grain mining, no more gambling in grain. The farmer now is not going to work five months in the year; he will be obliged to farm twelve months; he must get acquainted and shake hands twice a day with the homely old milk pail, and he must learn to hear the music of the friendly pig around the place; in other words, he has got to get right down to real genuine farming, and he must get a smaller farm. Does it not appeal to you as ridiculous that the farmer of Ontario, of Quebec, or of Nova Scotia, on a clay land farm not equally as fertile as the wonderful land of western Canada, farms fifty or one hundred acres, while the man in western Canada in order to make a living from a more fertile land must farm a half section, two or three sections and even as high as the American farmer who with his tractor machinery, and so forth, handles eight or ten thousand acres? Such a farm will speedily go to weeds and depletion; and these are farmers that cannot meet the situation in western Canada and who must therefore change their methods.

What is the immediate cause of the financial distress in the West? My Progressive friends from western Canada who sit opposite me heard repeatedly last year that, "The present crop is a debt-paying crop." It is not that you cannot farm to-day in western Canada. The difficulty in western Canada lies in the heritage of the past three or four years, and the money that should have been going to pay for the present year's operations is being extracted from the land to pay the debts accumulated in the period of extravagant expenditure and easy credits of three or four years before, and that in spite of the fact that the year before the province of Saskatchewan gave $403,000,000 worth of products and the other provinces equally proportionate amounts.

Mr. IRVINE: Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that the conditions in the West to-day are the result of lack of business ability on the part of the farmers there? Is he making a sweeping charge in regard to the three provinces?

Mr. McMURRAY: I am afraid I shall have to go to the trouble of making my speech over again for my hon. friend's benefit. Had he thought it worth while listening to me I think that he would have gathered this and the other points as I went along. Now, I want to talk to my western friends through the mouths of western farmers themselves, and the hon. member (Mr. Irvine) can draw his conclusions from what I say. The first man I would quote is a prominent member of the grain growers' organization of Saskatchewan He gratuitously sent to me a communication which I presume my hon. friends across the way have also received. This man I remember came to the vicinity of Indian Head sixteen or seventeen years ago as a poor boy and worked on a farm there for his daily pay. To-day he owns three thousand acres of land, 1,800 acres of it under cultivation as agricultural land, and 1,200 acres of grass land for his cattle. Reciting the conditions in the West he says:

> What are the remedies? (1) Reduction of size of farms, even if we have to sell them at a loss; (2) better live stock; 85 per cent of the cattle in Saskatchewan are scrubs; (3) cheaper supplies; (4) more immigration.

Mr. IRVINE: Does he say lower tariffs?

Mr. McMURRAY: No, cheaper supplies.

> 4. More immigration: let us get thousands of those good agricultural people from central Europe out here on the land. They have proved among our best settlers to-day in western Canada. There are fewer of them in financial trouble than there are Canadians or English speaking people, because they are more careful and do not buy so extravagantly, do not go into debt.
>
> 5. It doesn't seem good argument to say we should bring in more settlers when those already here are not too prosperous, but it is good argument. More settlers, different methods and systems of farming will increase our production, reduce our debts and taxes, help to pay for our railways and war debts.

The second western authority I shall quote is a member of parliament in the Saskatchewan legislature.

Mr. GOOD: Would the hon. member give the name of the authority he has just quoted?

Mr. McMURRAY: I shall be glad to give it to my hon. friend privately. This member of the Saskatchewan legislature is Mr. George Spence and he sits for Noteku. I think that is somewhere in the constitutency of the hon. member for Swift Current (Mr. Lewis). Writing in the Regina Leader he says:

> A man in the southwest to-day who is building for the future wisely and well is a real "homemaker" and not a "fortune seeker."

I may remark in passing that the southwest is a district periodically troubled with drouth, and it is questionable if it should ever have been turned to agricultural purposes, for it is naturally a ranching country.

> This type of man is bound to win out because he is of the hardy pioneer stock that believes in individual effort and work. He knows that success or failure is an individual responsibility; that there is no "easy money"; that acts of parliament will not do for him what only he can do for himself. He is long on self-reliance and short on substitutes for that quality. We should be careful in our desire to help this type of man not to undermine this spirit of self-reliance. There is no substitute for it, whatever. The most effective and acceptable assistance that can be offered him is that which touches actual conditions and helps him to help himself.
>
> The statement can safely be made that large-scale farming and ranching have failed. They are both things of yesterday. The superiority of intensive over extensive farming has been definitely established. The big cow ranch is doomed to disappear and give place to the small stock-farm, as exclusive ranching is as lopsided a business as exclusive grain growing. To cheapen production, which is our only salvation in this crisis of low prices, we must have the greatest efficiency in feeding and caring for our animals. The brood sow and milk cow are foundation stock. The bacon hog and the stall-fed steer are great sources of exportable wealth.
>
> The next step in intensified agricultural development is an intelligent survey and classification of lands, showing which are and which are not suited to cultivation; and larger tracts of open range made available to communities of small farmers for summer pasture. As more and more corn is grown, stall-feeding to finish will become the practice as there will always be a shortage of summer grass.
>
> "Grain growing alone is a soil-robbing proposition, a seasonal occupation, and an intensifier of our farm help problem."

I commend that to the committee as being pretty sound advice. Now, this continued defaming—I was going to say slandering—by, I am pleased to say, a very limited number of the representatives of the West has not been received with any great cordiality in the prairie provinces. The depicting of our sturdy and courageous western men and women agriculturists as quitters and squealers has not met with much response, and I doubt very much if those who have given voice to such statements in this House will receive any very great welcome from their constituents.

The press of western Canada have taken the matter up and I have before me a list of replies received from substantial and responsible farmers in the West and published in the Winnipeg Evening Tribune of 10th, 12th and 13th April. As they are typical I will read two or three of these communications. The first comes from J. N. Christison, who farms eight miles from Morris, Manitoba. He writes:

> I have no serious fault to find with the present system of carrying on farming as any other business in this country. I came from Scotland and it seems to me that people here want to get rich too quick. They want to pay for a half section in five or six years. They ought to be willing to work half a lifetime to do this as they would have to do in most countries.

. I don't think a Western Canadian wheat board would be of any practical benefit to the farmer. Great Britain will not pay $1.50 a bushel for our wheat if Argentina will sell for 85 cents. The law of supply and demand must rule in the world's markets.

Everything costs more now than before the war and the rule should be economy until prices come down. The trouble with a lot of farmers is that they went in too far when wheat was $2 a bushel. They bought more land and now they are deeply in debt. The pay-as-you-go principle is the one to follow in farming and would save a lot of trouble.

The troubles of most farmers are largely of their own making. If they have not got too far into the hole they can pull out through practising rigid economy.

That is from a western farmer, not from a theorist. Here is another story which is really typical of many of our early farmers in the West. It is from Peter Goosen, a Mennonite, one of the class I referred to a short time ago. He lives nine miles from Morris. He says:

I began farming at Morris 30 years ago with $500 as my capital. Now I have eight and one-half quarter sections, 1,640 acres of land. I have my own threshing outfit and about $10,000 out at interest. My first wife died and I was left with nine children, the oldest 14 years. I was a widower for fourteen years and it was pretty hard raising all those children.

I don't work much now, but I supervise. Last year we made a profit. We make a profit every year. Just in March I sold a carload of wheat which netted me $1 a bushel and which showed a fair profit.

The greatest difficulty facing the farmer is the high cost of supplies and equipment.

Binders which used to be $150 are now more than $300. Seed drills have gone up 100 per cent. Oil and gasoline are much higher than they used to be. Labour is twice as high as it was before the war. Twine, which is essential, is much more costly than it used to be.

Careful economy until prices come down is the only thing for the farmer.

I don't think a wheat board will be of much benefit to the farmer. I ship my grain in carload lots and have no serious complaint to make. A man must handle his money for a good crop carefully. Some men think when they get a good crop that it will be the same every year. They spend money like water and buy more land. In the boom time during the war I bought only 80 acres of land.

If I were a young man I could start again with $500 in some new district and make just as good a success as I have made in Morris district,

I have a dozen such letters taken from the Tribune, but I will not weary the House by reading them all. These letters show the true conditions existing throughout western Canada, and this false election cry—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. McMURRAY: —has been carried too far and has done more to break the morale of our farmers in the West than anything that has occurred there in a long, long time. As an instance of what can be done by settlers in the West I may refer to the Icelanders. They came from a poor land and settled as a rule in rather indifferent agricultural country between the two lakes. They raised sheep and carried on mixed farming; to-day they are prosperous.

Now, some of my hon. friends have referred to emigration from Canada. That apparently has always been going on. But who are the people that are leaving Canada? They are people of our own stock, Canadian and Old Country, and those of American stock. Very, very few of our agriculturists of foreign origin are leaving Canada. The trouble is that our present system of education educates our young people away from the farm—not the children of poor people but those of the well-to-do. A well-to-do farmer gives his boys and girls a good education, and they go to the cities. Our cities have grown in advance of the country, there is no occupation for these well educated young people in these cities and naturally they drift across the line into the United States and are lost to us forever. The same holds true of the skilled English mechanic. While our cities were expanding there was a place for him; when this expansion ceased or slackened he found himself without work and was attracted to the large centres across the line. The hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Garland) spoke of our American settlers returning to the States. Probably the first and hardest hit in western Canada by the depression was the large farmer from the neighbouring republic. He came to western Canada with his tractors and other equipment, he was of a speculative type, and as soon as the depression came he was one of the first to leave. The people we are going to keep in this country, Mr. Chairman, are those of the real, genuine agricultural type. In this connection I would submit to the government the advisability of bringing here settlers of German stock, the Reusch Deutscher, the peasants of Germany and Austria. They have always made good in western Canada. They go on the land and stay there.

What ought immigration to do for this country? It ought to lessen the cost of production, to stabilize our industries, to improve our social conditions, to bind Canadians closer together. I was particularly struck by the remarks of the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Manion). He appealed for immigrants to develop Northern Ontario. It is a very fine country with a harvest growing right there that any man with an axe and hardy enough can cut down. It is destined to become a very flourishing district and will yet supply much needed freight to the railroads which are our common property.

Probably the principal opposition to a vigorous policy will come from organized labour. Well, in the days of Canada's greatest immigration activity, when settlers were coming

to us by their thousands, labour never enjoyed better pay, longer hours and more work.

An hon. MEMBER: Longer hours?

Mr. McMURRAY: Yes. You will have longer hours on the farm because you have to work all winter to make farming pay. If we bring to this country a sufficient number of settlers and place them on the land in western Canada the manufacturers of eastern Canada must immediately begin manufacturing to supply their wants; and the increased products that come from the West will flow down through our channels of trade to enliven and create greater industry here.

The government is endeavouring to bring in more immigrants, and I am now about to express my own idea of what I conceive to be a sound immigration policy. When I am told by a limited number of my Progressive friends—because I am glad to say that many of their colleagues have taken the opposite stand—when I am told that the immigrant cannot live and flourish in western Canada I refuse to credit the statement. When I think of the great fertility of that country, when I think of the thousands of immigrants that have settled there, when I think of the thousands of trainloads of grain that are yearly sent out of that country, when I think of over 150,000,000 acres of arable land in the West, a great deal of which is close to the railroads, I am convinced that the statement is not correct. I am confident that the hardy immigrant will prosper there in the future just as his countrymen did before him. These immigrants can be had in the shape of agriculturists from Great Britain, from the continent of Europe, and from the United States, and even from our own cities. But before any immigrant can be successful I think he ought to receive a reasonable degree of help, advice and instruction. If the Minister of Immigration were a clergyman he might very well take as his text—and I say it with all reverence—"I go to prepare a place for you; that where I am ye may be also."

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. McMURRAY: We have a preacher on our side too. As to our railroads, when Jim Hill was building the Great Northern railroad in the United States he found it necessary to give to the settlers along the line cattle, pigs and sheep. Surely we with a greater railroad system and with a finer country should not hesitate for one minute to fill it with sturdy, hardy people who will develop the land and help make our railroads a success.

I would suggest to the government that it would be good policy to buy one or two million acres of land immediately adjacent to the railroads for a settlement scheme similar to that which proved so successful for our returned soldiers. There is nothing to hinder us taking, as an experiment, 1,600,000 acres of land and settling 10,000 families on it. This would probably cost the government $24,000,000. Supposing twenty acres were broken on each farm, at five dollars per acre this would cost a million dollars more. Then supposing the government erected houses on these holdings at a further cost of $10,000,000 or $15,000,000. As a result the settlers would have every prospect of success. I do not know whether the government is prepared to embark upon such a policy, but the land is there and will produce the wealth, now lying latent, if we bring settlers to it, for our earlier settlers in the West have proved that they can turn our prairies into highly productive land. This is no new experiment; it has been tried with the returned soldiers and has proved a success.

We have a great economic problem on our hands, Mr. Chairman, a problem greater than has ever faced us before probably. This problem has to be met in a businesslike way, and immigration is the only solution that I see. By a well-conceived immigration policy much of our western land can be made productive and so save the Dominion from severe economic stringency, if not disaster. This is not a governmental question, it is really a national question that affects each and all of us, and I submit that the government should not recklessly nor carelessly be condemned in its immigration policy for the sake of mere party advantage. Immigration vitally affects western Canada, and the government is entitled to the support of the West in its endeavour to evolve a satisfactory policy.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for North Winnipeg (Mr. McMurray) has made a number of statements to which no doubt exception will be taken in some quarters, and I have no doubt that hon. gentlemen to my left are eager to get a chance to reply. There is one statement to which I would like to draw his attention in which he went further I think than we might have expected him to go in view of a previous statement made by him. He said, if my notes are correct, that he would not close the door to any immigrant who had the courage to cross the seas and come to Canada. I take it that my hon. friend really would not go so far as to make a statement of that kind after considering exactly what it means. I think that he would modify that statement to say that he would include only immigrants

of the white race. The hon. gentleman says yes; I thought that would be his reply.

I am afraid it will be necessary for me to make a further statement on the question of oriental immigration. I have apparently, quite unintentionally, incurred the displeasure of the Japanese Consul General at Ottawa. Possibly it would be well for me to read the correspondence that has passed between us. The first is a letter dated the 24th of March, 1923, addressed to myself and signed by Hon. T. Ohta, Consul General of Japan:

The attention of this office has been drawn to Hansard of March 23rd in which the following remarks made by yourself are quoted:

Page 1507: Mr. McQuarrie: The Japanese Consul General was kind enough to send me a memorandum of the Japanese views, and I suppose copies have been sent to other members of the House. In that memorandum the details of this alleged gentleman's agreement are set out. It is stated in the memorandum that the arrangement was to the effect that no more than four hundred Japanese labourers should be admitted in any one year....

Page 1508: Mr. McQuarrie: ....I am opposed in the first place, to the agreement itself, and I am opposed also to any secrecy regarding it. There should not be any secrecy about it. We have received the memorandum from the Japanese Consul General as to what the arrangement is with Japan....

As the matter is of much importance in connection with the duties of this consulate, I would be much obliged if you would be good enough to advise me to what Japanese Consul General you refer to as having sent you the memorandum mentioned, and if possible let me have a copy of same.

For your information I am sending, under separate cover, a copy of a pamphlet issued by this consulate last year.

Thanking you in anticipation,

Your sincerely,

I replied as follows:

OTTAWA, March 28th, 1923.

The Hon. T. OHTA,
Consul General of Japan,
Plaza Building,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—I beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 24th instant referring to certain remarks made by me on the 23rd instant in the House of Commons and reported on pages 1507 and 1508 of Hansard.

I might explain that on the occasion in question, I spoke unexpectedly and without having my notes before me. Upon going through my files, I find that among others I have two pamphlets; one entitled "Facts About Japanese in Canada and Other Miscellaneous Information—1922" and purporting to be issued by the Consulate-General of Japan, Ottawa, and another one entitled "A short Statement of the Position and Facts Regarding the Japanese in Canada" which purports to be issued by The Canadian Japanese Association, 329 Gore Avenue, Vancouver, B.C., dated June 1st, 1921.

I find that, inadvertently, I attributed to the first mentioned pamphlet or memorandum a statement which is contained in the latter. The memo issued by the Canadian Japanese Association contains the following paragraph:

"Since Japan entered into a "Gentleman's Agreement" with Canada, restricting immigration from Japan to the number of 400 labourers per annum. Japan has not fully availed herself of this privilege, and for the fiscal year 1919-20 she has only sent 201. Not only that, but the Japanese government has exercised great care and vigilance in selecting the labourers allowed to proceed to Canada. These men have fair educational qualifications and are of good moral character, as is evidenced by their conduct in the country of their adoption."

This is the statement to which I referred. I am sorry that I mentioned the information as having been received from the Consul General of Japan.

I shall take the first favourable opportunity, when the oriental immigration question is under discussion again, to make the necessary correction in the House.

I trust this will clear the matter up to your entire satisfaction.

Yours very sincerely,

Then follows a letter dated April 3, 1923, addressed to myself from the Consul General of Japan:

Dear Sir,—I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter dated the 28th of March, admitting your fault in connection with the statement made by yourself on March 23rd in the House with regard to the disclosure of details of the Lemieux agreement, and giving a promise that you will make the necessary correction at the first favourable opportunity.

While appreciating the circumstances under which you made the mistake in question, I would say that the circumstance itself has nothing to do with the fact that my reputation has sustained considerable injury by your statement. Under no circumstances are you entitled to any action which not only reflects on my integrity but constitutes itself a serious charge against my official duties as Consul General. I was quite surprised by this deplorable occurrence, as it was entirely beyond imagination that a matter which has grave concern with the integrity and honour of a representative of a friendly nation should be treated in such an irresponsible manner by a member of Parliament of any country.

I will, however, refrain from going any further in this matter as you say you are sorry, and I will accept your letter as a genuine expression of regret and hope that you will make the promised retraction in order to clear up the matter.

Yours sincerely,

I must say that when I wrote the letter of March 28th I did not do so because I feared any dire consequences which might have happened as outlined in the last letter from the Consul General, but did so in order to clear up a mistake which I myself had made. I do not know exactly what would have happened if I had not said I was sorry, but, of course, having made the mistake I was only too glad to admit my fault and to state that I was sorry. In this connection, and as an extenuating circumstance, I would like to draw attention to the similarity between the two pamphlets. I am not suggesting that there is any connection between the two; that is to say, I am not contending that the authors were the same, or even that the Consul General of Japan knew anything about the statements of the Canadian-Japanese Association, but it does seem to me that such a pamphlet would not have been issued by the Canadian-Japanese Association without the knowledge of the Japanese representatives in this country. The momorandum issued by the

Consul General of Japan deals with a number of subjects. It takes up: The number of Japanese in Canada; the number of naturalized Japanese in Canada; acreage possessed by Japanese in Canada; Japanese passengers sailed to Canada since 1908; the classification of Japanese labour; summary of trade of Canada with Japan; Canadian commodities exported to Japan; Japanese commodities imported into Canada; the number of Japanese in the Canadian Expeditionary Force; also —and I would call particular attention to this —the amount subscribed by Japanese in British Columbia to victory loans.

There are other extracts in the same connection: An extract from the Vancouver Province of November 6, 1919, and then a passage from the Tokio Asahi of April 14, 1922, which refers to the reception given by the Prince of Wales to a Japanese-Canadian soldier who happened to be in Japan at the time. Then we also have "Japanese needed to work in Fish Canneries of B.C.," and certain excerpts from the House of Commons debates. I might mention that the pamphlet I have just been referring to is entitled Facts about Japanese in Canada and other miscellaneous information. The pamphlet issued by the Canadian-Japanese Association is headed A short statement of the position and facts regarding the Japanese in Canada. It goes on to give some statistics, and to refer to the part taken by Japan in the great war and it deals quite extensively with that. Then it takes up the question "Can the Japanese be assimilated?" and gives, as I said before, certain statistics as to the number of Japanese in Canada, the number of Japanese owning land, and so forth. I would like to question the propriety of propaganda of this kind being issued by the consular representative of a foreign nation, whether friendly or otherwise. I am forced to the conclusion that this pamphlet issued by the Japanese Consul General is nothing more than propaganda intended to influence the members of this House and the people of this country. If we examine the publication we find that no arguments are advanced, but that certain alleged facts are stated, and the conclusion to be drawn is that the Japanese in Canada are so few in numbers that they do not constitute a menace to this country in any sense of the word. On page 7 the number of Japanese in Canada are given in comparison with Canadian population as follows:

Canada, population, 7,206,643. Japanese, including those naturalized, etc., 17,691, or 24 in 10,000.

British Columbia, population, 392,480. Japanese, 16,867, or 420 in 10,000.

Alberta, population, 374,663. Japanese, 375, or 1 in 10,000.

Saskatchewan, population, 492,432. Japanese, 147, or 3 in 10,000.

Manitoba and Yukon, population, 464,126. Japanese, 86, or 2 in 10,000.

Ontario, Quebec and New Brunswick, population 4,878,495. Japanese, 216, or .04 in 10,000.

Mr. BALDWIN: When was that pamphlet issued?

Mr. McQUARRIE: It bears the date of 1922. Now, as to the number of Japanese passengers that sailed for Canada since 1908—the details are given here on page 9, but I will not read them—the total is stated to be 17,570. Then on page 12 the number of Japanese passengers that returned from Canada from 1908 to 1921 is given as 17,683. These tables will show that more Japanese have returned from Canada than came to the Dominion during the same years. In that connection we all know that there has been an increase, quite a marked increase in the Japanese population of Canada, and particularly in British Columbia in that period. In the same pamphlet we find an extract from the House of Commons debate of May 8, 1922, purporting to be a statement by the Prime Minister. I think it is unfair to publish a portion of the speech of any hon. gentleman in this way so as to indicate to the public that he—in this case the Prime Minister—was favourable to Japanese immigration whereas, as a matter of fact the Prime Minister in the speech which he gave on that occasion stated emphatically that he was very much opposed to oriental immigration, and, that the government proposed to take effective measures to prevent it. An extract is also given from the speech delivered by the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Dickie.) That also is misleading and again I say that it is unfair to quote any member of this House in that way. The same thing was done in the case of the hon. member for Nanaimo as in the case of the Prime Minister and I submit that such a procedure is not justified. If the Japanese are going to quote a member of this House at all they should either give his entire speech or such parts of it as fairly represent what he actually said. There are other features of this pamphlet to which reference may be made. It purports to set out what the rights of foreigners in Japan are. From this pamphlet it would appear that foreigners are welcome in Japan and are given very extensive privileges. My information—and I may say that I obtained it from people who have been in Japan—is that that representation is rather misleading; that the foreigner is not welcome in Japan, that he is not given a chance in any line of business, and that he is discouraged in

every possible way. So much for the statement of the Consul General of Japan.

I also have to take exception to propaganda which is being carried on by the Consul General for China, Mr. Chilien Tsur. In this connection I would like to read a short extract from an editorial which appeared in the Ottawa Citizen of March 24, of this year. It says:

Hon. Chilien Tsur, Consul General for China, in his address to the Ottawa Canadian Women's Club, deprecated the tone and character of some of the remarks made in parliament by honourable members regarding the question of Chinese immigration. "Is that the Christian way of expressing cordiality and peace?" he is reported to have said.

Then there was a statement made by the same gentleman in Victoria as to the segregation of school children there; another statement made by him in reference to the immigration sheds in Vancouver; and a statement in regard to the head tax. The gentleman has been going from one end of Canada to the other criticizing the government and the people of this country in regard to the laws which are in effect here. I take it, Mr. Chairman, that that kind of thing contravenes all the ethics of international usage. I do not think it is right or proper for this gentleman to issue propaganda of this kind, but I must say that it appears that that kind of thing is pretty general throughout this country, I should say throughout the North American continent, and that there is a very strong concerted movement going on at the present time to put before the people of this country the right of the Japanese, particularly, to equality of treatment. I have certain extracts here from San Francisco papers which I should like to read in this connection. It seems they are going to have very shortly a convention composed of representatives of the various Japanese associations of America, including the Japanese Association of Canada, the object of which is to enforce race equality on the people of this country. I will read from the Sacramento Bee of March 19th, 1923, the following:

The New Anti-American Agitation in Japan

To Force Race Equality Through Treaty Revision

Is the Japanese government quietly encouraging a popular outbreak of anti-American feeling preparatory to diplomatic demands on the immigration question? We know that the Japanese associations in this country are under the direct control of the government. These organizations are now making plans for a large scale agitation in Japan for "race equality" (in America only—not in Japan and her territories). A powerful "Society to enforce Race Equality" was organized in Tokio last January. Among its promoters are many influential merchants, members of parliament, preachers, and other leading men who have lived in America and are co-operating with the Japanese associations. This agitation menaces the peace of America and Japan. Its object is to "Enforce race equality." Race equality with the Japanese means wresting from America something which the people of the Pacific coast will not concede. The Japanese are raising an issue which would mean war. Tokyo knows this. Tokyo controls the Japanese associations in this country and can control agitation in Japan. Why is this rising tide of mischief-making not controlled at the start? In my last report I dealt with the American influence and significance.

The following editorial refers to the Tokyo end:

(Translation, Japanese American News, March 16, Editorial)

Necessity of Understanding with Tokyo Confreres

Treaty Revision and the American Brotherhood

Never before has there been such sharp debate on the Japan-American question as in the Japanese parliament this year. There have been discussions before but they never rose to the proportions of the debate this year. And this vigorous debate was mainly the result of dissatisfaction over the discriminatory treatment of Japanese in America and the desire to correct it. The government's replies were mostly irrelevant but nevertheless they showed a hesitating desire to comply with this demand. The interpellations and answers were necessarily formal but the debate was wholly different from the usual noisy wrangling of the opposition. For this reason this debate will have a certain degree of influence and significance.

Not that we think that this debate in parliament will produce immediate results. It goes without saying that the Japanese-American question will not be settled in this way, but there is not the slightest doubt that parliamentary discussion will have an influence on the government, on the people,, and on one element of the international situation. For this reason we have taken much interest in the parliament this year-and we think we have much to be thankful for.

We think also that one reason for this happy phenomenon in parliament was the opportune effort to arouse public sentiment by the "American Brotherhood" now called the "Society to enforce Race Equality," organized by men who rose to prominence in America or have interests in America. The personnel of the organization of the Society to Enforce Race Equality and the main features of its work have been reported already in numerous telegrams and other communications. Probably most of the people in Japan who are deeply sympathetic with the Japanese in America in their present situation are connected with this society.

We may presume that these persons organized the society and undertook to arouse public sentiment, not merely out of sympathy for the Japanese in America, but from the broad standpoint of the Japanese nation and Japan-American relations, recognizing its necessity for our nation and race. But in its work and effects thereof, in its motto—Equal treatment for the Japanese in America—it is absolutely at one with the earnest desires of the Japanese in America. Therefore we tender to the Society for the Enforcement of Race Equality our deep respect and gratitude.

The 100,000 and more Japanese in America to-day are at the parting of the ways. In the midst of terrible anxiety they are seeking a way out of darkness into light. To put it concretely, they earnestly hope that when the treaty is revised the discriminatory treatment they now suffer in immigration, in the land question, and other matters, will be abolished. And in order to attain this hope we must start a nation-wide popular movement, organizing public opinion for stimulating the government, helping and compelling it to act. And in this popular movement our first reliance for sympathy and help is the American Brotherhood. It is no simple matter to start a nation-wide movement

We cannot do it by sending hundreds of telegrams. There must be an organized body of confreres in Japan. The debates in parliament have prepared the people by giving preliminary information. The Japan-American question has blossomed out in this parliament. We truly rejoice in this. But we must add to this preliminary knowledge by giving more detailed and reliable information on the Japan-American immigration question, showing how equal treatment for Japanese overseas is necessary for the honour and interests of the national people. If we do not arouse public sentiment to this extent we can not escape from our present sad plight.

I have also another quotation from the same paper of date March 17th, 1923, which reads:

A Trouble-Making Body of Immigrants

Japanese Determined to Override Wishes of Western America

Scheme to Compel Government to Demand "Equal Treatment"

No other immigrant group in this country has ever undertaken so persistently to evade the laws of the land and override the will of the American people as do the Japanese. At this moment they are forming plans for a combined movement for the avowed purpose of forcing the Japanese government to take a stand which would mean war or the over-riding of the will of the people of at least nine western states. This movement has already begun in Tokyo and the American end is being organized by these peculiar agencies of the Tokyo government, the Japanese associations. For the first time in the history of the Japanese colony, if the scheme carries, the entire group will be organized for joint action. What they propose to do is brought out in the following translations from a local Japanese paper. The Japanese-American News of March 15, 1923, in its Los Angeles column under the date of March 13, has the following:

Japanese All-American Conference

We have already reported that at the meeting of the managing staff and the standing committees of the Central Japanese Association (Los Angeles) day before yesterday, it was decided that a proposal be made that this year's regular meeting of the affiliated Japanese associations of the coast be deferred and a general conference of all the Japanese associations in America be held in Seattle after the decision of the Anti-Japanese land cases, set for hearing April 16 in the U.S.A. Supreme Court, has been rendered.

Yesterday the following letter, accompanying the resolution, was sent to the Japanese Association of America; the Japanese Association of the Northwest, Seattle; the Oregon Japanese Association, Portland; the Japanese Association of Canada; the Japanese Association of New York; the Japanese Association of Chicago; the Japanese Association of Hawaii; requesting approval of the proposition.

Greetings:

At a joint meeting of the managing staff and standing committee of this association on the 12th instant the following resolution was adopted and we respectfully ask your prompt consideration and approval of the same.

Japanese Association of Southern California.
Ginnosuke Yuass,
President.

March, 1923.

Proposal of an All-American Conference of Japanese Residents

Said conference to be held after the decision has been rendered in the land law appeal cases set for hearing April 16th in the Supreme Court. In addition to the delegates of the affiliated Japanese associations of the coast, delegates to be invited from all Hawaii and from the New York and Chicago regions. The conference to discuss preliminary investigations regarding the revision of the Japan-American treaty and the effect of the Supreme Court's decision.

The calling of the conference is to be left to the Japanese Association of the Northwest, Seattle.

Following up the matter editorially the Japanese American News (March 15) says:

ALL-AMERICAN CONFERENCE OF JAPANESE RESIDENTS

Extremely Proper

The Central Japanese Association of Southern California has proposed an All-American conference of Japanese residents. The plan is to hold a convention after the decision of the land law cases which are to come up for hearing in the Supreme Court April 16th, the convention to be made up of representatives of the Central Japanese associations of Los Angeles, San Francisco, Portland, Seattle, Vancouver, B.C., New York, Chicago and Hawaii, for the purpose of considering

1. Preliminary investigation regarding the revision of the Japan-American treaty, and
2. Effects of the Supreme Court's decision.

The motto of the association is "Abolish discriminatory treatment". There follows this paragraph to which I would call the attention of the committee:

If our government is not firmly resolved—

By "our government", they mean the Japanese government—

If our government is not firmly resolved on revision every means should be employed to make them so. We cannot easily do this by ordinary methods. We Japanese in America to whom it is a question of life and death should determine to accomplish our object at any sacrifice.

It appears that something is being done to endeavour to arouse public opinion. I am not prepared to say that the pamphlet issued by the Japanese Consul General was part of that general movement, but I do say that its tenor is the same; and if that pamphlet had never been forwarded to me the Japanese Consul General would never have had occasion to take exception to my remarks in the House of Commons, because there would have been no opportunity for me to confuse pamphlets issued by him with those issued by Japanese associations. The situation in California is very serious; but considering the population of the United States as compared with that of Canada, the number of Japanese in Canada is much larger proportionately than the number of Japanese in the United States. It has been pointed out on many occasions by interested persons that the number of orientals in this country is very small. But the same thing applies to the United States. The trouble is the same here as it is in the United States, and that is that the oriental population is

not properly distributed. We have them on the Pacific coast while there are very few in other parts of Canada. In British Columbia as well as in California there is a very significant feature of this question which has many times been referred to. I refer to the birth rate of the Japanese. I have here a pamphlet, a short extract from which I should like to read; it deals with and possibly explains this question. I am reading now from a pamphlet issued by the North American Commission of the American Legion. This pamphlet is entitled The Oriental Question Report presented by the National Oriental Committee of the National Convention of 1922, which report was unanimously adopted. At page 30 there appears the following:

In order that the seriousness of the Japanese question may be understood it is necessary to obtain the Japanese point of view, which can be had in no way better than from the statements of prominent Japanese and the editorial comment in Japanese newspapers. One of the most instructive of such editorials, appearing in the "Shin Sekai" or "New World" of San Francisco, in October, 1919, said:

"We should advance and not recede. To stop is to retreat. While we push forward boldly the enemy has no chance to form plans.

"What can Phelan do? What can Inman do? When we of the Yamato race arise with a mighty resolve their opposition will be as futile as an attempt to sweep the sea with a broom.

"Even if photograph marriages should be prohibited, we cannot be stopped from leaving our descendants on this American continent. Even if not a single Japanese woman comes it is not possible to prevent the seed of our great Yamato race from being sown on the American continent by marriages with Americans, with French, with Indians and with negroes, especially since there are already 100,000 Japanese here and 5,000 are born annually.

"Supposing that we Japanese were prohibited from owning or cultivating the land. Even the laws of California are not forever unchangeable.

"The day will come when the real strength of the Japanese will make a clean sweep of all laws."

"The far-seeing nature of the Japanese designs is attested by their not infrequent allusion to the plan of one hundred years. An album of scenes depicting the Japanese farming activities which was published in Sacramento in 1915 contained a preface which said that it would serve not only as a souvenir but for the larger purpose of contributing to the formation of the great colony scheme of 100 years". An article in the Sacramento "Daily News", a Japanese newspaper, discussing the then pending alien land bill, said:

"It is impossible to escape anxiety because of the many serious matters which arise, one after the other, in connection with our plans of resistance in the present crisis and their relation to our compatriots' plan of a hundred years."

The importance of propagating the Japanese race in furtherance of this plan of one hundred years is emphasized in the following article which appeared in the "Nichi-Bei" of San Francisco, in October, 1919:

"The Americans wish to kick Japan down to international isolation and confine development of her people to one small island country. Truly it is a laughable and villainous plot. Awake! Even if we cannot expand our country's borders let us expand with all speed the Yamato race of which we are justly proud. Beget! Beget! Beget!. It is only by the propagation of our Yamato race by every good Japanese that we can solve the anti-Japanese, nay, the American-Japanese problem. For the next ten, twenty, fifty or one hundred years, beget! beget! Children, boys and girls, will be treasures more valuable to your countrymen than hundreds of millions of gold. And at the same time they are the supreme treasures for the development of our race".

A quotation from a Japanese language newspaper, identity not given, read into the record of the Congressional investigation of 1920 says:

"We must send for wives. We must raise as many children in America as possible, so that we shall acquire a stability and strength which no amount of anti-Japanese agitation can shake. Land can be had by legal invasion of the spirit of the laws. But without children to inherit, what hope for the future of Yamato-America? Land, broad acres settled thick with Mikado's subjects, children to inherit the land, mothers to bring forth the children."

Protesting against the suppression of photograph marriages the Osaka Mainichi Shimbun quoted in the San Francisco Nichi-Bei of January 17, 1920, says:

"The annual migration of women to America by photograph marriages numbers more than 1,000. At the present time the single prefecture of Hiroshima has 44,155 of its people residing in America. Of these 15,592, not more than one-third, are women. Yet our government, ignoring or glossing over these facts, dares to suppress photograph marriages in a cowardly truckling to America, injuring the national dignity, and adopting an expedient of suicidal repression of our overseas development."

The use which the Japanese hope to make of the voting power vested in the thousands of American-born children of their race who are now rapidly approaching twenty-one years of age is a matter of grave concern. Before quoting the Japanese on this point a short extract will be given from a letter to the Portland, Oregon, Northman by Miss Francis Hewitt, recently returned from Japan, where she had spent six years teaching English to Japanese school children. Referring to the misinformation relative to the Japanese purposes conveyed by the missionaries who dare not write anything displeasing to the Japanese censors of their letters, and by tourists and notables who go to Japan on trade or other commissions and are so entertained "that they seem to lose all sense of sane observation." Miss Hewitt says:

"They do not learn that every girl is thoroughly drilled in the doctrine that should she become a "picture bride" in America or an immigrant to other lands her loyal duty to her emperor is to have as many children as possible, so that the foreigners' land may in time become a possession of Japan through the expressed will of the people".

The Nichi-Bei of San Francisco, in an editorial translated in the Seattle Post-Intelligencer of July 4, 1922, comments enthusiastically upon the voting power of the 40,000 American-born Japanese in California, not to mention that of the 49,000 in Hawaii and the other thousands scattered along the Pacific coast, and still other thousands who are being born each year. This editorial indicates the means whereby the Japanese, as stated in the editorial herein quoted from the Shin Sekai, expect that the "real strength of the Japanese will make a clean sweep of all laws." It argues:

"If the Japanese now here settle down where they are, and the number of American-born Japanese grows gradually, it may be presumed that in the next ten or twenty years the number of second generation Japanese in this state, who will have the right to vote, will reach a large figure. Then will the political influence of the native-born Japanese be recognized;

then will probably come the time when the attitude of the American-born Japanese will decide the course of an election. Even 5,000 voters among the Japanese five years hence will be able to accomplish a great deal. But with twenty or thirty thousand of them—then a great change will have come in the situation of the California Japanese. At any rate, no person with political aspirations will be able to ignore the voters of Japanese descent."

Anticipating the possibility of the denial of suffrage to American-born Japanese whose births have been registered in Japan as required of Japanese subjects, the Japanese Sacramento Daily News suggests the discontinuance of the practice of sending such birth notices to Japan, saying:

"Hereafter the omission of the notice to Japan is just the way for Japanese subjects, by securing American citizenship, to lay the foundation of a great development. And another day, when the opportunity comes for them to reinforce the Japanese residents in America who have no citizenship rights, they must, on behalf of His Majesty, the Emperor of Japan, become the loyal protectors of the race. Even though they are not registered in Japan, if they return to Japan and have documentary evidence that their parents are Japanese they can register at any time."

I would like also to refer to an editorial published in the Vancouver Daily World of recent date, under the caption, "An Ungrateful Guest." It says:

After spending three years in Ottawa as a guest of Canada, Mr. Kosaku Mizusawa, late of the Japanese Consulate general, has gone to the United States and there delivered an attack upon this country, its people and its laws. Such a gross breach of hospitality and of etiquette deserves notice.

Mr. Mizusawa is described in the Japanese language paper which prints his interview as being an "Eleve Consul." The admixture of French and English is apparently intended to convey the idea of a student-consul or consul in training. As a student-consul Mr. Mizusawa has at least one thing to learn and it is to be hoped his official superiors will promptly teach him the importance of keeping a still tongue in his head. Such an official, breathing such sentiments under such circumstances, is a danger to international good-will. The circumstance that the interview was printed in Japanese in a Japanese language paper circulating up and down the Pacific Coast aggravates rather than mitigates the offence.

The charge made by Mr. Mizusawa that "Canadian anti-Japanism is far more cruel than the California anti-Japanese laws" is based on a recent immigration measure offered at Ottawa by Mr. Neill of Comox-Alberni, which never reached second reading, a land bill said to be offered by Mr. H. H. Stevens, which had a similar painless death, and the refusal by the Dominion authorities to add to the large number of Japanese now controlling the fishing industry of this coast.

Then there is a part here that I cannot make out—something about an actual grievance. Then it goes on:

It is true that the officials of the Fisheries department are, on instructions from Ottawa, refusing to grant more licenses to Japanese fishermen than were held in the season of 1920-21. That number comprises roughly two-thirds of all the licenses issued on the B. C. coast.

Says Mr. Mizusawa: "The Japanese engaged in that industry in that country are largely naturalized citizens of England. It is difficult to understand how any law can be passed to stop them from fishing. But they are doing it by administrative process in connection with the issuance of licenses. The Canadian anti-Japanism is far more cruel, in my opinion, than the California anti-Japanese laws."

Mr. Mizusawa has, during his three years' stay in Canada, become so accustomed to seeing his countrymen displace Canadians and British in the industries of British Columbia he cannot comprehend that a halt has been called in the work of Orientalising the coast fisheries. That new Japanese who have never fished before cannot be admitted to the fisheries fills him with a sense of outrage. He finds it difficult to understand how any law can be passed that can stop his countrymen from fishing here. In this disability, his countrymen are at worst only sharing the fate of white fishermen who cannot get permission to fish or operate canneries, of white citizens who own hotel bars and cannot operate them, of white trappers and loggers and manufacturers and a host of other people who at some stage or other find their activities curtailed through the paramount right of the state.

I suppose this gentleman will be even more pained to hear that a cut of 40 per cent has been made in the number of Japanese licenses issued this year.

Now, the claim is made that these Japanese are naturalized British subjects and as such are entitled to all the rights and privileges of British subjects. I had occasion to point out a few days ago the case of a Japanese who was naturalized when he was very young. I have under my hand the evidence which was given before the British Columbia Fisheries Commission in this connection. Hozumi Yonemura, who was assistant secretary of the Japanese Association, District No. 2, was examined and presented a memorandum which is included in the evidence. During the course of his examination the following questions were asked:

Q. Were you born in this country?—A. No, sir.

Q. When did you come to the country?—A. 1911.

Q. You were naturalized then?—A. The same year, I think it was.

Q. How old are you now?—A. 21.

Q. You were naturalized in 1911; you would only be ten years old then. It seems you have to be 21 to be naturalized.—A. I have been told by my father.

Q. Was your father a citizen of this country then?—A. No.

Q. Is he here now?—A. Yes.

Q. When did he come to the country?—A. About 18 or 19 years ago.

Q. He came here and then he sent for you?—A. Yes.

Q. Is your father naturalized?—A. No, I don't think he is.

Q. What is your father's name?—A. Koshiro Yomamura.

Q. Where does he live?—A. New Westminster.

Q. What business is he in?—A. Contractor.

Q. Have you ever become expatriated from Japan?—A. No.

Q. You never made any application for expatriation?—A. I did, but I could not succeed. That expatriation is in question now in the House of Commons in Japan.

Q. So that you still are a citizen of Japan according to the Japanese law?—A. Yes.

Q. And the same thing applies to all the Japanese in this country?—A. Not those who were born in this country.

Q. All the naturalized Japanese in this country are still citizens of Japan according to the law of Japan?—A. Yes.

Q. You had to make an affidavit saying you were in the country three years before you could be naturalized, and you had to swear an affidavit of allegiance to the British Crown which you did not understand. What I am asking you is this, were there many Japanese who were in the same position?—A. There must be many others.

Now, in this same connection I also have the evidence of P. E. Kuwabara, who said he was secretary of the Steveston Fishermen's Benevolent Society. He was examined before the commission at Vancouver. The following is part of the evidence:

Q. Now, when we were up at Essington we were told by a Japanese there—he was secretary of the Japanese union for No. 2 District—that he came to this country in 1911 and that he was naturalized the same year. At the present time he is only 21 years of age and consequently he was naturalized when he was 10 years old. He said he had been told by his father that this was quite the proper thing and he said there were a great many other Japanese who were in the same position, who had been similarly naturalized in an illegal manner. Now, would you contradict that gentleman?—A. That is correct.

Q. Therefore there are a great many Japanese whom you refer to in your document who have not been naturalized at all?

Mr. Martell: There are also a great many Japanese not expatriated by the Japanese government.

A. That is correct. I can say so.

If these statements are true; if these witnesses knew what they were talking about, then we have a peculiar situation in British Columbia in that a great many of these Japanese were naturalized in an illegal manner, and if these naturalizations were questioned they would have to be revoked.

Mr. CARROLL: Is the hon. member criticising now the judges who have recommended naturalization, or the minister who has charge of that kind of thing?

Mr. McQUARRIE: What was recommended in the report of the British Columbia Fisheries Commission, of which I happened to be a member, was that all these naturalization certificates should be called in and that only those should be issued in cases where the applicants were bona fide entitled to certificates. I am not criticizing anybody.

Mr. CARROLL: Does my hon. friend mean to say that the judges of the various courts of British Columbia have granted certificates or recommended the granting of certificates to the Secretary of State which are wrong?

Mr. McQUARRIE: These certificates were issued some years ago, and I must say, from information that I have, that naturalization certificates were granted in a somewhat loose manner.

[Mr. McQuarrie.]

Mr. CARROLL: The hon. member must then be criticizing the judges of the British Columbia courts.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I am criticizing no one; the hon. member is trying to put words in my mouth. I am simply stating the facts, nothing more.

Now, as I have stated previously, it is suggested by the propaganda to which I have referred that there is really no oriental menace in British Columbia; that the members from that province have been making a great fuss about nothing; that there is no danger there at all, nothing we should get excited about, nothing in respect to which we should take action. Well, in that connection I would say, as I have said previously, that this is not a political question or rather it is not a party question. I suppose it is a political question, and for that reason I resent interference by the representatives of foreign nations. But it is not a party question; and I am going to quote from statements made not by members of my own party, but by ministers of the Crown in British Columbia who, of course, are Liberals. The first is a statement made by Hon. E. D. Barrow, Minister of Agriculture in British Columbia. I read from a despatch published in the Vancouver Province of November 23, 1922, dated at Victoria. It says:

Figures showing the extent of the penetration of Japanese and Chinese into the fruit, vegetable and general market gardening industry in British Columbia were given the legislature yesterday by Hon. E. D. Barrow, Minister of Agriculture, in the debate on Mr. Ian Mackenzie's resolution calling for amendment to the B.N.A. Act to give the province power to control oriental ownership of lands or other natural resources and employment in industries connected with them.

Ninety per cent, of the local produce furnished in the city of Vancouver supplied by orientals and 55 per cent, of the potatoes of the province are produced by orientals, Mr. Barrow said.

To present the seriousness of the menace, Mr. Barrow quoted figures which he said were collected two years ago by the department of agriculture in its survey of the yellow peril. This survey showed that there were 14,050 acres of agricultural land owned by Japanese and Chinese and 12,000 acres leased by them.

"That was the condition two years ago and we are satisfied that the acreage held by orientals has been increased since that time," Mr. Barrow said.

At the time of the survey, out of the 4,500 acres in the province devoted to small fruits, the Japanese hold 2,341 acres, or more than 50 per cent. He declared that this added to the problem of the berrygrowers in connection with economical marketing on the prairies.

For truck farming the Chinese own 1,632 acres and lease 8,184 acres, the Japanese own 281 acres and lease 560 acres, a total of 10,097 acres, Mr. Barrow said.

"This is the time to take a definite stand to prevent orientals from acquiring any more of our farm lands," Mr. Barrow went on. "It is now practically impossible to buy any produce not grown by orientals. If the oriental were not producing our vegetables the white

man would be. The same method is to enact legislation to prevent them from acquiring more than they have."

Mr. Barrow pointed out that the greater proportion of the hothouses near Victoria were owned or run by orientals and they are aggressive on the north side of the Fraser in the berry districts. There was concern that some of them would indirectly get some of the rich Sumas lands being developed by the government.

There are no orientals coming into Chilliwack, however, Mr. Barrow said, as in that district the community spirit is too strong against them. There is no real estate firm in the district that would dare to sell land to orientals. But there is fear that some of the fertile alluvial lands nearby, which are held in big blocks, might pass into the hands of Orientals.

Here is a statement by the Attorney General of British Columbia, the Hon. A. M. Manson, and this I take from the Vancouver World which is the Liberal organ in the city of Vancouver:

That in the shingle mill industry in British Columbia the oriental had already secured the balance of power and that to-day 54 per cent of the shingle mills in this province were controlled by Asiatics, was stated to the House yesterday by Hon. A. M. Manson in seconding the motion of Hon. William Sloan, calling upon the federal government for total exclusion of Asiatics from Canada.

"And that is not all," he said. "It may be interesting to this House to know that 7½ per cent of the industrial workers in the logging industry are Asiatics: that 41 per cent in the lumber dealing industry belong to the same race; that 16 per cent in the baking industry; 39 per cent in the fish canning industry; 39 per cent in the vegetable canning business; 15 per cent in the coal mining industry: 37 per cent in the pulp and paper industry and 39 per cent in the saw milling industry are also Asiatics."

The attorney general did not mince words in dealing with the problem. "The story of the oriental in British Columbia has been the story of a progressive menace," he said. "He came to us first as a hand laundry man. Then he became a factor in the fishing industry. Next in the logging and lumbering industry. Then he invaded mining and farming and now he is a menace in the wholesale and retail merchant business."

While seconding the motion for exclusion of entrance into Canada he stated that he thought we should go still further and adopt a policy that would compel the oriental already here to leave Canada.

I have here a statement by the Hon. William Sloan, Minister of Mines in British Columbia. This is taken from the Vancouver World of November 11, 1921:

In the face of all the facts that I have been able to assemble it must be clear to us that the industrial and economic life of British Columbia is already endangered by Asiatic competition and that the white people cannot compete with this foreign population for the chief reason that orientals are, as has been repeatedly emphasized, accustomed to and contented with a much lower standard of living. In the final analysis it must be admitted that while a single state may continue to contain two races, it cannot long continue to contain two conflicting and distinct civilizations.

Mr. Sloan goes on to give a statement which is very interesting. He says:

I wish to submit some very interesting figures which have been compiled with regard to the activity of orientals within our province and which indicate serious inroad in our industries of fishing, agriculture, lumbering, mining and also in respect to business and trade.

In 1920, 2,227 gill net licenses and 519 trolling licenses a total of 2,746 licenses were issued to Japanese by the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

It may safely be said that there were 5,492 Japanese fishermen at work in British Columbia in 1920, which number certainly has not decreased in recent years.

The Asiatic Exclusion League of Canada points out that the total number of births in British Columbia in 1920 was 11,192, that the Japanese births aggregated 657, making the proportion of Japanese to whites one in seventeen.

Statistics also have been compiled which indicate that the proportion in 1921 was about one in 13.

Out of 438 grocery licenses issued in Vancouver in 1920 over 171 were granted to orientals. There were 80 oriental laundries. In restaurants 713 orientals were employed and 50 per cent of said restaurants were owned and operated by orientals. There are 62 oriental barber shops in Vancouver.

Sixty per cent of the merchant tailors in Vancouver are orientals. In the present year these numbers have grown alarmingly. Japanese and Chinese merchants now hold 1,656 trade licences in the city of Vancouver.

In my own constituency in Nanaimo, an industrial district, it is noteworthy that orientals also have been obtaining a footing, as is indicated by the following facts: In that city there are three Chinese laundries, two Chinese barbers, five oriental merchant tailors, three Chinese fruit, and vegetable merchants peddling from door to door, and at least 75 per cent of the truck farming of the district is controlled by orientals.

He goes on to show how the orientals are also invading the coal mining industry. I have also some information contained in a memorandum of the Steveston Fishermen's Benevolent Society, a Japanese organization, which was presented to the British Columbia Fisheries Commission, and which deals particularly, of course, with my own district.

I would like to draw attention to the condition which exists in the town of Steveston, which is at the mouth of the Fraser river. A few years ago this town had a population of some three thousand, the majority of whom were white. Now it has a population of about the same number or a little larger, but practically all of them are orientals. I will give you the Japanese gentleman's own figures. There are about 600 married couples living in Steveston and its vicinity with approximately 1,200 children, together with about 700 single fishermen, all engaged "in fishing and the subsequent industries on the Fraser." That would make an oriental population of some 3,100. Then he goes on to say that these fishermen have invested in their business a large sum which is stated to be $1,694,900 and is made up as follows:

870 gas-engined fishing boats (under 10 B. H.P.), valued $1,000.00 per boat, and $500.00 fishing nets and other gears	$1,305,000
50 fish-carrying boats (from 10-20 B.H.P.), valued at $3,252.00 per boat	133,900
38 fish-carrying boats (over 20 B.H.P.), valued at $6,500.00 per boat	256,000
Total..	$1,694,900

Then, in the same document, we are told about the trolling and other operations, which give employment to a great many more Japanese. There is one statement here, and I would like to call attention to it because it seems to convey the idea that these men think they are really helping the country by engaging in the fishing. It says:

> We are all working to promote the production of one of our national products, namely, fish.

They think they are really helping us by doing this fishing. I take it that they are not doing anything to help the country but are rather taking advantage of our natural resources in a way that should not be permitted and in a way that would not be permitted to us in Japan. There is another peculiar thing about this statement and that is, it is contended that by catching fish on the west coast of Vancouver Island they are doing a patriotic work inasmuch as they are catching the fish which otherwise would go to the Americans. It says here:

> If this observation is correct, which we presume it is as far as the present stage of biological observations are concerned, we are not killing any Canadian fish, but are killing our competitors' fish for the benefit of the nation. We are not very familiar with the political aspects of fisheries in connection with United States, but we presume we are doing a very beneficial and rather patriotic work for our adopted country, especially when fisheries authorities in the state of Washington are apparently taking an attitude that they are very little interested with the question of the conservation of salmon, but only concerned to put up as many cases of canned salmon as they possibly can by almost any destructive means of fishing.

Now, I think, we are telling these Japanese that we do not need them in our fisheries.

I would like if I may be permitted to do so to read another editorial from the Vancouver World.

The CHAIRMAN: I am afraid that the hon. member in his elaboration of citations is getting beyond the provisions of the rule which declares that speeches in Committee of the Whole must be strictly relevant to the clause or item under discussion, which in this case is immigration. I am drawing my hon. friend's attention to the rule so that he may be guided by it.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I think the editorial I am about to quote is really relevant to the subject under discussion. It summarizes very well the conditions that we are faced with in the city of Vancouver to-day and is entirely relevant, particularly in view of the fact that the government proposes to admit merchants to Canada although other immigration is to be excluded. Now, this editorial from the Vancouver World which, of course, is a government organ, is to the following effect:

[Mr. McQuarrie.]

> The Army of Asiatic Retailers
>
> The figures, printed elsewhere in this paper, showing the extent of the Chinese and Japanese competition in the retail merchandizing and general occupational businesses of this city, will come as a startling revelation to many people.
>
> Within the past year a general branching out of Chinese and Japanese stores has taken place all over the city. There is hardly a business block, either in the down-town section or in the outer districts where the local tradesman is not suffering from the effects of Asiatic competition. But until The World secured the returns from the City Hall records, who for one moment imagined that 1,658 Chinese and Japanese were holding trade licenses within the city limits?
>
> Nor has the worst been reached, by a long way. Six months ago The World pointed out the menace which would come within a few years from the admission of last year's army of 1,445 qualified Chinese merchants through the port of Vancouver. Not many of the 1921 class are yet in business. They came armed with the necessary capital to secure entry, but they are still busy learning English, studying Canadian business methods and preparing with patience for the time when they will be able to take their line in the ranks of the commercial contenders for Vancouver's retail trade.
>
> Many of the Chinese retailers are doing business under assumed names. Possibly out of admiration for one of the leaders of the Vancouver bar one Chinese tailor has taken the name of "Charles Wilson." His explanation is that this is his real name "in English." Another, a grocer, has paid a delicate compliment to the Scotch by taking the name of "MacLean." Others are content to take mere company names which sound like the names of Anglo-Saxon concerns, such as "The Royal" and the "North American," etc. But it would surely make the Bard of Avon turn in his grave to see who runs The Stratford Gent's Tailoring Club, or the Stratford gentlemen who patronize it.
>
> To-day the Victoria Chinese are using the strike, picketing and intimidation to prevent the principle of separate schools for Asiatics being introduced there. They and their mouthpieces are demanding that the Asiatic school populace shall be educated on terms of intimacy with the children of white people. Undoubtedly the equipping of their children with the fullest measure of intimacy with their white competitors in the business affairs of life is the governing factor in the refusal of the Chinese to attend the schools set apart for themselves.
>
> A study of the article referred to will show that there is no line of industry which the evergrowing tide of Asiatic invasion is not prepared to contest with the Anglo-Saxon in this province. The time has come for some enlightened self-sacrifice on the part of buyers as well as for the utmost efficiency on the part of the tradesmen to meet the situation which is probably destined to reach much more aggravated proportions before relief comes.

The statement referred to in the editorial is as follows:

> Over 1,600 Oriental Shopmen
>
> Stores of Asiatics Occupy 100 Blocks
>
> How many Chinese and Japanese are there in business in the city of Vancouver?
>
> The full total is impossible to state without a complete census, if such a thing were possible, but the records of Trades License Inspector Jones' office at the City Hall show that no fewer than 1,658 Chinese and Japanese have been licensed to carry on merchandizing businesses within the city limits.
>
> This does not include men who work for wages, and there are many such, but only those who are in business for themselves. As there are 18 stores with 25

feet frontages in an ordinary Granville street block, it would take nearly one hundred city blocks to house all the businesses run by Asiatics in this city, if each of them occupied 25 feet of space and all were hived together instead of being spread over the city.

All of them, however, do not occupy business premises. There are 152 Chinese hawkers and peddlers, who do business from carts and autos. In a few instances there is a duplication of names where a man may have separate licenses for selling stationery or confectionery and tobacco under the same roof.

The business of hawking and peddling is almost entirely monopolized by the Chinese with their 152 peddlers. Only two Japanese are as yet in that business. So, too, in regard to laundries. Out of the 55 laundries in the city 41 are run by Chinese.

Once Favoured by Widows

Candy, ice cream, fruit and tobacco—the typical small business which used to be the mecca of the retired workman or the widow with small means—is the chief business that has been attacked by the Asiatic in point of numbers. Of licenses in these lines, no fewer than 137 are held by Chinese and 197 by Japanese. The Greeks have made the candy, fruit and tobacco business their chief object of attack, but they hold only 103 licenses as compared with the 334 held by the two Asiatic races.

There are 97 Chinese grocers and 79 Japanese grocers in the list; 62 restaurants run by Chinese and 27 run by Japanese.

The Japanese have entered strongly into the rooming-house business, there being 69 lodging-houses run by Japanese as compared with 14 run by Chinese.

No fewer than 45 barber shops are now run by Japanese and 20 by Chinese. The jewellery business and the drug store business, both reputedly lucrative businesses, have attracted the Asiatic merchants, there being 22 Chinese jewellers and eight Japanese jewellers in business here and 27 Chinese drug stores and four Japanese drug stores.

Asiatic Penetration

The full extent of the penetration of the Asiatic merchants into various lines of retail business is shown by the following list: Autos for hire, 14; auto drivers, 15; garage and supply houses, 5; apartment houses, 13; billiard and pool rooms, 10; bootblacks, 1; butchers, 40; barbers, 65; brokers, 8; boot and shoe dealers, 27; boot and shoe repairers, 23; bath parlours, 12; candy, ice cream and fruit, 133; confectionery, 11; cleaners and dyers, 55; druggists, 33; dry goods, 38; dressmakers, 4; express and draying, 38; flour and feed, 8; fish dealers, 20; grocers, 172; greengrocers, 57; gents' clothiers, 63; hawkers and peddlers, 154; hardware, 9; jewellers, 30; lodging-houses, 83; laundries, 43; milliners, 3; miscellaneous, 52; printers and publishers, 5; poulterers, 17; photographers and photo supplies, 12; restaurants, 89; secondhand dealers, 14; stationery and books, 54; tobacconists, 201; wholesale dealers, 29. The above makes a grand total of 1,658.

I think I have shown that there is something of a real menace facing us, particularly in British Columbia, and I submit that immigration of this class should be excluded from Canada. I was very glad indeed to know that the hon. member who preceded me (Mr. McMurray) agreed with me in this particular. He said that we should encourage to come to Canada those immigrants who have the courage to work and face hardships, but he would not include in that class the oriental immigrant. Since this matter was before the House last year the agitation for the exclusion of orientals has been continued in British Columbia. I have before me a number of resolutions which have been passed by organizations at different times since I had the honour to place before this House last session the resolution calling for exclusion. I will not take the time to read these resolutions, but I would say that, irrespective of party, the demand from all classes that these orientals should be excluded from Canada is as strong as ever, and I hope that the Acting Minister of Immigration (Mr. Stewart) will endeavour this year to do something to meet the situation.

Mr. GARDINER: I listened with a good deal of amusement and not a little amazement to the address of the hon. member for North Winnipeg (Mr. McMurray) this afternoon and evening, but I believe the most amazed member in this House was the hon. Acting Minister of Immigration (Mr. Stewart) himself. I will take up a little later some of the points the hon. member for North Winnipeg dealt with. But at the present time I would like to say a few words with regard to Canada as a country to live in. I believe that it is generally a well-accepted fact that, in so far as Canada is concerned, we have, perhaps, one of the best countries that can be found on the face of the globe. We have a country of large dimensions, and of very extensive natural resources. Those natural resources are so extensive that even the people who are living in Canada to-day do not know a tithe of their extent. Under these circumstances it would be quite natural, of course, for us to expect that immigration to Canada, would be almost spontaneous. But I find myself in a somewhat peculiar position, and that position is simply this, that, so far as the people of Canada are concerned, we must take the condition to-day and discuss it as it exists.

I regret that I had not the opportunity of listening to very much of this debate. I have been engaged in the special committee on Agriculture looking into agricultural conditions and consequently I may perhaps repeat some of the arguments that have been used and if so, I will have to ask the pardon of the House. It is proposed by the Acting Minister of Immigration on behalf of the government to increase the immigration grant in the effort to induce people to come to Canada, and I understand the bulk of the money is going to be spent in an endeavour to bring to this country farmers, agricultural labourers and domestic servants. In so far as the two latter classes are concerned, I believe the country can well afford to accept quite a few immigrants who

10 p.m.

come as farm help, that we can also afford to accept a number of domestics but I find myself in somewhat of a disagreement with those who propose to bring in people who will immediately go on the land. First of all let me say that I am not very well acquainted with conditions in the East, and consequently I must speak of that part of the country which I know best—western Canada.

We have heard many speeches in this House with regard to conditions in the West. We have heard some addresses which to all intents and purposes intimated to members of this House that conditions in western Canada were not nearly as bad as they were painted, but I may say that I listened to the address of the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Garland) some few days ago and I noticed that the press of this country got after him very severely because he chose to tell the truth as he knew it in this House. I am fairly well acquainted with the conditions in the district in which that hon. member lives, and if I can add anything to what he has stated, I would say that the hon. member told a part of the truth and not all of it. If he had told the conditions as they really exist in that part of the country, I believe the members of this House would be still more amazed than they were at what he said. I believe it is generally understood, so far as Canada is concerned, that we have in our cities, towns and villages, a greater population than conditions at the present time could justify. I noticed in one of the Ottawa papers the other day a statement by Mayor Plant that 20 per cent of the citizens of Ottawa have received some assistance during this last winter. That condition is more or less prevalent throughout the whole of Canada, and, it consequently is convincing evidence of the inadvisability of bringing in more people who would settle in the cities, towns and villages, and of the wisdom of bringing people who would settle on the land and become farm labourers or domestic servants.

We heard a good deal about agriculture during the war. Hon. members of this House will remember how the government of the day did everything in their power to induce the farmers throughout the length and breadth of Canada to produce and produce some more, and no doubt the farmers of Canada did all in their power to produce all they possibly could. As a matter of fact, some of the farmers in Canada got into financial difficulties because they undertook to produce more than their capital would allow them to produce efficiently. But the point I want to bring before the House is this: Hon. members will remember that during the war the people of Canada recognized the fact—and I believe it was stated on more than one occasion on the floor of this House—that agriculture was the backbone of Canada. I have here a summary of Canadian trade for the eleven months ending February 28, 1923, and I wish to call the attention of the committee to some of the items contained therein. If we look down the export column for that period we shall find that Canada exported altogether $854,893,844 worth of goods. The amount of agricultural products exported included the following items: First, we have agricultural and vegetable products, mainly foods, totalling $363,615,713; next, agricultural and vegetable products other than foods, $21,479,441; and there is another item, animals and animal products, amounting to $126,922,203.

Now, Mr. Chairman, all these products spring first of all from the farm. True, there are included in some of the items agricultural products which are partly manufactured, such as flour, and other articles which undergo some finishing process, such as bacon, etc. But the point I want to drive home is this, that agriculture as the basic industry of the country provided exports during that eleven months amounting to a total of $512,017,357, leaving for all exports of all other classes of commodities produced in Canada only $342,876,487. There is something else I would bring closely to the attention of the committee. Let us take fibres, textiles and textile products. During the eleven months I have mentioned Canada has exported $6,946,047 worth of these products. I hope that the House will bear these figures in mind, because they are important. Obviously therefore there seems to be no question about the fact that agriculture is the backbone of Canada; but, if I might say so, I think that Canada's backbone is broken and broken badly.

I have some information here which I might give to the committee relating to the economic conditions of western Canada, and I speak of a part of the country that I know very well. While it is admitted that during the past years we have had a dry area in western Canada, yet in the greater portion of the West we have had fairly good crops; and I do know from actual experience, in discussing various matters with farmers of western Canada, that even in those parts of the country where the people enjoyed good crops they seem to be as badly in debt as are the people where there were practically no crops at all. I do not know what the idea of the minister or the government can be in bringing more people into the country to go on the land. I cannot comprehend the reason at all. I do not know whether it is for the

purpose of increasing the population or in order to increase production. No doubt the object is mainly to increase production, and if that is the case I desire to submit to the committee some evidence that has been given before the special committee on Agriculture, so that we may see whether we can afford to produce much more agricultural commodities than we are doing now.

The special committee, of which I happen to be a member, has taken a good deal of evidence and it appears, practically from every witness that has come before the committee, that the conditions in regard to agriculture are deplorable not only in the West but in the East as well; and even in Quebec the conditions appear to be as bad as they are in western Canada. The other day we had a witness from Montreal who stated that the farmers of Quebec are up in arms because they receive so little for their produce notwithstanding that they have to pay high prices for the things which they must have in order to produce farm products.

The committee will remember that at the last session of parliament we passed an act for the purpose of grading hogs, and the reason given by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) for the passing of that act was its necessity in order that we might get a class of hog grown in Canada from which we could produce what he called "Wiltshire sides" that could be sold to advantage in Great Britain. I do not know for what reason, but I am told that that act has never been enforced in eastern Canada; it has been applied only in the West. Now, I do not know that the Minister of Agriculture under the act was allowed to discriminate as between the East and the West in its application, and whatever reason he may have had for not putting it into force in eastern Canada is totally unknown to me. Perhaps the Mininster of Agriculture may some time in the future explain this discrimination. The fact remains, however, that the real idea behind that act was for us to produce such a class of bacon hog in Canada as would enable us to compete with other bacon-producing countries in the world for the market in Great Britain. We were told that that was practically the only market available for bacon products, and consequently we must produce that kind of bacon which was desired there. I believe that the members of the committee will admit with me that we have produced what is termed "select bacon hogs." We have produced the best hog it is possible to produce in this or any other country. But what is the situation? We find that when the packing houses have taken the select hogs from our farmers and have properly graded them, when they have cured them and cut them up into Wiltshire sides, they sell that bacon in Great Britain at a loss. Mr. McLean, the Secretary-Treasurer of the Harris Abattoir in Toronto, appeared before the committee the other day and he was asked at what price they were selling this Wiltshire bacon in Great Britain. I quote from the evidence:

By the Chairman:

Q. Just let me ask you this question. What are you selling bacon for in England at the present time?—A. I should say that the average price of Canadian bacon sold in England last week was about 80 shillings per 112 pounds.

If we figure this out in Canadian money we find that the price is about 18 cents per pound for the best bacon Canada can produce. I might explain to the committee that this bacon is merely cured; it is not smoked. When it gets into Great Britain the people who get it smoke it and place it on the market. But the most amazing part of Mr. McLean's statement was that it cost the Harris Abattoir 96 shillings to produce that bacon which was sold for 80 shillings in Great Britain, or in other words, a loss of 16 shillings on every 112 pounds sold on the British market. The question is, how long can we continue to feed Great Britain at a loss with our best farm products? How long can that continue; and in view of that, would it be advisable to ask the people of Great Britain or the United States to come to Canada and start farming? Could we ask them to come here and farm in order to produce the best class of bacon so that it might be sold in the British market at a lower price than it is sold for in Canada?

Two or three days after Mr. McLean had given his evidence I looked up one of the Calgary newspapers. As hon. members know, we have a big packing plant in Calgary, which is one of the best in the country. I noticed that they were advertising the best bacon at 45 cents and best hams at 33 cents per pound. At the same time they were selling bacon in Great Britain at 18 cents a pound. I maintain that such a condition of affairs should not be allowed to continue any longer than can possibly be prevented, and until it is eliminated it seems to me to be futile to ask people to come to this country to engage in farming. I would suggest to the Acting Minister of Immigration that he might better spend some of this money which he is asking for immigration in advertising in the Old Country papers something along these lines:

If you purpose coming to Canada to farm, don't; stay in Great Britain, because we will feed you cheaper there than here in Canada.

That is not the only farm product, Mr. Chairman, that we are selling in Great Britain at a loss. Here is another very substantial item. We had before that special committee the secretary-treasurer of the Millers' Association of Canada, comprising the millers of Ontario and Quebec. This gentleman stated that wheat ground in Canada and shipped as flour to Great Britain was being charged from 2 to 5 cents per 100 pounds more in freight than the flour of wheat ground in United States mills. It seemed that it made no difference whether the boats were of British or Canadian registry, providing they sailed from a United States port they carried flour ground in United States mills that much cheaper than they would carry Canadian-ground flour. But the most amazing statement he made was when he was asked whether the mills that he represented were selling flour in Great Britain at a lower price than in Canada. He answered, "Absolutely, relatively we are selling flour in Great Britain at a lower price than we are selling it in Canada." And he had a most ingenious excuse to offer by way of explanation. He said, "If we were supplying the Canadian market alone we could only run our mills about 50 per cent of the time; by running our mills full time, even if we have to sell our flour at a lower price in Great Britain than we receive in Canada, this lower price provides a little profit towards meeting our overhead expenses. Consequently we do sell flour in Great Britain at a lower price than here." Now, it seems to me there is something radically wrong with any system that will permit the products of the Canadian farm and the Canadian mill being sold abroad at a lower price than what they can be obtained for at home, and I trust, Mr. Chairman, that the special committee will have some substantial recommendations to make to this House. and I hope that if those recommendations have any virtue they will be incorporated in legislation.

The hon. member for North Winnipeg (Mr. McMurray) dealt quite lavishly with conditions in western Canada, and told us that it was possible to get all the immigrants we require from continental Europe, and that they would naturally make the very best settlers. As far as I am concerned, I should like to say that if those people care to come here on their own initiative I would not wish to keep them out, but I do say that we farmers of western Canada—and I believe I may speak for the farmers of the East as well— have no desire to compete against this class of farm labour. We do not wish to have to accept their standard of living, and consequently we are opposed to any great influx of such immigrants. This very important fact must be remembered, that to-day we find a very much higher standard of living in our urban centres than in our rural, and this is really the reason why so many of our young people, and even of our older people, are being attracted to our cities, towns and villages. If we are going to keep our people on the land the living conditions in rural Canada should be made just as good as they are in the urban centres.

With regard to wheat production, the hon. member for North Winnipeg seemed to think that all we had to do in western Canada was to produce as much as we possibly could and we were bound to be successful. But there is such a thing, Mr. Chairman, as cost of production. If we take into consideration our cost of production we find that invariably there is quite a discrepancy between this cost and the price we receive for our products. We had before the agricultural committee a young man—

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Casgrain): I would remind the hon. member of rule 57, headed "Reports from Committees." It provides that:

> Reports from standing and special committees may be made by members standing in their places, and without proceeding to the bar of the House. Until the report and evidence have been laid upon the table, it is irregular to refer to them in debate or to put questions in reference to the proceedings of the committee.

I would therefore ask the hon. member to refrain from quoting from the report of a committee which is at present sitting.

Mr. GARDINER: I will not quote the figures, then, Mr. Chairman, but I think I shall be quite within the rules if I give a summary of the results. This young man made a study of agricultural conditions in Manitoba. He took three specific points and got the farmers to keep exact cost accounts. After these accounts had been finally analyzed it was found that the cost of producing wheat at those three points was more, and in some cases very much more, than the farmers received for the product. In other words, the wheat was produced at a loss. Later in the session the House may have an opportunity of getting the actual figures, and it will then be found that my summary is borne out by the evidence. If we farmers in western Canada are producing our wheat and other products at a loss, what is the sense of bringing other people here to produce still more products to be sold at a still greater loss? Of course, it is well understood that so far as the price of our wheat is concerned it is set by the Liverpool market. Therefore our only remedy is to reduce the cost of production.

That is where the salvation of the Canadian farmers seems to lie in my judgment.

For the last forty or fifty years we have had a fiscal policy which seems to be based upon the principle that those industries which may be termed secondary must receive extra consideration. That is to say, these industries which are based on our primary industries receive protection, but our primary industries receive no protection whatsoever. Consequently we have to meet the competition of the world, and this coupled with the fact that our home manufacturers are enabled to set the price of their products means that what we must buy is at a price out of proportion to what we receive for that which we have to sell. The policy of the government seems to be to adopt immigration as a cure for the depression that we have in Canada at present. I remember that when I was a young boy I used to go to fairs, and there we would see gentlemen who were selling salves and lotions which they claimed were a cure for all diseases. It is possible that these remedies did do some good; but while they might heal a running sore for the time being it was invariably the case that the disease would break out in some other part of the body, so that the patient would have to consult a physician or surgeon before actual relief was obtained. No doubt the skilled surgeon, instead of using salves and lotions, would use the knife and with a few deft strokes cut out the offending part and afford real and lasting relief to the patient. We used to call the gentlemen who sold these salves and pills, "quack doctors"; and it seems to me that the remedy the government proposes for the present depression—immigration—is a quack remedy that will not satisfy the people of Canada any more than the remedies advocated by the quack doctors relieved their physical ills. I do not know whether the minister would give a name to the remedy which he proposes; he might call it "immigration lotion," to be well rubbed in—something of that description. I am satisfied, however, that it will not be a cure for the economic disease from which we are suffering at the present; some more specific remedy will have to be applied.

I would like to make a few suggestions for the consideration of the government as to what I believe would be advisable in the interests of Canada as a whole, and more particularly in the interests of the farmers. The first thing I regard as necessary is a reduction in the cost of living, that is, a lowering of the cost of the things we must have in order to exist. The prices of agricultural products have come down very substantially; as a matter of fact many of our products are down to the basis of pre-war figures, but we find on looking over the list of other things that we must buy, such as boots, shoes, clothing of all descriptions, furniture, etc., that the prices of these articles are high in comparison with the prices of agricultural products. I believe, therefore, that the House would be well advised to consider seriously ways and means whereby the cost of these commodities may be greatly reduced.

Our greatest disability in western Canada at the present time is lack of proper line of credit. I have nothing to say against the banks so far as the amount of credit they are giving is concerned, but hon. members will realize that the banks are not in the business of giving long-term loans; they are organized only for the purpose of giving short-term loans. While bank loans or bank credits, therefore, may be fairly satisfactory for seasonable loans they are not at all satisfactory for long-term loans. Our present long-term loan system is very expensive. We can get loans from the mortgage companies for a term of five years—sometimes we can get ten years—at a rate of interest of about 8 or 9 per cent. In the first place, agriculture cannot pay as high a rate of interest as 8 or 9 per cent, so that some means will have to be found whereby we can get cheaper money for long-term loans. When a farmer gets a loan of $1,000 on his quarter-section of land from a mortgage company, he finds that when he goes to the bank to get the proceeds there is coming to him only $940 or $950 instead of $1,000. In other words, it has cost anywhere from $40 to $60 to have that loan put through; the amount which he actually receives is reduced by that sum, and on the top of that he pays 8 or 9 per cent interest. But that is not all. If at the end of the five years he is incapable of paying off the loan, he has to incur practically the same expense that he incurred originally, in order to have it renewed. It seems to me that in any country which claims to be an agricultural country the first thing to do is to provide what we would call long term rural credits at reasonable rates of interest. I say that one of our greatest disabilities at present is our high interest rates. I trust, therefore, that before the session is concluded the House will see its way clear to make some provision along these lines.

I have said that we are paying too much for the things we must have in order to produce. I would like to see, when the budget comes down, a substantial reduction in the tariff duties. We are not asking the House or the government to take off the duties entirely, but a substantial all-round reduction

would, I believe, be one of the best things that could happen to Canada. If there was a little more competition from outside sources we could realize the possibility of getting at a lower price the commodities that we must have in order to live.

A good deal has been said about the conditions in Quebec, which has been held up as a province where everybody is prosperous, particularly the farmer. When the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) came before the House with his estimates, he gave us a brief outline of his travels during last summer and he held up the province of Quebec, so far as agriculture was concerned, as the banner province of Canada. But we have had quite a number of witnesses from that province who seem to think that agriculture in Quebec is just about as badly off as it is in any other province, and that there is just as much dissatisfaction among the farmers there as there is among the farmers of the West.

We have in the past been spending millions of money to bring people to this country. We have held out to them the possibility of making a livelihood here, but circumstances and conditions which now prevail have placed them in a very precarious financial position. In view of the fact that these people have come here at the invitation of the Canadian government on behalf of the Canadian people, it seems to me that our first duty is to look after those who are already here. When we have made conditions livable for those who are now in Canada, that will be time enough to launch out upon a substantial immigration policy. Let me repeat, the duty of this House and the duty of Canada is to the people who are now here. I am convinced, of course, of the fact that immigration eventually will have to increase before Canada can ever enjoy that measure of prosperity that she should have, but our first duty, it seems to me, is to take cognizance of the conditions that confront us now and find a remedy, if possible, for those conditions. When we have found the proper remedies for the unfortunate condition that we have at the present time, there is no doubt in my mind that Canada will not have to spend very much money to induce people to come to this country. The moment people throughout the world realize that Canada is enjoying a substantial measure of prosperity we shall get all the immigrants we require without spending very much money.

Mr. MURDOCK: I beg to move that vote No. 53 for Immigration and Colonization be reduced by the sum of $50,000.

[Mr. Gardiner.]

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think perhaps we had better hear the reason for this amendment, and why it is only 10 per cent or less. How do we arrive at the $50,000?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I made the explanation this afternoon, but perhaps the hon. gentleman was not in the House. The explanation is that we voted a sum to send lecturers to the United States and Great Britain, which was the system pursued in the old days. Now under present conditions there is a very great difficulty in getting these appointments made, and I am therefore asking that the item be struck out.

Amendment agreed to.

Item as amended agreed to.

St. John Immigration buildings, $23,000.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): This is the item on which my hon. friend (Sir Henry Drayton) wanted some details.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: How much was capital, and how much maintenance?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): In 1920-1921 the principal paid was $17,609.66, and interest $4,842.65; in 1921-1922 we paid in principal $22,888.65, and interest $7,359.32; for 1922-1923 we are asking for $15,846.74 principal, and interest $6,488.30. Those are the three payments that have been made in connection with the St. John building. The total of principal is $56,345.05, and of interest $18,690.28. In 1921-1922 for repairs and extras, which included some extra stressing of the roof, we paid $6,946.09. For 1922-1923 we are asking for $275.61, making a total in all for repairs and extras of $7,221.70.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My recollection was that there were other operating costs included in the same account. I think the interest item possibly includes caretaking, does it not?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No. I think this is where the difficulty arises. There was an item in the estimates for 1921-1922 of $43,000, and the question arises as to what proportion of that had been paid in that particular year. The vote in 1922-1923 is $25,000; is 1921-1922 $43,000, and in 1920-1921 $9,000. My hon. friend will notice that while there was only $9,000 voted in that year there was paid out $22,452.31, so that there was paid out of contingencies for that year the sum of $13,647.49.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Where is the caretaking, for example, carried?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): In another item altogether.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What item?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The item for contingencies.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That is where the trouble was. Last time we were told it was in this item.

Item agreed to.

Interior—salaries, $1,502,982; contingencies, $115,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I notice there are some rearrangements. Perhaps the minister could tell us what changes have been made. For example, he has a financial controller this year that he did not have before, and some other positions are apparently done away with.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): This item was not the one I wanted called.

Item stands.

Immigration and Colonization—salaries, $272,325; contingencies, $60,000; total, $332,325.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Will the minister give us the details of the changes in this vote?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I may say that there is provision here for sixteen new appointments. Ten of them have not been made and, probably, unless heavy immigration takes place we will not need to make them.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: We had that information before.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes, the following items are of interest: statutory increases $6,445; transferred from immigration to outside service salaries vote, $6,760; provision for promotions and increases due to reclassification $2,565; transferred from immigration outside service to the inside service $16,125, the total amounts to $32,160. There are a number of vacancies due to resignation or transfer, and the net increase is $28,790.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: You spoke of transfers from the outside to the inside service How many employees were there?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Sixteen employees altogether. The positions filled are—Miss M. Purdy, Sr. clerk-stenographer, $1,320; Miss L. M. O'Connor, Sr. clerk-stenographer, $1,320; P. A. Casey, clerk, $1,005; Miss M. G. McFarlane, file clerk, $960; Miss J. Byers, file clerk, $960 Miss E. Morgan, Jr., clerk-stenographer, $600. The positions unfilled include, Inspector of British Immigrant children (female), $1,320; Inspector of British Immigrant children (male), $1,320. The rest are clerk-stenographers.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What was the cost of the service last year?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The amount voted last year was $243,535 and the actual expenditure $206,282.08.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: So that the minister is asking this year for an increase over his actual cost last year of some $65,000. I suppose that has been done on the supposition that his department is going to do a little functioning this year.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): It will be noticed that out of the sixteen positions six have been filled. If the others are not required they will not be filled.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It is quite obvious that my hon. friend has a list there but it does not mean that the people referred to were employed or that the money for their salaries was paid. I make it out that my hon. friend is asking for $65,000 over his expenditure of last year. Am I wrong in that supposition? If so I hope my hon. friend will correct me.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Quite right.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I suppose that is because the minister expects to get going this year.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): If we do employ the number that is set forth here we will require the vote; if we do not need them we will certainly not employ them.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It is quite obvious that the number of new appointees is really not illustrative of the situation. The comparatively few employees would never make up that $65,000 increase. I notice there is a new official now, "Director of Publicity"?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): That is Mr. Stead.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What was his former position?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I understand Mr. Stead was paid from the outside service last year, as well as Mr. James, his assistant.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Mr. Stead was in the outside service and is now included under Civil Government?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: And the same with the Assistant Director of Publicity?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then I notice from what the minister said the last time this matter was up that there is still a further discrepancy in the amount, in that he transferred nine out of this total to Chinese Immigration. They would no longer appear in this vote. Is this correct?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): My hon. friend is not just correct in his statement. They were transferred as well from the outside service into the Chinese service. They were paid while working in the Chinese service from the outside service, so that they were not transferred from this staff. This is the inside service staff.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: They were transferred from the outside.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Item agreed to.

Exhibitions—further amount required—(Governor General's warrant January 30th, 1923), $12,000.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): This is item 400 in the supplementaries. This is a warrant that was taken for the expenses of Colonel Belcher, who travelled from Vancouver to Halifax, speaking in various towns and cities on his way, interesting people in the various provinces in the British Empire Exhibition which will be held in 1924.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That is the assistance the government gave to the exhibition.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Item agreed to.

Advances to soldiers settling upon the land and cost of administering the Soldier Settlement Act, including salaries, $8,400,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: This is an item of considerable importance, and I think the House would like to have full details in connection with the status of the undertaking, how many applications we still have, how many are still open, and generally the position of the undertaking. I expect there will be some discussion on this item. I do not know whether we will advance it much by taking it up at five minutes to eleven.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I might make the explanation and if there were any questions asked—

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The only point about that is that if a statement is made and the matter is not proceeded with, it will all have to be gone over again. I do not think anything will be gained by it. If there are some small non-contentious items they might be put through.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Do you wish to sit any later?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: No.

Item stands.

Progress reported.

COMMUNICATION FROM VANCOUVER BOARD OF TRADE

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Before the House adjourns I will lay on the Table some papers I promised this afternoon relating to a communication from the Vancouver Board of Trade.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King, the House adjourned at 10.55 p.m.

Tuesday, April 17, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

REPORT PRESENTED

Annual Report of the Trade of Canada for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1922.—Mr. Robb.

FRENCH TREATY

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE—MR. CLARK

On the motion of Hon. W. S. Fielding (Minister of Finance) for the second reading of Bill No. 23 respecting a certain convention of commerce between His Majesty and the President of the French republic:

Mr. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. On Wednesday last I spoke to the Acting Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) with regard to the resolution that has stood in my name on the order paper since the 15th February, and discussed with him the possibility of bringing that resolution forward by amendment to a motion to go into supply. I spoke to him in order to meet his convenience and that I might give some members on his side of the House two or three days' notice of my intention to move such amendment. The minister advised me that he would see the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King). On the following day—that is, last Thursday—I wrote the minister the following note:

Have you discussed with the Prime Minister a suitable day for me to move my resolution on a motion to go into Committee of Supply? Could you agree to next Tuesday?

His reply, endorsed on my note, is in these words:

The government has no objections to your bringing it up on Tuesday next.

Thereupon I advised members in accordance with my undertaking that my understanding was this resolution would have right of way to-day. On Friday I noticed it was stated that the French treaty would probably be taken up to-day, but it was certainly my understanding and the understanding of the other members whom I advised that nothing would come on prior to a motion to go into supply which would prevent my moving an amendment to such motion.

I allowed my resolution to stand on various occasions at the request of the government before the date that government business was given precedence over private members' resolutions, and did so on the faith of undertakings given me by the government that a day would be found for the discussion of the resolution; but each time I have had an opportunity to bring it forward something has intervened to make it impossible for me to proceed. To-day of course it may be said that I can go on after the French treaty is disposed of, but obviously the whole day will probably be taken up with this particular business—my information is to that effect—and consequently consideration of my resolution is again postponed and the convenience of members on both sides is interfered with. I certainly feel that I am entitled to a statement from the government that either a day will be set aside for the discussion of my resolution as a private member's resolution or that on a given date an amendment to a motion to go into supply nothing will be allowed to intervene in the nature of government business.

Hon. Mr. FIELDING: I do not know what happened in regard to the motion of my hon. friend, Mr. Speaker, but so far as the French treaty being set down for to-day is concerned, there can be no misunderstanding. Several questions were asked as to the time when it would be brought forward, and a few evenings ago it was definitely stated that in all probability this treaty would be brought up on Tuesday, and last night it was more precisely stated, so there can be no misunderstanding with regard to the time. If there has been any misunderstanding on the part of my hon. friend with regard to his motion I am very sorry, but it is not within my knowledge.

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend has stated the case exactly except for the inference he drew that nothing was to intervene on a motion to go into supply. I received a note from him asking if he could go on with his resolution on Tuesday. After consulting with the Prime Minister I informed him that the government had no objection to his bringing it up to-day. As a matter of fact there has been no attempt to shut off his resolution at all. But we ought to do everything possible for the convenience of the House generally. I am of opinion we will have plenty of opportunity to take up my hon. friend's resolution after the French treaty is disposed of. I certainly want to carry out any arrangement made with my hon. friend, for I would not wish him to think that I am attempting to sidetrack him in any way.

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: Mr. Speaker, an undertaking that this resolution may be gone on with on motion to go into Committee of Supply involves that the government will not put any other motion in between or it involves nothing, because the member has the right to move his amendment on going into Committee on Supply without any concession at all from the government. Now, in view of the fact that he did so understand for to-day, and I think rightly so after the answer given by the Acting Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) by note to him, it seems to me the government should undertake that next Monday or Tuesday there will be no government business put ahead of supply in order that the hon. member may go on on an amendment to supply. I do not think there is any chance at all of his getting time for his resolution to-day after this French treaty resolution has been debated.

Mr. FIELDING: Rather than there should be the least misunderstanding in the matter I will withdraw the motion for the second reading of the French treaty and let my hon. friend go on. I will move immediately that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that the hon. minister shall have leave to withdraw his motion? Carried.

Motion withdrawn.

EQUALIZATION OF RAILWAY RATES

On the motion of Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) for Committee of Supply:

Mr. J. A. CLARK (Burrard): Mr. Speaker, the amendment I desire to move, seconded by the hon. member for Victoria City (Mr. Tolmie) is as follows:

That in the opinion of this House all unfair and unjust discrimination against British Columbia as

exemplified in the "Mountain Scale" of freight rates should be rescinded, and the special reduction made by the restoration of the Crowsnest pass rates on the basic production of the prairie provinces be extended to the basic productions of all other provinces of confederation.

In presenting this resolution—

Mr. SPEAKER: When the hon. member a few days ago moved a similar resolution, I felt that under British parliamentary practice matters sub judice could not be brought before the House. The question was discussed by several hon. members on both sides after the hon. gentleman had agreed to postpone the consideration of his resolution. Many representations were made to me as Speaker from both points of view—that the subject matter of the hon. member's resolution should be considered as a question sub judice, and, on the other hand, that it should not be so considered. I invited the opinion of some of the oldest members of the House. I invited the opinion of the Acting Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham), and of the hon. member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton). I asked for the opinion of the present Chairman of the Board of Railway Commissioners, Hon. Mr. Carvell, and I also had the benefit of the views of two or three of the most experienced members of the House—because it is paramount to determine whether the Privy Council of Canada should be considered as a tribunal. The question has impressed me as sufficiently important to justify a formal ruling, which I give as follows:

On the motion that I do now leave the chair for the House to resolve itself into Committee of Supply, Mr. Clark (Burrard) moved in amendment, seconded by Mr. Tolmie (Victoria):

That all the words after the word "that" be struck out, and the following words be inserted instead thereof:—

"In the opinion of this House all unfair and unjust discrimination against British Columbia as exemplified in the 'mountain scale' of freight rates should be rescinded, and the special reduction made by the restoration of the Crowsnest pass rates on the basic production of the prairie provinces, be extended to the basic productions of all other provinces of confederation."

This question is now before the Governor in Council on an appeal from a decision of the Railway Board which established, by a General Order bearing No. 366, dated 30th of June, 1922, certain scales of rates known as the "mountain scale," in British Columbia, on a higher basis than that charged for the same class of goods moving between points in Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba, known as the "prairie scale."

By petition dated the 1st of December, 1922, the Attorney General of British Columbia appealed from the said order to the Governor General in Council, praying that the same rates be charged on goods of like character from and to all points in the provinces of British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Ontario as far east as Port Arthur.

The question was partially heard by the Governor in Council on the 3rd of February last, and it was announced that further hearing was postponed until after the prorogation of the present session of parliament.

My attention has been drawn to the circumstance that whilst this appeal is pending the question must be considered sub judice and therefore should not be debated in the House. Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, No. 234, says:

Besides the prohibitions contained in this rule (our rule 19) it has been sanctioned by usage both in England and in Canada, that a member, while speaking, must not:

"(c) refer to any matter on which a judicial decision is pending."

May, page 296, says:

Matters awaiting the adjudication of a court of law should not be brought forward in debate.

The precedents cited by May cover instances where individual rights are concerned and relate chiefly to election petitions. I have very fully scrutinized those cases. The point at issue may be briefly stated in the following proposition: Is the Governor in Council, in the exercise of his powers to review the decisions of the Railway Board, vested with a judicial rather than an administrative or executive function?

In the interpretation of the functions of the Governor in Council, one must bear in mind the provisions of the British North America Act, section 9 of which reads as follows:

"The executive government and authority of and over Canada is hereby declared to be vested in the Queen."

Section 11:

"There shall be a Council to aid and advise in the government of Canada to be styled the Queen's Privy Council for Canada."

Section 13:

"The provisions of this act referring to the Governor General in Council shall be construed as referring to the Governor General acting by and with the advice of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada."

There seems to be no doubt from the above citations that the Privy Council of Canada is vested with executive powers only and has no judicial authority whatever. We must realize that the Canadian government has no

other powers than those conferred directly or indirectly by that Imperial statute called the British North America Act.

In England, there is a Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, but there is no similar institution in Canada. Prior to the year 1903, the Privy Council of Canada had full control over all matters now dealt with by the Railway Board. Section 8 of the Railway Act, 1903, which created the board, says:

1. The railway committee of the Privy Council is hereby abolished, and, in lieu thereof, there shall be a commission, to be known as the board of railway commissioners for Canada, etc.

2. Whenever by an act or document the railway committee of the Privy Council is given any power or authority, or any duty is cast upon it, in regard to any company, railway, matter or thing, the power or authority so given, or the duty so cast upon the said committee, may or shall, as the case may be, be exercised by the board.

These provisions have been carried into sections 9 and 32 of the Railway Act, 1919.

The board itself is a court of record under section 9 of the act, but it has disposed of the case of the freight rates which is now out of its purview and engaging the attention of the Governor in Council.

The Privy Council has specifically reserved to itself the power to revise the board's decisions as to questions of facts. Subsection 2 of section 44 of the Railway Act of 1903, which is now subsection 1 of section 52 of the Railway Act 1919, reads as follows:

The Governor in Council may at any time, in his discretion, either upon petition of any party, person or company interested, or of his own motion, and without any petition or application, vary or rescind any order, decision, rule or regulation of the board, whether such order or decision is made inter partes or otherwise, and whether such regulation is general or limited in its scope and application, and any order which the Governor in Council may make with respect thereto shall be binding upon the board and upon all parties.

Subsections 2 and 3 of section 52 provide for an appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada upon a question of law or jurisdiction.

It is therefore evident that the powers of the Governor in Council have not been abridged as to questions of facts, and they remained exactly the same after as before the creation of the Railway Board. They are simply administrative or executive as heretofore, just as if the Railway Act had never been passed.

The Ministers of the Crown are seized with the appeal for the purpose of advising His Excellency thereon. Their advice may be rejected and is not in the nature of a final judgment. Todd says, in Parliamentary Government in the British Colonies, p. 40:

In the ordinary exercise of his constitutional discretion the Governor is unquestionably competent to reject the advice of his ministers whenever that advice should seem to him to be adverse to the public welfare, or of an injurious tendency.

The question as it now stands before the cabinet, is not, in my humble judgment, sub judice as this legal term implies. It is being considered by the government under administrative powers which the Governor in Council did not delegate or alienate when the Railway Board was created. The fact that the cabinet hears counsel representing both sides of the issue does not constitute it a tribunal. The ministers are at liberty to take all the information required before arriving at a decision upon which they will base the advice to be tendered to His Excellency the Governor General. They may be guided by considerations of public policy quite foreign to the brief. Their decisions which take the form of orders in council and are signed by His Excellency, when accepted, are not, properly speaking, judgments, the ministers' functions in this regard cannot therefore be said to be in any way judicial. They are purely administrative.

One of the traditional rights of parliament is its expressive power. Any grievance, any complaint, any notion can be aired in parliament. It would be a breach against the ancient privilege of the freedom of speech, so essential to every legislature, for the Speaker to prevent a debate on a matter because it is being considered by the Governor in Council, and particularly in the present case, the hearing of which is being postponed on account of the session and will only be resumed after prorogation.

Todd, Parliamentary Government in England, Vol. 1, page 414, says:

Freedom of speech in parliament is an essential part of the liberties of Englishmen. This privilege was guaranteed by the Bill of Rights, and it includes a license to discuss all matters affecting the public welfare, whether the same have been commended by the Crown to the consideration of parliament or not. From the time of Edward III to our own day, parliament has freely exercised the right of tending advice to the sovereign, unasked, upon matters the final determination of which appertained to the sovereign alone. . . . The two Houses of Parliament collectively represent the whole community, and are the Great Council of the nation, while ministers are merely the council of the prince. They are, therefore, entitled to approach the sovereign with advice or remonstrance upon all affairs of state, and in regard to every grievance under which any subjects of the realm may be suffering.

I have given this point of order a great deal of attention. I have weighed the views expressed on both sides with care and concern. If there should be a doubt lingering in my mind—but there is none—I would give the benefit of that doubt in favour of the broad principle of the supremacy of parliament in all matters of public policy.

I have come to the conclusion that the motion of the hon. member (Mr. Clark) is in order, and I rule that debate thereon is allowed.

Mr. CLARK: In my presentation of this resolution I hope to be able to show to the House that so far as British Columbia is concerned we are not seeking any sectional advantage, but rather the removal of a sectional disadvantage from which the province of British Columbia has suffered since confederation. I also hope to be able to show that by the elimination of this sectional disadvantage the general trade of the country will be stimulated, and that immigration which we so much need will be thereby encouraged, and made posible by reason of the fact that settlers will be able to market their produce at reasonable rates, and be able also to purchase their necessities at reasonable rates.

I also desire to make it quite clear that my aim is to effect this correction by constitutional means, relying upon the fairness of the people and of this House, rather than upon threats that British Columbia will withdraw from confederation.

I also want to make it quite clear that I am not animated by any spirit of unfriendliness towards the Canadian Pacific Railway. I feel that we are fighting for a principle, and that we differ in principle from the Canadian Pacific Railway. I lay no blame upon them for fighting for their principles, but we propose in so far as it is in our power, to bring home to the people of this country that we have been suffering from a sectional disadvantage, the removal of which is in the interests of the whole of Canada, and which the interests of British Columbia absolutely demand if that province is to go forward and succeed.

It may be said that it is a strange thing for a member of this party to move a resolution dealing with freight rates after the stand that we have taken with regard to keeping our railways out of politics, and having regard to the fact that there is a judicial body seized with the power of dealing with the question of freight rates.

At the last session of parliament the government dealt with freight rates. At the outset I want to say and I say it with all frankness that if the government is prepared to withdraw that legislation I am prepared to withdraw my motion. In other words, I am prepared to go before the Board of Railway Commissioners and argue this case if the board is left free and unhampered by this House. But my point is this: At the last session of parliament this House undertook to fix the freight rates on two specific commodities namely, grain and flour, for three specific provinces. This House has gone into the rate-making business. The result of that legislation was to accentuate the discrimination which already existed against British Columbia. We were already suffering from discrimination by reason of the mountain scale, and the reduction of the rates on these two basic commodities merely served to accentuate that discrimination.

It may be of interest to know that British Columbia is supported in the stand it has taken by no less authority than Sir Henry Thornton who, speaking before the Board of Trade of Vancouver on January 18, of this year, said in regard to freight rates:

> If I were in your position I would adopt the same attitude as you have adopted and advance the same arguments. It does seem to me that whatever rates are to be applied on the transportation of grain from the prairies to the West should be based upon sound economic and scientific principles.

And he went on to say that the agreement known as the Crowsnest pass agreement did not embody, in fact, any sound economic or scientific principle, but was merely a matter of expediency based upon the situation which existed in 1897. He characterized that agreement as "a horse-trading proposition between the Dominion government and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company."

For the purpose of rate making Canada is divided into three divisions—the East, the prairie, and the Pacific. The East embraces all of Canada as far west as Fort William; the prairie, the country from Fort William to the mountains; and the Pacific that portion of Canada west of the mountains. The eastern rates are the lowest; the prairie rates are the next lowest; the mountain rates are the highest. The eastern rates are the lowest because of the factor that enters into rate making in that portion of Canada, namely water competition. For the principles of rate making I refer to the judgment of the Board of Railway Commisioners of June 30, 1922, the last decision. In that judgment the board says it found "that in the main the rate structure of eastern Canada was justified on the basis of water and rail competition." These are the words of the Commissioners. Now then just what is the exact position of British Columbia in regard to rates? That also I will give you from the board's last judgment. These are the words of the Commissioners:

> Under the western rate case—
>
> Which was in 1914—
>
> —a basis of one and a half for one was adopted on the Pacific standard tariff.

That meant that one and a half miles on the prairie would equal one mile in British Columbia. In other words, for the same money you could haul the same commodity on the prairies three hundred miles and in British Columbia only two hundred miles. That was the situation. The judgment of the board last June corrected that to some extent in these words:

> The rates on the new "Pacific" standard mileage tariff are to be constructed by applying to the "Prairie" standard tariff, 1½ miles for one mile.

In other words we can to-day haul a commodity in British Columbia one hundred and fifty miles as against two hundred miles on the prairie for the same rate. That is the situation to-day, and that is the discrimination of which we complain—a discrimination that we say is unfair and unjust and should be eliminated.

I do not propose to quote figures giving the details of rates for the very good reason that I would be wasting the time of the House by so doing. I could quote rates which would show this discrimination, but nothing can be clearer than the general principle laid down in that judgment. I do not think it needs elaboration but I will say this: I could give you illustrations—and I have no doubt that members of this House in reply to me will use illustrations to the effect—that British Columbia has rates from Vancouver, and other coastal points, to the far East—and when I say "the far East" I mean Montreal and Toronto—a distance of 2,800 miles which are very favourable, which are more favourable than rates on similar products from the Maritime provinces for an equal distance. For instance, I can quote you rates on canned goods and fish from Vancouver to Toronto which are less than the rates from the Maritime provinces upon the same products for an equal distance which appear favourable to us. The fact remains, however, that it costs us more money to ship those very commodities on which the rates would appear so favourable from Vancouver to Winnipeg than from Vancouver to Toronto or Montreal—it also costs us as much, or more, to ship those commodities from Vancouver to Calgary as it costs us to ship them from Vancouver to Montreal. That is what we say is not scientific. That is what we say is preventing us from getting into those provinces which are our markets, namely Alberta and Saskatchewan. We have in Vancouver to-day six or seven hundred manufacturers who are clamouring for a market. Their only market is an export market; we are unable to get into the prairie market of Alberta and Saskatchewan by reason of that mountain scale, of that discrimination which exists against us. And yet the Canadian Pacific Railway Company tells us that we are being treated fairly; not only that but that other parts of Canada are being discriminated against by reason of the favourable rates given to us.

Another instance of that might be given in the case of rice. We can ship rice to Toronto cheaper than we can ship it to Winnipeg or prairie points. The reason for that is to enable the rice mills to meet the competition from New Orleans. All these things, I maintain, have no application to the general principle defined in the judgment referred to. That one and a quarter miles on the prairie is the same as one mile in British Columbia is the thing we complain of.

Mr. Carvell, Chairman of the Board of Railway Commissioners, in a recent letter to the Associated Boards of British Columbia points out—and he also points it out in this judgment—that from 80 to 85 per cent of British Columbia traffic was carried at commodity rates. and that in the movement of the staples of British Columbia at commodity rates, the effect of the mountain scale is not apparent in many cases. I have given the House some illustrations of where, on some of our basic commodities, this discrimination is not apparent, but in every instance that discrimination is not apparent where the shipment extends over a long distance, it becomes apparent the very moment you examine shipments of our commodities into the prairie provinces where we want a market, and where we insist that we are entitled to a market, if trade is to flow in its proper and natural channel. I wish to quote from that letter which I referred to and I may say that it is difficult for me really to bring up such a letter in the House, because I am absolutely opposed to the principle of criticizing the members of any judicial body, but I think it is only fair to our province that I should quote from this letter, because it has been published broadcast throughout the country. In this letter Mr. Carvell says:

> Mr. Oliver fails to realize that in the class rate schedule for all points from the coast, east of the boundary, 134 miles are eliminated from the actual mileage across the mountain, and if these are counted it would then bring the class rates practically down to the prairie level.

I point out that is true so far as it goes, but he does not mention that the same condition exists between Fort William and Winnipeg, and has existed for many years, and that it has nothing to do with this question whatsoever. It is based on an entirely differ-

ent principle, and does not deal with and has no relation to this question of discrimination. The letter continues:

> As I view it, the whole question is one of whether the coast wholesaler who can bring his goods in by water will be able to send them further east and thus displace the business which has heretofore been done via Winnipeg.

I do not know what he means by that, unless he stands on the principle that he is not going to see anything done which will interfere with the flow of trade to Winnipeg and the business now handled by the wholesaler of Winnipeg. That is an extraordinary principle on which to make rates, if that is the principle. Then he says:

> So far as the present programme of the province of British Columbia is concerned in freight rates, it is much more political than real.

That statement I object to most emphatically, because, irrespective of party in British Columbia, the whole public—100 per cent—stands for the removal of this discrimination, and we have fought as hard as we know how, ever since the board was constituted to remove that discrimination. We fought before that board in 1906, again in 1910, again in 1914, we have been fighting since 1920 till to-day, and we are still fighting before the Privy Council and this House for the removal of the discrimination.

The first contention of the province of British Columbia is that by the terms of union Canada undertook to build a railway, the Canadian Pacific railway, and there was nothing in that agreement upon which British Columbia came into confederation which would indicate that there was going to be any discrimination in rates over that road. I would refer members of this House to the original negotiations between Earl Granville and Governor Musgrave, in which it was stated:

> That the establishment of a British line of communication between the Atlantic and Pacific oceans is far more feasible by the operation of a single government responsible for the progress of both shores of the continent than by a bargain negotiated between separate, perhaps in some respects, rival governments and legislatures.

And the extracts from the terms of the union itself reads as follows:

> Whereas the construction of a line of railway through British territory across the continent of North America, which, in conjunction with existing railways would afford uninterrupted railway communication between the Atlantic and Pacific seaports of the Dominion of Canada is a work of vast importance, not only to the political and commercial interests of Canada, as tending to the closer union of its several provinces, but also to the British Empire at large, as affording rapid and direct communication through British territory, Australian and Asiatic possessions and opening up for colonization an almost unlimited extent of fertile country.

Hon. members should note that this was for the closer union of the provinces. I ask you, do you expect closer union with British Columbia if you discriminate against that province? I also draw your attention to the fact that it is an Imperial project. Are we in British Columbia to pay additional rates by reason of the fact that this project was Imperial in its nature and for the closer union of the provinces of confederation? I merely draw attention to these terms. I think, perhaps, others will elaborate the point, but I draw attention to it for this specific reason: the Board of Railway Commissioners in their judgment of June 30, 1922, refused to consider that argument. They said that—

> In the present application, various additional contentions were advanced. Emphasis was laid upon the implications alleged to arise from the steps culminating in confederation.

They say that this case is analogous to a case of Attorney General for British Columbia vs. C.P.R. in which it was held that under the terms of the contract with the Dominion government for the construction of the Canadian Pacific railway dated October 21, 1880, the only party who could make any complaint as to the non-observance of the terms of union was the government of Canada. I present that argument because the Board of Railway Commissioners have refused to consider it, and here I have an opportunity of presenting it to the government of Canada for its consideration.

Mr. CARROLL: Do I understand the hon. member now to be criticizing the judgment of the railway commissioners?

Mr. CLARK: My hon. friend can draw his own inference.

Mr. CARROLL: Does he know an appeal has been taken to the Privy Council on that question?

Mr. CLARK: The judgment of the Speaker indicated that I did.

Mr. CARROLL: Would the hon. member suggest that it would be a fair proposition in this House that the Privy Council should vote on this question before they have taken the whole evidence into consideration.

Mr. CLARK: The Privy Council can take care of itself, I have no doubt.

Mr. CARROLL: Does my hon. friend think it is fair to ask the Privy Council to vote on this question before they have concluded their judgment on the appeal?

Mr. CLARK: I am not advising the Privy Council. I am submitting the case for the consideration of the House.

Mr. SHAW: I do not want to interrupt the hon. member in his argument, but before he leaves that point, will he indicate whether or not the particular subject matter of his argument to date was under consideration by the Board of Railway Commissioners, I think in the year 1908, and if so would he be good enough to indicate to us the judgment of the board at that time?

Mr. CLARK: 1908?

Mr. SHAW: I think the case was brought by the Attorney General of British Columbia.

Mr. CLARK: I do not think I followed my hon. friend.

Mr. SHAW: I wanted to ask, simply for information, if the argument he has thus far addressed to the House with regard to the constitutional question was not involved in the question before the railway commission in 1908, and I think, if my recollection is right, the railway commission of that date refused to entertain the question.

Mr. CLARK: I cannot definitely answer that question, because according to the dates which I have, the applications were made in 1906, 1910, 1914, and the last two years. What I think, however, is that if the Board of Railway Commissioners had listened to that argument in 1908, they certainly would have listened to it last year, because it would have been considered a precedent. So I assume, because it appeared in the judgment of last year, that they did not consider it then, that they did not consider it even if advanced in 1908 or any later year.

The next point I wish to advance is regarding the guarantee given by the province of British Columbia upon bonds of the Canadian Northern through that province. In 1911, Sir Richard McBride, then premier of British Columbia, appealed to the electors of that province for endorsation of his railway policy. He asked that the government be authorized to guarantee the bonds of that railway company up to $35,000 per mile, and he was returned to power on that plea. Let me read this brief statement of Sir Richard McBride's, just one sentence, indicating the lines on which that election was fought:

> We believe that through the introduction of the Canadian Northern railway into this province with the control of freight and passenger rates in the hands of the government, there will be such an adjustment of railway freight and passenger rates throughout the province generally that it will place travel within the reach of the financial ability of the whole Canadian people.

The agreement between British Columbia and the Canadian Northern railway, which agreement was consummated after that election, gave control to freight rates to the Lieutenant Governor in Council of that province. In other words the control of rates within that province on that particular line was not in the hands of the Board of Railway Commissioners, and for that privilege British Columbia guaranteed those bonds to the extent of $35,000 a mile. That was the consideration we got for that guarantee—the right of making rates and the right of counteracting this discrimination about which we have been complaining ever since the Canadian Pacific railway was built. We lost out even on that, because in 1914 this House passed an act which declared the Canadian Northern railway to be a work for the general advantage of Canada. That immediately cancelled the main consideration which we got, and which we were relying upon for our guarantee, and it gave to the Board of Railway Commissioners the right to make rates upon that railway. It has often been stated that British Columbia has been relieved from the guarantee of those bonds. Not at all. We are liable to-day upon those bonds just as we were when we gave the guarantee. Further, let this be noted that if British Columbia under its guarantee had been bound to take over the Canadian Northern railway in British Columbia, that would not have perturbed us. It might have caused us some temporary embarrassment; but there we have the most wonderful piece of mountain railway construction in North America, and possibly through any mountainous country in the world. I have no hesitation in suggesting that if the Canadian Pacific at any time since 1914 had had opportunity of taking over that piece of the Canadian Northern railway, between Edmonton and Vancouver, they would have jumped at the opportunity, especially of taking it over at the full value of those bonds. It would have been for them the cheapest investment in the world, and furthermore it would have disrupted and destroyed absolutely our Canadian National railways, because this is the most vital and important part of that line to-day. In that connection, I should like to point out two or three facts of interest as regards the grades of that railway. This is a comparison between that portion of the Canadian National railway, that I have been speaking of, and six or seven other transcontinental railways. The Canadian National railway crossing British Columbia has a maximum grade of .7 per cent, but that is only for about twenty-eight miles. Practically throughout

4 p.m.

its length the maximum grade is ·4 per cent. The comparison is as follows:

Railway	Maximum grade Per cent	Maximum elevation Feet
Canadian Northern..	.7	3,706
Canadian Pacific..	2.2	5,321
Northern Pacific..	1.6	5,500
Union Pacific..	1.8	8,200
Great Northern..	2	5,202
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul..	2.5	6,322
Sante Fe..	2.6	7,421

The situation is most remarkable. We have there a railway which, with one engine can haul fifty loaded cars of grain from Edmonton to Vancouver throughout the length of that road, whereas these other roads have difficulty in hauling twenty-two loaded cars over their mountain grades, and in so doing the roads are obliged in many instances to use two engines, whereas on the Canadian National railway one will do for the whole route. So there is the road on which British Columbia has lost the right to fix rates by reason of the action of parliament. In view of what this House has done in the past, I think it is perfectly fair that immediate action should be taken to restore that agreement—if the Crowsnest pass agreement should be restored—or any part thereof. The latter agreement was made between the Dominion government and the railway company. Why should not an agreement such as I have described be restored, an agreement to which the Dominion government was not a party, but yet undertook to interfere with and thus take away from the province of British Columbia rights which existed thereunder and for which we paid in guaranties to the extent of $35,000 per mile?

Now, the stock arguments which are advanced against the removal of this discrimination are—cost of construction, cost of operation, density of traffic. I want to face every one of these arguments squarely. As to cost of construction, I would refer the House to Volume 12 of the report of the special committee on rates of last session, in which at page 475 the evidence of Mr. Lanigan will be found to the effect that the original cost of construction of the Canadian Pacific railway has long since been lost and is no longer a factor in rate-making. I would also refer to the fact that the Canadian Pacific railway was not built through British Columbia entirely at the expense of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. There is a very considerable portion of this line, namely, that between Emery Junction and Boston Bar on the North Thompson which was built at the cost of the treasury of Canada and handed over complete to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. Why should we pay any extra rates because of the cost of construction? I would also refer hon. members to the evidence of the Hon. Mr. Oliver, the Premier of British Columbia, on the same point. At page 170 of Volume 6 he says:

> I want to deal with another phase of this matter: British Columbia was the only province from which a huge land subsidy was exacted in aid of the construction of the Canadian Pacific railway. That land subsidy given by British Columbia in connection with the main line of the Canadian Pacific railway amounted to approximately 12,000,000 acres. I want to submit to this committee the view that if there is any merit at all in the plea of the cost of construction, that has been entirely offset so far as British Columbia is concerned by the huge land grant which was given in aid of the construction of that road. That land grant was a strip of land 40 miles wide through the entire width of British Columbia, and any deficiencies were made up out of the prairie lands of the Peace River district of British Columbia,—3,500,000 acres.

I also draw the attention of hon. members to the fact that the cost of construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway from Winnipeg to Moncton was approximately $100,000 per mile. The cost of construction of the Canadian National railway through British Columbia was approximately $65,000 per mile, or considerably less. Yet we do not find any discrimination against the people who live along the line of the Grand Trunk Pacific between Winnipeg and Moncton. Their rates are the same as the rates on the other roads in those provinces. I would also direct attention to the fact that there is no special discrimination against localities by reason of the expense of construction of the Quebec bridge or the $9,000,000 Montreal tunnel. These great expenditures are not considered, and I agree entirely with Mr. Lanigan that the cost of construction has nothing to do with the fixing of freight rates.

Now, with regard to the cost of operation, I would point this out to those who suggest that any definite figures can be given as to excessive cost of operation on the Canadian Pacific railway through the mountains, that since 1914 operating costs and operating revenues have been kept by divisions of lines east and lines west, and therefore it is impossible to analyze and determine the relative cost in any particular province. In other words, it is impossible for the railways to meet the onus which is placed upon them by the Railway Act to show that any special discrimination against a particular locality is not undue or unjust. In any case it is admitted by the same Mr. Lanigan, the general traffic manager of the Canadian Pacific Railway, that the cost of operation is no longer

a basic factor in the making of freight rates. As to this I refer the House to the report of the committee on Railway Transportation Costs of last year. At page 573 the following examination of Mr. Lanigan by Mr. McMurray is found:

Q. Mr. McGeer during his evidence this morning said that rates had nothing to do with the operating costs on the prairie. I gathered that was a statement made by the Board of Railway Commissioners at some time or other. Do you agree with that statement?

A. I think there are three things that make rates, and those are what Mr. George Olds, a very old traffic manager of the Canadian Pacific railway, used to call the "Three C's": Conditions, circumstances and competition.

Nothing much to do with the cost of operation.

You cannot segregate the cost of carrying a certain class of traffic for one year as compared with the cost another year and build up any kind of a tariff under which these people are interested.

Q. I was not asking you for the argument, but whether you agreed with that statement?

A. I do not agree with that statement. That is, that the rates are built on the cost?

Q. No, that the rates are not built on the costs on the prairies?—A. They are not and cannot be built on the costs. The whole rate system has to furnish a certain amount of revenue to meet the cost of operation.

Q. Are they furnished on the costs in British Columbia?—A. No.

Thus we have the admission of the very man chiefly concerned with rates on the Canadian Pacific railway that rates are not built on the cost of operation.

Now, I think I can show this House that the basic factor in fixing freight rates in this country is the earnings of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and I am forced to that conclusion by the judgment delivered by the Board of Railway Commissioners on June 30, 1922. We have in that judgment a statement filed by Mr. Lanigan of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company with respect to basic commodities. It was stated in the judgment:

At a hearing of the special committee on the 20th day of June instant, Mr. Lanigan, freight traffic manager for the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, filed a statement showing what would be the reduction in the revenues of that company if the offer above referred to had been accepted.

It will be recalled that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company offered certain rate reductions and showed what they would mean in the way of loss of revenue. Then followed the statement filed by Mr. Lanigan showing what that loss of revenue would be. I shall not give the details, but the total, including international and interstate traffic, is $10,558,469. Now, the board goes on to say:

This showed a total, not including reductions on international traffic, of $8,338,469, and, of this amount $5,354,139 was the estimated reduction on grain. Taking this from the total reduction leaves a balance of $2,984,330 to be distributed among the other commodities. By the legislation hereinbefore referred to granting the Crowsnest pass rates on grain as therein provided, according to the evidence of Mr. Beatty as recorded on page 46 of the reports of the special committee, assuming the grain traffic of the Canadian Pacific railway to be the same as in 1921, the adoption of the Crowsnest rates would reduce their revenue by $7,159,537, which, taken from the sum of $8,338,469 would leave $1,178,932 is still available for reduction in rates on the above list of basic commodities, and the board, after very careful investigation, has concluded that this would be represented by a reduction of 7½ per cent on the rates now in existence on those basic commodities, less than the increases authorized by general order No. 308, not, however, including therein any reductions heretofore made upon any of the said commodities upon domestic rates in Canada.

Then they go on to say:

The Canadian Pacific railway figures are given above, as this company is taken as the standard in rate discussions.

What can be clearer than that the rates today prevailing are fixed on the basis of the revenue of the Canadian Pacific Railway, not on the basis of operating costs? I leave it to hon. members to draw their own inferences as to whether or not that is a sound method of fixing railway rates. I am drawing attention to it with a view to proving conclusively that the basic factor in rate making is not the cost of operation, but, as I have pointed out, the revenues of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Now, we come back to the operating costs of the Canadian National Railways. It is admitted—in fact, prominent officials of the Canadian National Railways have boasted that operating costs on their line through British Columbia are no greater than those in any other part of Canada. In that connection also I wish to refer to one brief sentence of Sir Henry Thornton's evidence before the Senate committee on the fuel supply of Canada, given on the 21st of March of this year. This appears to me to be very important as bearing upon a comparison of the cost of operation on the prairies and in British Columbia, or in British Columbia and in eastern Canada. He says:

I can move coal much cheaper in the month of May in the West than I can in the month of February, because on account of the cold weather, the snow, our train-load is cut in half. It costs, I should think, easily twice as much to move a ton of freight in the western country in winter time as it does in the spring or summer.

I would draw the attention of hon. members to the fact that the climate of British Columbia is much more temperate than that of any other part of Canada. No part of that country, or at least very small portions of it, are subject to the extreme climatic conditions that prevail in the prairies and in cen-

tral and eastern Canada. Therefore, according to Sir Henry Thornton's reasoning, the cost of operation in British Columbia should be about half the cost on the prairies over a great portion of the year.

Another factor which might be taken into consideration is the question of the earnings of these roads—western earnings and eastern earnings. I would refer the House on this question to volume 14 of the report of that special committee, page 554, where certain statements are filed in the evidence of Mr. McGeer, who was counsel for British Columbia in connection with this matter. In those statements he showed that the earnings of the Canadian Pacific Railway in British Columbia up to 1913-14 were very much greater than its earnings in eastern Canada. I will not trouble the House with the details, but the evidence is there and can be seen. I would point out also that at present this situation as between the East and the West, we can only compare the earnings of the railway companies on lines west of Fort William with those on lines east of Fort William. The accounts of the railways show that the net earnings per mile of line and per train mile are higher on these western lines than they are in the east. For instance, in 1920 the net earnings of lines east were $10,723,868 as compared with $28,311,645 on lines west. In other words, the net earnings per mile of line on lines east were $2,221 and on lines west $3,466, the earnings per train mile being 46 cents on lines east and $1.19 on lines west. So that the question of earnings does not operate against us in the fixing of rates.

Then we come to the question of the density of traffic, the other argument advanced against us. I ask hon. members to compare the density of traffic on lines through British Columbia with the density of traffic on lines from Winnipeg to Moncton. There is not a shadow of a doubt that the density of traffic on lines in British Columbia is infinitely greater than that on lines between Winnipeg and Moncton yet there is no discrimination against the people in this latter section. Now is there any discrimination against the people living between Fort William and Sudbury on the Canadian Pacific Railway, where the same condition exists. Furthermore, I would point out that the traffic in British Columbia is growing day by day; it is infinitely greater now than it was a few years ago. There are 700 manufacturers in Vancouver awaiting an opportunity to ship their goods into the prairies, and they will take advantage of that opportunity the very moment that equitable freight rates are given to British Columbia.

I come now to what I think concerns more particularly our friends in the East. I think beyond all question of doubt that the removal of this discrimination will react to the general advantage of Canada and more particularly the East, and more particularly still the cities of Montreal and Toronto. Our railways in this country have been clinging to the long haul instead of assisting in colonization and relying upon the increase in population to increase their general traffic and consequently, increase the prosperity of the country. The Panama canal since 1919 has become a great factor in the situation, and we see the railway companies to-day as a result of that Panama canal competition doing the most extraordinary things with regard to rates. For instance, on bar iron they have given a rate from Montreal to Vancouver of $13 a ton—not to help British Columbia, but to enable the eastern manufacturer to compete with the manufacturers in the United States and Great Britain, who enjoy rates infinitely lower than $13 per ton. They ship by steamship through the Panama canal and get their products into Vancouver for about $6 per ton.

I might give another instance. The rates on chemicals going to Vancouver have been reduced for the same purpose of enabling the eastern manufacturer to meet the competition of the American and the British manufacturer. There is a freight rate of approximately $20 per ton on chemicals going to Vancouver, whereas the freight rate on the very same commodity to Calgary is $30 per ton. Remember, that is not designed to benefit British Columbia. It is designed for the purpose of enabling our eastern manufacturer to compete with the American and the Britisher. I do not object to that. We in British Columbia want to do business with eastern Canada. We want to buy your manufactured articles, but we cannot buy them if you will insist on denying us the right of bringing them through the natural trade channels, and we are being denied that right to-day.

The other day the Minister of Customs was asked in the House whether he proposed to put a customs officer at the port of New York. He did not because it would take business away from the transportation companies. Now the fact is that that business is not travelling over the railways to-day, and that fact is evidenced by the figures of trade passing through the Panama canal. Just let me illustrate the effect of having a customs officer at the port of New York on the British Columbia purchaser of manufactured articles, particularly heavy machinery and such like. For instance I have heard our pulp manufacturers say: We are forced to buy in the markets of the United

States because though we could buy as cheaply in eastern Canada markets, we cannot buy there because we cannot pay the freight rates; and they are denied the right of bringnig those goods through the Panama canal—denied that by the government of this country. But if we had a customs officer at New York we could buy those goods, ship them to New York, tranship them there into American or British bottoms, and bring them around to Vancouver via the Panama canal at rates which would compete with the rates we pay for the American and the British article. But the situation at present is that if we ship these goods to New York and then tranship them having no customs officer at New York we have to pay duty on our own Canadian manufactured goods, just as if they were manufactured in the United States. What I want to impress upon the House is this, that our transportation companies are not getting that business now. You are losing it here in the East, and losing it fast, and the following figures are the best proof of that.

In 1913 we had 132 deep-sea going vessels coming into Vancouver; in 1920, 333; in 1921, 496; and in 1922, 717—increasing at a tremendous rate.

Now what about the imports through the Panama canal? In the short period of one year these imports increased by 700 per cent. The imports in 1921 through the Panama canal amounted to 20,416 tons; in 1922 the imports amounted to 149,553 tons; our total imports through the Panama canal being greater than through the port of Montreal. That is what the eastern manufacturers have got to waken up to if they are going to retain the western market. They have to waken up to the fact that they have to allow freight to flow through the natural trade channels. The Americans have wakened up to that fact. They have their regular established steamship lines going through the Panama canal. Their railway companies are spending millions of dollars to-day on developing the short haul as opposed to the transcontinental haul, because they realize that they cannot haul a commodity across the continent in competition with a steamship travelling through the Panama canal. That is obvious and the sooner we waken up to it the better.

There is also the greatest opportunity here for the colonization and settlement of that huge western country. That western country cannot be settled unless you make it possible for the immigrant whom we propose to bring in to go there and prosper. In the first place the western farmer to-day—and you can sneer if you like; I have heard many jeers and sneers, and I take issue with them—the western farmer is suffering under a disadvantage, and that disadvanatge is this. It costs him too much to lay his grain down to the consumer. He is losing from six to ten cents a bushel on his grain by reason of the fact that we have not wakened up and are not taking advantage of the natural trade routes. If we take advantage of these natural trade routes he can then market his grain and obtain a reasonable return for his product. Furthermore, he would then be able to buy his necessities, his machinery and other things that he has to use in his business, at the lowest possible cost. Do not make it necessary for him to haul these things he needs right across the continent. Enable him to take them in by the shortest route, and then you will cheapen the cost of living and make the prairie an attractive place for farmers to come and settle and prosper. But if we insist upon these artificial trade channels we cannot hope to make the West a popular place for the immigrant to come and settle.

I am quite aware it might be said that the Americans to the south of us have higher freight rates than we have in the West on grain and some other commodities. That is true, but let it be remembered that these American farmers are in this position: They have at their door a huge local market—something we have not got. They can sell the bulk of their grain locally, but we are dependent on the price we can get in distant markets for our living. Furthermore, let it be remembered that they have a protective tariff. I know my friends to my left will not agree that that is any advantage to them, but the farmers of the United States see the special advantage that tariff is to them. They are the people who have promoted a tariff on behalf of the farmer, and they are the people who have got it.

Let us also take advantage of their disadvantage if such exists. If they are suffering under a disadvantage let us make our country more attractive to them and then we can bring into this country from the United States the most desirable type of immigrant. They will move across the line if we make our country more attractive and make it possible for the farmer in this country to prosper.

There is just one other point that I wish to draw to the attention of the House and it is this: The principle of equalization of freight rates, in so far as British Columbia is concerned, has already been recognized by the past government, and in the opening paragraph of the judgment of the Board of Railway Commissioners handed down in June, 1922, the commissioners recite the direction

which was given by the Privy Council on the 6th October, 1920, after they had heard an appeal from the judgment of the commissioners. The Privy Council then said:

> The committee of the Privy Council therefore further recommend that as conditions have probably changed materially in recent years, tending more and more to make equalization practicable an inquiry by the board be directed to be held at the earliest date with a view to the establishment of rates meeting to the utmost extent possible the above requirement as to equalization.

Namely, the removal of the mountain scale. Now, I have various other arguments which I could advance but I feel that I cannot, in justice, take up any more of the time of the House. That it is a matter of the most vital importance to British Columbia is true, but I want to urge that I am not advocating this from the sectional point of view of that province. I believe that it is in the interest of this country, that if we are going to encourage people to come to Canada we must make the country attractive to them, we must make it possible for them to prosper. There is no question but that the high freight rates in Canada will make it impossible for a small population such as we have to prosper unless we largely increase that population. Furthermore, by increasing that population, by bringing in desirable immigrants and bringing them in as fast as we can, we will make it possible for these railways to prosper by hauling much greater quantities of freight, by moving much larger numbers of passengers; and that such equalization, and a broad-minded attitude on this question, will react not only to the advantage of British Columbia, to the advantage of eastern Canada and of the whole Dominion, but to the advantage of the railway companies themselves.

Hon. S. F. TOLMIE (Victoria City): I have a great deal of pleasure in seconding the motion so very ably presented by the hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Clark). This matter of freight rates is one of the most important that we have in British Columbia, situated as we are at the extreme western end of Canada. I feel that I will be quite safe in supporting the statements of the mover of the resolution to the effect that the statement of the Chairman of the Railway Commission, as it appeared in a western paper a short time ago, namely that the feeling in British Columbia was much more political than real, is not correct. The fact that we have fought this question of high freight rates for so many years should be ample proof for everyone that we are in earnest in our contention.

It is rather interesting, in looking back to the time when British Columbia was a colony and to the time when it was proposed that she should be taken into confederation, to observe that in the undertakings that were then being considered it was decided to construct a railway from the Atlantic to the Pacific with the object of bringing the provinces of Canada closer together, and increasing trade from east to west rather than from north to south, and that at that time Great Britain also encouraged this work with the idea that it would enable her to reach her possessions on the Asiatic side and in the Pacific, with much greater ease and safety than was previously possible. British Columbia cordially entered into this bargain and made very liberal grants of land, giving to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company a grant of twenty miles wide on each side of that line from the Alberta boundary west, and also about three-and-a-half million acres of rich land in the Peace River district. I might also point out that in making the bargain the federal government took over the right to collect a tariff, at that time enjoyed by the colony of British Columbia, and in exchange the federal authorities gave to the province a grant of $100,000 a year in perpetuity. It is interesting to note here that while other sections of Canada east of the mountains made land grants towards the construction of the Canadian Pacific railway, the colony of British Columbia gave her own land for this purpose; the lands granted in other provinces belonged to the Dominion. At that time nothing was said concerning the extra cost of construction through the mountains; nothing was said about it being necessary to give the railway any undue advantage or any privileges or monopoly; the whole spirit of the bargain was that of equal treatment for all the provinces. No references, as I say, were made with regard to an extra tariff being levied in the mountain section; I am quite sure that it is very doubtful indeed if British Columbia would have entered into this bargain had any such proposition been initiated by the federal authorities. In the selection of the route the Canadian Pacific Railway Company had the whole country to itself. It could have selected a pass from the Arctic circle clear down to the American boundary line. As a matter of fact the company selected the route through the Yellowhead pass west of Edmonton. That route was chosen, in the first place, by the company's engineers on account of its better grade. After some little time the company changed its mind and decided to go west through the Kicking Horse pass, but it was necessary to obtain the sanction of the federal government to that change. In the Kicking Horse pass, as has been so well

pointed out by the mover of the resolution, the grades were very much greater than the grades in the Yellowhead pass, the mountain at its highest point being some 1,650 feet higher in the former than in the latter. In addition there is also the handicap of heavy grades in both directions. Any of you who have been through that country will know that there is a huge depression lying immediately to the west of the Rocky mountains and to the east of the Selkirks—what is known as "The Great Dip." It was only at that point, where the Yellowhead pass crosses the mountains, that a first-class grade could be obtained.

Now, British Columbia urges this: That these routes having been clearly open to the selection of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, the company having first made the selection of the better grade across the mountains and then having changed to the Kicking Horse pass, and this having been endorsed by the parliament of Canada, the province should certainly not be penalized for any mistakes made by the railway company, or by parliament on that occasion.

With regard to the mountain scale at present existing, which is one of our first objections, and which is one of the subjects behind the resolution of the mover, we find, as has been pointed out, that under present conditions it is possible to haul for 125 miles on the prairie, at the rate applicable to a 100 mile haul through the mountains. I am quite sure that this is not in keeping with the spirit of confederation where, as I pointed out a moment ago, equality in all the provinces was the prevailing question that was prominently kept before us. In British Columbia we want this corrected. We believe in the Railway Commission . We believe it is a very valuable body and one that is rendering a great service to this country under a very heavy handicap but during the last session the government according to its right thought it proper at that time to step in and over-rule the heads of that commission and make certain changes in what is known as the Crowsnest pass agreement, giving certain concessions to the prairie provinces. This, we claim, is an added discrimination against the province of British Columbia, and we ask now in this resolution that that privilege be not confined to the prairie provinces favoured last year, but that it be extended to all the other parts of the Dominion, including the province of British Columbia.

It has been clearly shown that there has been very little difference, if any, in the cost of transportation over the line of the Canadian National railway in the mountains and over similar distances on the prairie sections. In fact I am informed, taking the distance from Edmonton to Vancouver, and Edmonton to Fort William, that you pass over higher land on the way to Fort William than on the trip to Vancouver. It was also shown last year in the findings of the Railway Committee of this House, which sat during last session, that the cost of construction is no longer a serious feature in fixing freight rates over the Canadian Pacific railway.

The position in British Columbia is this: Here is a vast province of great resources, with plenty of goods for sale, timber, minerals, fish and agriculture, anxious to do business with the eastern section of Canada, particularly that section lying immediately east of the Rocky mountains, but severely handicapped by freight rates which have prevailed for a great number of years. We feel that if we are to have the proper development which we have a right to expect, we should have equal treatment, and that we should be placed on an equal footing with that country lying to the east of us and with other parts of Canada. The result of the high freight rate has been that we find a certain amount of business uncertainty and unrest. There is a lack of confidence among business men, capital is shy about investment, particularly since the increase of freight rates some time ago, and many of those inland towns built along the line of the Canadian Pacific railway at the time of its construction have practically not developed at all, handicapped, as they are very greatly, by the excessive freight rates which they have to pay. We find that our mills, particularly those lying inland, are not doing the amount of business that they would under more favourable conditions. I am quite sure that if these concessions asked for in the resolution were granted we would have immediately very much improved business conditions, which would not only be enjoyed by the great northwestern country, but by the people throughout the whole of Canada.

Take the matter particularly of the concession made last year under the Crowsnest pass agreement in the matter of grain and flour. which includes, as I understand, feed grain and mill offal, such as bran and shorts, a tremendous advantage would be enjoyed by our British Columbia friends if this material were permitted to go to British Columbia at a lower freight rate. You will understand in those western valleys we not only have an excellent growth of grass in summer, but we are able to grow a great deal of forage for winter use, ensilage and hay. If we could

buy those cheap concentrates east of the mountains and have them delivered to us at a reasonable figure, we could extend our dairy operations much more. We have in that country as regards dairying, the finest possible conditions existing anywhere on the continent of America, and this has been proved on more than one occasion by our being able to produce cattle that have broken the world's record in dairy production. Looking at conditions generally in Canada, particularly agricultural conditions, while we all recognize the necessity of having a first class market, the first thing we need to encourage the farmer to produce is to guarantee him a first class market which will yield him some profit for his work. What do we find? When we consider these markets, we find we are very much handicapped by the heavy cost of distribution, and one of the principal causes is the heavy freight rates. I am quite sure that if the concessions asked for were extended to British Columbia, much more of the wheat would roll to the West than is moving at the present time. But why not? The development of our agriculture is far too important to have that wheat guided with a view to helping out any particular point. If we are going to make a great country of this Canada of ours, huge in extent as it is, populated with a virile people, and to develop it in keeping with its present place in the world and as part of the great British Empire, we must put aside any little feelings we may have about any particular section which we wish to boost, and let the grain and any other produce we have run along natural lines. We have two channels through which trade flows. One is the natural channel and the other is the boosted channel. If we want to stand on a sound foundation, we must always rely on the natural channels of trade. I will read to the House this statement from the Toronto Globe, a paper that I have not quoted very frequently since I have come into this House:

The Western Grain Route

If British Columbia in asking for a reduction of rates on westbound grain, were seeking simply to build up its own ports as against those of eastern Canada, its demand might be described as sectional. But what it contends is that the westbound movement is not artificial, but natural, and is economically the more profitable, at least for the grain of Alberta and western Saskatchewan. The vital question is not what is best for Vancouver or Montreal, but what is best for the grain grower in the West.

The western route to the Pacific has the advantage, for at least a large portion of the West, of a much shorter rail haul. Against this is the grade through the Rocky mountains. But here it is to be borne in mind that the National railway has a far easier grade than the Canada Pacific, and this advantage ought to be used to the fullest possible extent. This is not a sectional, but a national question.

I was just going to say that we are only in our infancy as regards agriculture. During the time that I had the honour to be Minister of Agriculture, I had a very careful estimate made by the experts of the Department of Agriculture, and I may say that while they were all recognized as experts, some were also agriculturists, and some even farmers. It was estimated at that time that by a slightly improved form of agriculture, the more strict selection of our seeds, better cultivation, the keeping of a better quality of dairy cattle, beef cattle, hogs and poultry, with very moderate estimates in all those particular lines, there would be an increase to the agricultural wealth of this country of not less than $503,000,000 a year, or enough to wipe out our national debt in five or six years without turning over a single fresh acre. This will show the possibilities. No single port is going to be able to take care of the produce of this country, when the western country gets into mixed farming as it will undoubtedly, because the history of some of the states to the south will be repeated. Their wheat production went down to only six bushels an acre, whereas now by the introduction of the dairy and creamery system on an extensive scale, they are producing more wheat to-day than before, and producing at a greater profit. Therefore, our agriculture being only in its infancy, all the good ports we have will be necessary to get rid of our produce as the quantity increases.

Perhaps the most important question to-day before the government and people of this country is that of making the business of the producer profitable. If we can do that, nothing else practically will matter because it will take care of itself. We are talking about immigration. We want more immigrants into this country; but I think simultaneously with any movement to increase immigration, we should certainly move along those lines that will better conditions for those people who are in the country already, and in that way improve conditions for any immigrants that might settle here.

One of the most important of those things is to keep down the cost of living and freight rates to within a reasonable figure, so as to enable us to place our goods on the market at a reasonable profit. While we recognize that one of the greatest handicaps in our development is cost of distribution, perhaps one of the greatest factors in that cost of

distribution is the matter of high freight rates. Those freight rates affect everybody and everything. They increase the cost of living, and while we blame the railways, the railways blame their employees for the high wages they have to pay and also the high cost of materials. This matter should be sifted to the bottom, and whatever remedies can be adopted should be adopted for the purpose of relieving the situation. One thing that the public are dead sure of is that we are not going to enjoy the proper prosperity to which this country is entitled so long as those high rates prevail.

5 p.m.

Our transportation system was largely built up many years ago with the great centres in the East kept plainly in view at all times, such as Montreal, Toronto and other centres. Conditions have changed tremendously since that time. I think a point has been reached where it is almost time to review the situation and to bring to bear such reorganization as is possible, taking into consideration the tremendous growth of the prairies, the development of British Columbia, the development and great increase of our agricultural production of the plains, particularly wheat, and also the great possibilities of Pacific trade which cannot be overlooked now. This is increasing in importance every year, and we must always keep in view the competition which the Panama canal is going to give the railways crossing this continent. I am quite sure the development of British Columbia would be a great boon to our prairie friends. I have always felt that that great province, with its rich resources, will, once it is developed, provide at the door of the prairies, particularly Alberta and Saskatchewan a market that will be a very valuable one. There is nothing that will help out the development of that country so much as favourable freight rates. I am sure, once rates are reduced, we shall find a great deal of the grain in the prairies flowing over the mountains, not only for consumption in British Columbia, but for shipment abroad through our elevators which are built now, and increased elevator facilities which will be provided in the near future. The Pacific offers to the prairies an excellent way of getting rid of its grain all the year round with a very short haul and all down hill.

I do not propose to take up any more of the time of the House. The mover of the resolution has gone into this matter very completely and in full detail. I have great pleasure in seconding the resolution.

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Acting Minister of Railways and Canals): Mr. Speaker, had my hon. friend had this motion presented to him two years ago, I am afraid he could not have seconded it in this House. He would then have been in the position of being a minister of the Crown with this case before him on appeal. He is fortunate, perhaps, in that respect to-day. The question of transportation, as hon. gentlemen have said, is one that directly and intimately affects the people. The method of moving from the point of production to the point of consumption the products of the people either on the farm or in the shop, to a large extent controls the returns which the people get for their labour or their investment. Neither the government nor parliament can minimize the effect of freight rates on the public business of the country, or on the private happiness, contentment and prosperity of the people.

But the question, so far as I can view it, is not one of freight rates, although that side of the question has been presented ably to the House. This country, years ago, rightly or wrongly, passed an act creating a body with machinery to which is referred the control of freight and passenger rates and movement of trains, together with the kind of equipment and standard of its repair. That was right or it was wrong. But to-day that is the law of the land. I know the hon. member for Victoria City (Mr. Tolmie) stated that last year parliament interfered with the work of the Board of Railway Commissioners. I want to point out the inaccuracy of that contention. In 1897 the Crowsnest pass agreement became a part of the law of the Dominion of Canada. That implied a contract between the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, the people of Canada, and the government of Canada. From 1897 until 1918, I think I am safe in saying, the Board of Railway Commissioners never had any jurisdiction over the rates affected by that agreement, at least not legally. Those rates were according to a contract embodied in the agreement called the Crowsnest pass agreement. In 1918, by another statute, with the consent of parliament and with the approval of the people of Canada, that agreement was suspended for a term, and during that suspension those rates came under the Board of Railway Commissioners. That term expired last year, and it was in the hands of this parliament to say whether or not it would be extended for another term. Parliament was not interfering with the work of the Board of Railway Commissioners as originally intended by this agreement, because that board was constituted many years after this agreement was made and the agreement was never brought under the board's jurisdiction until 1918. If this House had not enacted legislation for the purpose last session the Crows-

nest pass agreement would again have come into full force and effect, and accordingly parliament passed certain legislation allowing the main features of that agreement to again become operative. In other words, parliament refused to extend in its entirety the suspension of that agreement.

Now, the position to-day is altogether different. These rates have been under the control of the Board of Railway Commissioners since its inception, and this House is now asked to say that it is opposed to the existing machinery for the control of rates. How far has that machinery functioned concerning this very question now before the House? The Railway Act provides that the making of rates shall be placed in the hands of the Board of Railway Commissioners. If I remember correctly, the procedure is this: The railway companies file their rates with the board, and if any objection is taken to those rates by any person or any organization the case is tried on its merits by the board. Under that statute the very case we are now discussing was heard before the Railway Board and a finding given. But the Railway Act further provides that in case any dissatisfaction exists as to a judgment of the board, appeal can be had on questions of fact to the Privy Council—the cabinet— and on questions of law to the Supreme Court.

This case was heard before the Board of Railway Commissioners, and the judgment of the board was not satisfactory to the province of British Columbia, which thereupon lodged an appeal with the Privy Council. That appeal has already been partially argued, and the constitutional aspect, referred to by the hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Clark) has been presented to the Privy Council by Premier Oliver and counsel for British Columbia, Mr. McGeer. The Speaker has ruled that if the Privy Council were a court this case could not be discussed here to-day, but in his opinion it is not a court. Of course I must accept the ruling, but I would submit that the Railway Act to all intents and purposes constituted the Board of Railway Commissioners a court of first instance and the Privy Council a court of appeal.

Now, the government is in this situation. We cannot discuss the merits of this case no matter how we may regard them. We are precluded in all decency from discussing whether British Columbia is fairly treated or not, for, as I have already stated, the case is now before the Privy Council and has already been half argued, and the attorney-general and the premier of British Columbia agreed that the completion of the argument should take place immediately after the close of this session. The government having within a few weeks to give a decision on this case, and not yet having heard all the argument, is it in the interests of the people of British Columbia, is it in the interests of those who wish to have freight rates reduced that this motion should be pressed upon the House? I submit that any vote on this question could not be absolutely on the merits of the case, because members of the cabinet are precluded from saying a word one way or the other. Therefore in my opinion this question ought to be left in abeyance until at least the Privy Council, as the appellate court to the Board of Railway Commissioners, has had an opportunity to hear full argument and give its finding. If parliament then comes to the conclusion that that finding is not in accordance with the facts or with public policy, it can always so declare.

Mr. T. G. McBRIDE (Cariboo): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate I do not want to give the impression that I am asking for freight rates to be reduced. When I look over the freight rates that are charged in the United States and compare them with the freight rates that are charged in Canada, I find that on this side of the line they are about 25 per cent less. If we expect our railways to pay how can we consistently ask the government to cut freight rates? I believe in running our railways as a cold-blooded business proposition. In other words, I think our railways ought to carry at least their own overhead expenses and not expect the taxpayers to shoulder the burden. Why should we in the West pay taxes to make up an operating deficiency to get coal to the people of Ottawa? And why should the people of Ottawa be expected to pay taxes to make up an operating deficiency on the hauling of grain from the prairies to the seaboard? I do not think it is fair that those who are getting no consideration whatever from the railways should be taxed to make up these deficiencies. In my opinion freight rates should be fixed on a basis to cover overhead expenses, and indeed I hope to see the time when our National Railways will not only earn their overhead expenses but a surplus that will go a long way towards paying the debt of this country.

Now, when British Columbia entered confederation the government of Canada agreed to build a road to the Pacific coast. When that agreement was made nothing was said of discrimination in the way of freight rates. And here let me say that anything I am about to state in regard to the Canadian Pacific

Railway need not be taken as in any way condemning that railway. The Canadian Pacific Railway is an organization that I think every true Canadian has just reason to be proud of, and the same might be said of the Canadian National Railways. The officials and employees of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Canadian National Railway are giving transportation service to this country that is not surpassed in any other part of the world. The steamboats of the Canadian Pacific Railway and also of the Canadian National Railways on the Pacific coast are the flower of the Pacific ocean and should be the pride of all Canadians. Therefore I repeat any remarks I may make in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway are not to be taken as in any way condemnatory of that railway but are intended simply to show the discrimination against the West in the way of freight rates as compared with the other sections of the Dominion.

Now, I see no reason why the people in the West should not get the same scale of freight rates as apply in the East. When British Columbia entered the union her people took into consideration the inducements that were then offered to them to take that course. As I have already stated, one of those inducements was a railroad to the Pacific coast that was to be started within two years and completed within ten. That railroad was not started, I may say, until eight years after British Columbia had entered the confederation. However, that is past history. There is not a vestige of the agreement under which British Columbia entered confederation that has not been fully carried out by the people of that province. Why, then, should this government not see to it that the railway companies carry out their part of the agreement and exercise no discrimination in the matter of freight rates? Why should it be that a manufacturer of roofing paper, for instance, in Victoria, can ship his product down the Pacific coast, through the Panama canal, up the Atlantic and back to Winnipeg at $9.20 a ton less than he can ship it direct across Canada by rail? Yet he can do it. It simply means that the people producing these articles on the Pacific coast cannot compete, owing to the freight charges, with those engaged in similar businesses in the East. Why should it cost 100 per cent more to ship a car of apples from Okanagan to Vancouver than it does to ship the same distance in Ontario? And yet it does. It must be borne in mind that the British Columbia government gave 14,000,000 acres of land toward the building of the Canadian Pacific railway; and not only that, the Dominion government built the greater portion of the line and handed it over to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company free of cost. Taking these things into consideration I do not think any person can justly say that the cost of construction of the Canadian Pacific railway in the West to the company has been much in excess of the cost of construction in the East. It is argued that the Canadian Pacific was an expensive road to build. I will admit that, but are the people of the West to be penalized for the mistakes of the C.P.R. engineers? That is the question that is before this House. The C.P.R. had the same right to go through the Yellowhead pass that the Canadian Northern had. But in 1882 the C.P.R. came to this House and asked permission to change the route from the Yellowhead pass to the present route through the Rogers pass, on the ground that the distance would thereby be made some 79 miles shorter. It was a more expensive road to construct and no doubt is a more expensive road to operate, but that is no reason why the freight rates should be held up on the Canadian National on the basis of what the C.P.R. charges. I do not suppose there is a member of this House who would say that the East should be charged a higher freight rate on account of the Quebec bridge or the Montreal tunnel. No person will say that the cost of building that bridge or that tunnel should be charged up to the people in Quebec; much less should we in the West be charged with the mistakes of the C.P.R. We in the West are paying taxes on the money that the government advanced to build these roads, just as well as the people in the East; why, then, should we have to pay an additional tax in the way of high freight rates?

Some people will say that it has cost a great deal more to operate the roads in the West than it has in the East. I think I can show by figures that the cost of operation is from 65 to 80 per cent more in the East than it is in the West, I am sure that anyone who is accustomed to railway operations will admit that it costs more to operate in the East than the West. Let us look at a few figures. The cost of operation of the C.P.R. per mile in Alberta and British Columbia in 1917 was $5,682, whereas in Quebec and New Brunswick the cost in that year was $10,000 per mile, or 76 per cent more. In 1920 the cost of operation per mile in Alberta and British Columbia was $10,830 and in Quebec and New Brunswick $17,913, or 65 per cent greater in the East. In 1921, Alberta and British Columbia $8,631 per mile; Quebec and New Brunswick,

$15,560 per mile, or 80 per cent greater in the East than in the West. Why, then, are the freight rates in the West so much higher than they are in the East? Is there any just reason for it? Some people will say, "But look at the amount of freight that is handled in the East compared with the West." Well, let us look at the figures with respect to the density of freight as represented by gross ton miles in Quebec and New Brunswick taken together, and in British Columbia and Alberta, taken together. The figures are as folows:

	Tons
1917—	
Quebec & New Brunswick..	54,572
British Columbia & Alberta..	56,431
1920—	
Quebec & New Brunswick..	46,021
British Columbia & Alberta..	57,229
1921—	
Quebec & New Brunswick..	38,411
British Columbia & Alberta..	42,891

This shows that in the West the volume of business for the railroad is much greater every time.

Some people think that the prairies are flat and that freight can therefore be handled much more cheaply there. But the prairies are not flat; at both Regina and Medicine Hat there are pusher grades on the C.P.R. Nearly a 2 per cent grade is encountered between Montreal and West St. John.

We hear a great deal about the mountain scale out West. The C.P.R. does pay its men a mountain scale of wages for 200 miles but it charges the people in the West the mountain scale on 4,500 miles. That is what is called the mountain scale. Is there anything to justify it? Not that I can see. As for the Canadian Northern, there is no such thing as a mountain scale.

I would now like to say a few words about the Canadian Northern. On that line out West for a distance of twenty-eight miles, up the North Thompson, the Canadian Northern has a grade of seven-tenths of one per cent, and that is the heaviest grade on the line. The rest of the grade is four-tenths of one per cent. In fact, the grade is such that you could start a train at Jasper or Lucerne and it would almost run itself without an engine to Vancouver. Indeed there is not one grade on the Canadian National railway that is not fully compensated. It is not so on the Canadian Pacific railway.

Some people may say: Look at the cost of construction on the Canadian Northern railway through British Columbia. Suppose we compare the cost of construction of the Canadian Northern railway through British Columbia and in the East. From Kamloops to Hope was the most expensive portion of the Canadian Northern road to construct, and that section of the road cost $133,563 per mile, whereas the road from Ottawa to Montreal cost $178,000 per mile; in other words that section from Montreal to Ottawa cost $44,430 a mile more to build than the most expensive portion of the line in British Columbia. Or again, take that section of the road between Montreal and Winnipeg. That section cost an average of $59,313 per mile, whereas the section from Winnipeg to Vancouver cost $55,572 per mile, or in other words, $3,741 per mile less. Why then, when we take these things into consideration, should the people out West have to pay the freight rates they are paying to-day? I might say that all these figures were taken from the official railway accounts and have never been challenged.

There is no reason that I can see why the freight rates in the West should be such as they are; it is a discrimination against western Canada, and one that is hard to explain. There is no reason that I can see why any railroad company should be entitled to hold up the freight rates to debar the people in the West from doing business with the prairies, and that is what they are doing at the present time. All we ask out West is a square deal. We have carried out, as I have already said, every vestige of an agreement with the Dominion government, and we ask the Dominion government to carry out their part of the agreement and give us the same freight rates as other sections of Canada enjoy. If the freight rates have to be raised in order to put the roads on a paying basis, we are prepared to pay our share of the cost, but let the rest of Canada do the same thing. That is all we are asking.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): I wish to review this subject briefly, Mr. Speaker, and to state where I stand upon the resolution of the hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Clark). To come to an intelligent grasp of the whole question embodied and involved in this resolution, one has to go back some distance in the history of our railway legislation. That history has been reviewed, but I do not think reviewed fully, and I am quite certain not reviewed fairly by the hon. the Acting Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham).

This parliament has had from its inception the power to control railway rates in this Dominion. In so far as the railways of Canada were Dominion railways within the meaning of the British North America Act, the control of rates upon them rested with the parliament of Canada, or with such body or committee or commission as the parliament of Canada chose from time to time to depute

that jurisdiction to. Up till 1903 parliament had left with the Privy Council under the Railway Act the exercise of that control. The Privy Council had what was known as a Railway Committee, within which was placed the exercise of such review of the rates on our railways as was deemed in the public interest. While such was the law of the land an agreement was made by the Dominion government with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, in 1897, whereby in consideration of a grant of money for construction of a branch line the Canadian Pacific Railway Company agreed to give certain rates on grain and flour eastward and on other important commodities westward into and from the prairie provinces as a consideration for the aid so extended. Those rates were lower than had previously obtained on the goods affected.

In 1903 parliament decided on another body for the exercise of the control that had previously been in the hands of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. Parliament constituted the Railway Commission, and by specific legislation in amendment to and added to the Railway Act of the time provided that this commission should have control of all rates whatsoever, as well as the supervision of improvements, the maintenance of equipment and other matters that theretofore had been otherwise controlled. To that general reposition of power there was in the clauses establishing the Commission no exception at all, and it is unnecessary to add that any exception would be wholly inconsistent with the spirit and purpose of the legislation itself. As a matter of practical effect for many years no exception arose for the reason that in the case of the only exception which afterwards was found to exist namely this Crowsnest pass agreement, the rates thereunder were such as really not to be affected by the practical operation of the Railway Board.

What I would like to call attention to now is this, that in the granting of power to the board there was no exception, and intended to be no exception, but afterwards it appeared that in the general Railway Act, aside entirely from the provisions constituting and empowering the board, there was a clause that nothing in this general Railway Act should affect the provisions of any special act, the intention being, should affect any special act incorporating a company and the granting of certain powers thereunder. However, the effect of that general clause in the Railway Act was such undoubtedly as to maintain intact the original Crowsnest pass legislation. Now that Crowsnest pass legislation was not the only thing that was in my judgment intended to be cast aside by the general provisions adopted in 1903 establishing the Railway Commission. Previous to that there had been many agreements entered into, not only by companies and by individuals, but by provincial governments, with railways whereby for a consideration the railways undertook to give certain lower rates; but because of the establishment of a general tribunal and the submission of all companies to that tribunal these agreements inevitably were swept aside. If they were to still obtain in their old force then the whole purpose of the railway legislation of 1903 would be to that extent defeated. In a word, grievances of any kind—

Mr. CAHILL: Was not the Manitoba agreement with the Northern Pacific also left as binding on the government?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I will come to that very fully. I undertake that the hon. member will be fully satisfied with my treatment of his question a little later on.

All previous agreements were swept aside for that reason. Once the railway companies submitted to the tribunal constituted by the parliament of Canada and said "We will let this tribunal fix rates herafter" what more could we ask of the companies? Very well. Upon the establishment of the Railway Commission in 1903—there having been up to that time a gradual general reduction of rates in Canada—the rates then obtaining under the Crowsnest pass agreement were only such rates, and no lower, as the Railway Commission anyway would fix. So it turned out. Indeed, as time passed the Railway Commission found it possible to assess rates even lower than the Crowsnest pass rates, and those were in effect for some years. This point the Acting Minister of Railways overlooked in his review this afternoon. He stated that the rates effected by the Crowsnest pass agreement had never been under the jurisdiction of the Railway Commission. They were; the Railway Commission actually dealt with them and reduced them below the Crowsnest pass level. Now, all the while legally, because of that exception in the general Railway Act, the Crowsnest pass legislation was in existence; but not until 1917 did the time arrive when the effect of that agreement actually and practically interfered with the operations of the Railway Commission.

Mr. GRAHAM: Oh, oh.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister smiles. I thought I was giving a fair review of the his-

tory of this subject. Is not what I have said the fact?

Mr. GRAHAM: I was smiling at this: I do not quite agree with my right hon. friend's position on the submission to the Railway Commission of the Crowsnest pass agreement. However, it is immaterial; the results were the same; the rates were lower than the rates under the Crowsnest pass agreement.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is all I was endeavouring to point out.

Mr. GRAHAM: Not on account of the commission, however.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Well, the rates were lower and were approved by the commission.

Mr. GRAHAM: No doubt the rates were lower.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly and came under the commission just the same as any other rates submitted to them and assessed by them.

Mr. GRAHAM: Does my right hon. friend mean to say that those rates legally came under the Board of Railway Commissioners?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Of course they did, subject to the effect of the original agreement.

Mr. GRAHAM: Surely.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly, I have stated that, but the original agreement had no practical effect—the minister will now either contradict me or agree—the original agreement had no practical effect until 1917.

Mr. GRAHAM: When the rates became higher.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes—when the conditions were such that it would have been the duty of the commission, entirely aside from this agreement, to make the rates higher. Consequently, the act of 1897 was, in effect, a dead letter until 1917. This cannot be contradicted. If it can, I invite contradiction,—that the rates would have been the same if the act had never existed.

Mr. GRAHAM: Surely.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Very good; from the time the Railway Act came into effect until 1917 the rates would have been just the same if there had been no Crowsnest pass agreement at all.

Mr. FORKE: Did not the Crowsnest pass agreement fix the maximum rates?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly.

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. FORKE: It had nothing to do with the minimum rates.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Quite right. What I have said is the fact all the same.

Mr. FORKE: Yes, it is the fact but there is nothing in the argument.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the Crowsnest pass agreement had never existed then, in so far as the period from 1903 when the commission was established up to 1917 is concerned, during those fourteen years, the actual rates in effect would have been exactly what they were.

Mr. GRAHAM: Would this not be the case: Conditions arose and it was found necessary to have higher rates than those in the Crowsnest pass agreement. Then was it not necessary to change the law?

Mr MEIGHEN: Yes, I am just getting to that point.

Mr GRAHAM: That is my case.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Then the Crowsnest pass agreement and legislation was, so far as rates are concerned, a dead letter until 1917. But 1917 coming, the war conditions then prevailing necessitated a general rise in railway rates or the paralysis of the whole railway system of this country. So the Railway Board came to the government, and the government came to parliament, and asked that the Crowsnest pass agreement be removed and that the Railway Commission be free to fix such rates, everywhere in this Dominion, as, under all the conditions, were reasonable and fair. That step the government took.

Mr. GRAHAM: They suspended it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I know the government suspended it but the government's legislation in the first place, if I remember correctly—I will be corrected if I am wrong—was for the abolition entirely of the agreement. There was an amendment proposed, I think, in the Senate—I am not quite sure of that— and the government as a compromise agreed to it; but the government adopted the principle which had always been in effect until then, that there should not be hampering restrictions upon the board when dealing with the general subject.

Mr. BROWN: Why the necessity for parliament suspending the rate, as you contend, if it was already suspended or abrogated under the original Railway Act?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member has not quite understood me. Legally the agreement was in effect—that is to say legally it existed

—but it had no practical effect at all until 1917. In 1917 it came into practical effect because the time had come when rates had to be raised. Consequently then was the time, and the only time when if there was any need for it to be dealt with it would have been dealt with and dealt with by parliament. Because, I say again, I do not believe for a moment it was ever intended by the Railway Act of 1903 giving the Railway Commission this power, ever intended that there should be any exception under the Crowsnest pass agreement or any other agreement inconsistent with the provisions of the act. Remember I wholly agree that under the Railway Act by reason of another clause which had been always in effect—another clause intended to apply to legislation incorporating companies, the Crowsnest pass legislation was saved. It actually did save the Crowsnest pass agreement legally. However, I am now at the year 1917 when the suspension took place, the intention being at that time to remove the agreement so that the Railway Commission should be free. Then came the expiration of the suspension of the rates in 1922. Now I come to the argument advanced by the Acting Minister of Railways.

Mr. CAHILL: Was not the suspension for two years in the first place, and then for a further period?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Possibly so.

Mr. CAHILL: My hon. friend then agreed to have it suspended.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think we asked to have the agreement removed first of all, but there were objections to that and the government agreed to the suspension instead.

Mr. CAHILL: On two occasions.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Very well, the expiration of the suspension came in 1922 and then the Railway Commission—having already reduced the rates so far as they felt they could until they knew the fate of the Crowsnest pass legislation, and having to hold their hands from further general reductions which were due all over this country, until it could be known what was the decision of this parliament in respect of the agreement—came to the government and asked that the government declare, and that parliament declare, its position on the subject. The matter, as everyone knows, was referred to a committee and finally government legislation was introduced, the effect of which was to restore the Crowsnest pass agreement in part and let the rest of it go by the board, for another year. This legislation passed, the part restored being the rates on grain and flour moving eastward out of the western prairie provinces.

Now we must remember in this connection —though it is aside from my argument, and I ask that this interjection be forgotten as related to my argument, as soon as I make it— that there is no question that whatever may have been the result of the imposition of the Crowsnest pass rates on grain and flour eastward out of the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan, whatever may have been the result, below what the Railway Commission would have felt it should have done, so far as Manitoba was concerned, there was nothing effected whatever below what the Railway Commission would in any case have done. I say this on the authority of the evidence submitted to the special committee, which went to show the railways were prepared, under the better conditions that had been brought about, to reduce rates until they would equal in Manitoba the Crowsnest pass rates. It is presumable, however, that in Saskatchewan and Alberta the rates imposed by this parliament in restoring that portion of the agreement were below the rates which, under all the circumstances, the Railway Commission would probably have thought fair. How far below no one knows, but that they were below can be presumed from the subsequent judgment of the Railway Commission itself. As a consequence of parliament imposing those rates, in respect, we will say, of Saskatchewan and Alberta, the Railway Commission were prevented from doing what they otherwise would have done in rate reduction in other parts of the country.

Now the hon. minister argues as against the present resolution—why reduce these rates? He says there is a board which has jurisdiction in railway rates that we should not invade that jurisdiction, and that to do so is to act on a false principle. Then he immediately sees in front of him the act of last session in which we did invade the jurisdiction by restoring the Crowsnest rates on grain and flour, in a word by fixing rates on grain and flour coming eastward, and he says that is an exception, because there was an agreement and we had to bow to it. That agreement he says was made in 1897. Its rates have always been out of the jurisdiction of the commission and consequently there was an exception based on the sanctity of such agreement. Now I ask if such is the case, why in the world was not the agreement wholly restored and its integrity respected? If it is a sacred agreement, all of it is sacred and one part is just as sacred as another.

If the hon. member wants to get behind the agreement as an agreement, let him get behind it. He wants to justify smashing the agreement in two, and then to be allowed to say "because it is sacred as an agreement, I will get behind a fragment of it and let the rest go by the board."

Mr. CAHILL: What would have happened if parliament had taken no action?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Then the Railway Commission would have been free.

Mr. CAHILL: No, because the Crowsnest pass agreement would go into effect.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh yes, but if parliament had done what I said then, and say now it should have done, it would have left the commission free to reduce everywhere in accordance with the conditions obtaining, and to be absolutely fair between all parts of the Dominion. Now, let parliament do that, let parliament cease to hamstring the commission, let it remove the chains, and then representatives from all parts of the Dominion can fairly be asked to go with these questions to the Railway Commission of this country. But while parliament handcuffs the commission in order that it may fasten certain rates, how then can it ask members of this House, and representatives of other parts of Canada, to go to the commission—a commission which is tied hand and foot by the government itself?

Mr. FORKE: As far as I can follow my hon. friend's argument, it is that the Crowsnest pass agreement did not do very much good to the West at all, and how did it hamstring the commission so very much, if the rates were infinitesimally lower through the fact of the Crowsnest pass agreement being restored?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member is pleading that we may have done wrong but we did not do very much wrong because we did not make the rates very much lower any way. The fact of the matter is that parliament tied the hands of the commission. If we did not by so doing put rates below what the commission would have done anyway, what good did we do?

Mr. FORKE: The hon. member said we did not put them very much lower.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, I said in Manitoba we did not put them lower than the commission would have done. I said they put the rates in Saskatchewan and Alberta presumably lower than the commission would have done. How much I did not say It is the principle that is wrong—the principle of tying the hands of the commission before which all parts of the country are asked to come, and by whose decision all parts of the country are asked to abide. The government having taken the responsibility of doing that must answer to representatives of other portions of the country when those representatives come to this House and ask the government to do the same in respect to their provinces.

Next they have argued—though the minister did not do so this afternoon—that valuable consideration was given for this sacred agreement of 1897. Well, consideration was given by this Dominion but similar consideration was given by one hundred other acts, and there would be just the same reason for statutorily fixing rates in lieu of that consideration. But if in the Crownsnest case there was any given, it was given by the whole of the Dominion of Canada and was not given by any one single portion.

Now I would come to the subject referred to by the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Cahill) the agreement with the province of Manitoba made by the Canadian Northern Railway Company, an agreement for which consideration was given in lieu of control of rates being exercised by the province which gave the consideration. The province of Manitoba in 1901 made an agreement with the Northern Pacific to take over the Northern Pacific lines at a certain fixed rental for 999 years—a certain rental for ten years, a certain rental for another ten years, another rental for a third ten years, and then a rental of $300,000 for the balance of 999 years. The province immediately re-leased the lines to the Canadian Northern, and in that agreement re-leasing the lines they provided that Manitoba should guarantee the bonds of the Canadian Northern Railway Company on its line from Port Arthur to Rainy River, 290 miles, at $20,000 a mile, a liability of $5,800,000, and in consideration of such liability the Canadian Northern Railway Company gave to the province of Manitoba full control of rates on all its lines in Manitoba and on all its lines from Manitoba to Port Arthur, and from Port Arthur to Manitoba. There was valuable consideration and there was a sacred agreement, and the consideration came wholly out of the credit and out of the pocket of the people of Manitoba themselves. Now then, if agreements are sacred, surely they are sacred chiefly to those who give the consideration for them. Manitoba stands to-day with all its rights under that agreement intact. I call on the government of this country to restore the validity of that agreement to undo what was done by this House in 1903 and allow the

people of Manitoba, through its government to exercise full control of rates as they have a right to do under the terms of the agreement. If this government comes in and says the Crowsnest pass agreement must be respected, then why not the Canadian Northern agreement? If the Crowsnest pass agreement must be respected, or a part of it, a piece of it, torn and extracted out of the rest, for the benefit of a portion of the country which contributed no more to the construction of the road than all the rest of the Dominion, how much more should the Canadian Northern agreement enure to the benefit of, and be restored fully to the taxpayers of the province who paid the whole of the consideration themselves?

Mr. CANNON: Does the hon. member contend that the provincial government of Manitoba would constitutionally have the right to fix rates?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The provincial government of Manitoba has the contractual right to fix rates. As between that railway company and the Canadian Northern Railway Company, which is still a corporate company to-day, the government of Manitoba can force the railway company to put whatever rates in effect it wants, unless restrained by the parliament of the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. CANNON: Does the hon. member contend that a party to a contract can grant power to any party, outside the powers conferred on that first party by the constitution?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The province of Manitoba has the absolute right to exercise those powers unless restrained by this House. This House has the full right to remove the control it assumed by the act of 1903 and give complete effect to that agreement of 1901.

Mr. FORKE: Why did the hon. member not do that when he was in power?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Because we do not believe in special agreements at all. I spent twenty minutes of my address endeavouring to show that the late government set its face against all special agreements and believed them inconsistent with the proper working of the Railway Commission.

Mr. FORKE: That is an excuse.

Mr. MEIGHEN: An excuse?

Mr. FORKE: Yes, I think so.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the hon. member thinks it is an excuse, I would like to know what he thinks is a reason. I do not understand the hon. member.

Mr. FORKE: The right hon. gentleman knows quite well that the province of Manitoba would like to put that agreement over; but it could get no help from the Dominion, and the Railway Commission fixed those rates over the head of the province of Manitoba altogether. Manitoba has now power to enforce anything the Railway Commission would agree to.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman has not made himself quite clear.

Mr. FORKE: I think the right hon. gentleman understands perfectly.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am trying to understand the hon. member. I fully admit that this parliament has power to fix rates or to authorize as it did in 1903, the Railway Commission to fix rates irrespective of this agreement of 1901 but this parliament also has power to establish this agreement as a binding agreement to enable Manitoba to get the full value of the consideration which it gave just the same as it did in part at least in the case of the Crowsnest arrangement. That very thing I call now on the government to do.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. MEIGHEN: A matter was mentioned before six o'clock by the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Cannon) the exact purport of which I was not sure that I caught. I think though he was endeavouring to make the point that the agreement between the Canadian Northern Railway Company and the Government of Manitoba was beyond the jurisdiction of that government to enter into; that is to say, that the government of Manitoba constitutionally could not fix rates on Dominion railways. True, the legislature of no province can, as a legislative act, fix rates on Dominion railways; that is very clear. Similarly a town council could not do things with a company by general by-laws unless it had a contract with that special company. Perhaps this illustration will not add to the clearness of my argument and I will not pursue it.

Mr. CAHILL: Not a bit.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman need not smile. I do not think it would be clear to him no matter what I did.

Mr. CAHILL: That is not a smart answer.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I mean to say the hon. gentleman is hostile, that is all.

Mr. CAHILL: It is not even clear to himself.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, it is clear to me all right.

Mr. CAHILL: Well, explain it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: As a legislative act no provincial legislature can fix rates on Dominion railways; but as a contractual right it can. In a word, it can only base its power upon contract. If it attempts to fix rates without any agreement with the railway company, the company does not need to bother its head; but if the company agrees to submit to the rates fixed, then, aside from any interference by this House, undoubtedly the company would have to abide by those rates because it contracted to do so. This does not apply to us. We can fix rates by legislation. The company need not contract to abide by those rates for we have jurisdiction over Dominion railways. A legislature can fix rates only if the company agrees to abide by the rates so fixed; and the company is bound by those rates if it contracts to accept them, unless it is relieved by this parliament.

Then, it may be asked, how did this parliament relieve the company? It is very easy for me to answer. Remember when the provincial statute was passed there was nothing that prevented its enforcement. This parliament ratified the agreement, but at the same time reserved the right afterwards to come along and fix rates itself. The statute reserving this right is chapter 53 of the statutes of 1901. This parliament ratified the agreement. It did not need to ratify it in so far as the contract was concerned for the fixing of rates; there were other things, though, that had to have ratification to make the agreement binding. And in ratifying the agreement in toto parliament said "Nothing herein contained shall prevent the right of this parliament by commission or otherwise later on to fix rates itself." The clause I refer to is subsection 1 of section 3 of the statute.

Unless this parliament came along and itself got in between the railway company and the legislature of Manitoba and forbade the legislature to enforce its right, the legislature could do so. But parliament did come along and forbid the legislature to take action when it established the Railway Commission in 1903. Manitoba did not complain. Why? Because the Railway Commission did not establish rates higher than those that had been fixed by the province. The province had fixed rates in pursuance of this agreement in 1901 and right from the first day, the first of April of that year, the rates which the province fixed were

in force, showing that the province had a perfect right to contract so to do. The province of Manitoba got the benefit of those rates, having given consideration for them.

This parliament came along in 1903 and put the Railway Commission in a position, if it chose, to override those rates. The Railway Commission did not do so, but now it comes along and does override those rates. It exercises its power and steps in between the legislature of Manitoba and the Canadian Northern Railway Company and denies the right to the Government of Manitoba to enforce the contract that it made with the Canadian Northern Railway Company. Very well, if an agreement with the Crowsnest Pass Railway is an agreement, here is an agreement too. If one agreement is not to be swept away, why sweep away the other?

Mr. CAHILL: Because the company is swept away in one case.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, the company is in existence to-day in exactly the same corporate position that it was in in 1901.

Mr. BROWN: It would follow then from all that has been said that the province itself has no power to enforce rates under the old agreement without the consent of this House?

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is right.

Mr. BROWN: Very well. That is not the position taken by many in Manitoba, including some of the right hon. gentleman's friends.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is the position I understand to be the law. I do not know of any who take a different position. What is the position taken?

Mr. BROWN: If I mistake not, a campaign has been carried on in some quarters promising that certain individuals would restore the rates in Manitoba, and contending that the legislature has power to do so irrespective of the authority of this House.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh, I think my hon. friend is misinformed. I do not think anyone would argue seriously that this parliament, in respect of Dominion railways that are works for the general advantage of Canada, cannot fix rates or establish a tribunal to fix rates over and above and operating beyond the contract of the province of Manitoba. Now, the province of Manitoba did not complain so long as this parliament did not in any way fasten chains upon the tribunal that fixes rates. But when this parliament, on the advice of this government, fastens chains on the tribunal and prevents them from making rates that they believe to be equitable, then the

province of Manitoba is denied justice and is on good ground in calling upon the government to restore its rights as well under the 1901 agreement. I would like to know what the fault is with that reasoning. Because, this parliament, on the advice of this government, establishes fixed rates for wheat flour and grain westward, no matter what the Railway Commission should think would be fair, the province of Manitoba to-day is paying beyond the rates that would have been fixed and were fixed under the contract of 1901.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Were these rates not fixed by the parliament of Canada long before this government had anything to do with it?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No; the Prime Minister has not followed me either. Not at all; the government of Manitoba fixed the rates. The hon. Prime Minister will remember it put wheat down to 10 cents, subsequently to 11 cents—that is, wheat out of Manitoba to Fort William. About three years afterwards the Railway Commission was established. That body was then given power to step in and fix rates irrespective of that contract. But the Railway Commission, exercising that power, did not disturb the rates fixed by the Manitoba government, not until in 1917. That was the only time that there would be any reason to do it. But in 1917, it was made free to fix all rates irrespective of all agreements, on an equitable basis, all round. In 1917 this parliament, wiping aside the Crowsnest and all agreements, effectively stepped in and prevented the province of Manitoba from executing its contract with the Canadian Northern Railway Company. The province of Manitoba submitted as long as the tribunal was a tribunal unrestrained by the arbitrary acts of this parliament, but when this parliament restores another agreement and thereby prevents the commission from getting back to the old Manitoba rates as soon as it otherwise would, Manitoba has just ground for complaint and has a right to come to this government and say, "Restore our agreement too."

So much for the Manitoba agreement. Manitoba is not alone in this matter; other provinces have rights as well. But before I come to them, does anyone seriously argue that the act of last session was based upon any other consideration than that this government—to put it on the very highest plane—this government and this parliament thought that the old Crowsnest pass rates were as high as the western provinces could stand? Now, that is the highest plane you can put it on. I am not saying they were not; that is not the point. When this parliament seeks to justify its conduct on the basis of the old Crowsnest pass agreement, that is the time this parliament takes a stand there is no defence for whatever. The old Crowsnest pass agreement, if it was an agreement, stood, and its integrity should never have been invaded. That is to say, if the fact of the agreement was to be a rock upon which we stood, then let the agreement remain a fact; do not tear it to pieces and then pretend there is a certain sanctity about what remains. Could any humbug be more manifest? That is what parliament did. But more: If this parliament felt that, no matter what the Railway Commission might think to be fair in the light of the circumstances in the Maritime provinces, in Quebec and in every part of this Dominion—if this parliament felt in the face of the serious conditions in the West that no higher rates could be paid—and that is the best footing upon which we could possibly put our conduct—then the duty of this parliament was to leave the Commission free, but to give power to the government of Canada to pay a part of these rates out of the public treasury. Would that not have been the straightforward conduct? It is what should have been done. If this government felt and this parliament felt—let me repeat—that the rates of the old Crowsnest pass agreement were the highest that could be paid if the West was to be saved from paralysis, they should not on that account have tied the hands of the commission; they should have let the commission do what they felt was fair having regard to all parts of this country. They should have left the Railway Commission a real tribunal with power to exercise its functions and then paid —as it could easily have done with the authority of this parliament—the extra freight out of the treasury of the Dominion. Very well, they took the other stand. They said definitely: "We are going to fix rates on wheat flour and grain going eastward, and we are going to do it even though it should be the opinion of the Railway Commission that such rates are inequitable having regard to the rights of other parts of this country in respect of freights." What was the result? One result which has been depicted in the strong speech this afternoon of the hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Clark)—the discrimination that all along had existed, justifiably or not justifiably, against the western passage out of the prairie provinces, was accentuated and duplicated by the conduct of this government and this parliament.

Ever since the Canadian Pacific railway was built, British Columbia has laboured

under a discriminatory rate, always justified by the argument that British Columbia was a mountain province and that because of the grade of the railway and the cost of construction—chiefly because of the heavy grade over the mountains—it was only reasonable that a higher rate should be paid. The discrimination has existed all along. There were those who felt it should never have existed. There were those who ever since the Canadian Pacific was built have taken the stand propounded by the hon. member for Burrard this afternoon, who have argued with very much force that when this country undertook to build a railway through those mountains it undertook that the whole of that burden should be the burden of the Dominion of Canada, that no special part of it would be levied on British Columbia alone, and that when you fix extra rates over the mountain section you do impose a certain special part of the burden on the mountain province. There is great force in that argument, but it was resisted—resisted by the Special Committee of the Privy Council, and resisted afterwards by the Railway Commission, both of whom held that a certain amount of differential was justified. Rightly or wrongly, that view prevailed. But the condition against which British Columbia complained has been aggravated because this parliament came in and fixed special rates eastward and said nothing about rates westward. The differential against the westward rate is much greater than it was before. I want to know how the government justifies that. What answer have they to the hon. member for Burrard? What right has this parliament to come in and to magnify the differential under which British Columbia has laboured all these years? Now, let this debate proceed and let us listen carefully for the answer of the government to this contention. British Columbia has a grievance against this administration. British Columbia has been done a grave injustice; other parts of the Dominion have too, and the government cannot expect to be regarded as anything except a tribunal before which they all can come and demand redress at its hands If they had kept out of the jurisdiction that we stepped from in 1903, then they could maintain their position; but they did not keep out. They thought they would get in and get credit for reducing the rates on certain wheat and flour; they thought they would like to be called the party of low freight rates. All right; I say to them now: Be the party of low freights.

I say to this government: Come to British Columbia. Come to British Columbia and at least remove the extra differential you put against that province. Come to Manitoba and restore the rates you prevented Manitoba enforcing for the last fifteen years. Why don't you do it? Come to the Maritime provinces and listen to their complaint against the freight rates under which they labour. You cannot say you have nothing to do with it. You have already done with it. You went into two provinces and for one reason and one reason only, because you wanted votes in this House, for that reason and that alone, you went into two provinces and fixed rates below what the Railway Commission would do, and in that fact you imposed upon other parts of this country served by the railways, burdens that their people had no right to bear at all; you destroyed wholly the position upon which the government of Canada has stood for the last twenty years, that the matter of railway rates and railway control was for the Railway Commission alone.

Now the government is in the position of sheltering itself behind an agreement the integrity of which they claim is important. The shallowness of such position really hardly admits of serious argument. The idea of one party arguing that an agreement into which it entered is sacred and cannot be broken when the other party is at its door asking to be relieved! How foolish that is! The government cannot stand on such paltry talk at all. It cannot stand on it first of all because by the very Railway Act it broke down every other previous agreement. It cannot stand on it, secondly, because that very agreement they themselves took in their hands and tore to ribbons at the moment they were applauding its integrity. So I say, answer to the demand of British Columbia. Answer to the demand of Manitoba. Answer to the demand of the Maritime provinces. What you are ready to do for one part, be ready to do for all. That is the demand of this resolution. Pass this resolution, and the government must answer these demands, and there is no one who voted for the invasion of the jurisdiction of the Railway Commission who has any excuse at all for his vote against this resolution. And this government won't be through merely by voting it down.

Oh, we are told, the government is in the position of a judicial body, and they will be prejudicing the case if they vote on this resolution. They say: Inasmuch as we as a government must decide the appeal of the province of British Columbia against the judgment of the Railway Commission, inasmuch as we have to decide that, you should not bring the matter up in parliament at all until we are through. I would like to ask, what is

the use of bringing it up after they are through? After they are through, it is hopeless. I know the government has an appeal to decide. I presume all the evidence has not been heard, but the time for parliament to speak is now. There is no use speaking at any other time. Why, this government has other things to decide besides this. It has to decide what it is going to do about the extension of the rest of the Crowsnest pass agreement, and I presume if we bring that question up hon. gentlemen of the government will say: Oh, please don't bother us with that because we have to decide it later on. There is no use in parliament waiting until the government has decided. The only time parliament can express its opinion is now. Therefore we are expressing it now.

The government members may vote against this resolution because they must decide the appeal. There may be some force in that contention, but there is no force at all to the argument that we should not discuss the subject and press our views on the attention of the government. That is what we are doing to-day and we will continue to press our views, we will continue to press for the government to do for every province what it did for two and we shall do so until the government leaves the proper tribunal intact to exercise its functions as a judicial body should.

Hon. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou): I have heard my right hon. friend on more than one occasion adopt the casuistical tone which he has adopted to-night, and I notice that he resorts to it particularly when railway matters are under discussion. I call to mind with what simulated indignation in 1917, when he was dealing with the railway problem of that time, he undertook to deny that in 1914 when he steered through the House of Commons of that day the legislation that forever fastened on the Canadian people the ownership of the Canadian Northern railway, he had told parliament and the country that the legislation which he was then introducing for the purpose of taking over the stock of that company, involving the security of the Canadian people by way of mortgage, would have this effect, that in case of default the Canadian people could at once take possession of the property. Yet three years afterwards he came to parliament and introduced a bill for the purpose of enabling the Canadian people to take over that property at a valuation to be paid which three years before he had said would be absolutely forfeited in case of default.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the hon. gentleman permit me? I want to make one correction, not because the hon. gentleman particularly has made that statement, but others have. The legislation of 1914 provided that in case of default under the mortgage the government could take over the property upon such terms as parliament provided. Those were the exact words of the statute. When there was default, the government came to parliament to provide the terms upon which we took it over.

Mr. MACDONALD: I have not before me the statute, but I do not need to turn aside from this debate for the purpose of verifying what I say. I well remember, however, my hon. friend's attitude on those two occasions and of myself pointing out in 1917 how the arguments which he had used against the former Solicitor General, the Hon. Mr. Bennett, in 1914, had come home to roost.

You would think, Mr. Speaker, to hear my right hon. friend that we were discussing the question as to whether we should have passed the Crowsnest pass legislation last year. That has been the burden of his song. He has made his speech just one year too late. Why did he not when the report of the committee came before parliament last year stand up and say then in the same vehement tones the words he has used tonight? Why question to-night the action of the government in submitting that proposition to parliament a year ago?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did.

Mr. MACDONALD: But the right hon. gentleman did not do so. On the contrary. Let me call attention to the resolution which my right hon. friend's first lieutenant has moved, and to the resolution which my right hon. friend supported last year. What was that resolution?

That while the Board of Railway Commissioners remains as it is now a tribunal constituted by parliament to fix railway rates without discrimination and in accordance with changing conditions and to meet the needs of the country as a whole, it should be left free—

Mr. MEIGHEN: Hear, hear.

Mr. MACDONALD (Reading):

—it should be left free to perform such duty—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. MACDONALD: My hon. friends are applauding too soon.

—without dictation from this House and subject only to review by the Governor in Council as in the Railway Act provided.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Hear, hear.

Mr. MACDONALD: Yet my right hon. friend to-day puts up his lieutenant from British Columbia to say that that resolution last year was all tommyrot.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MACDONALD: His lieutenant places on the order paper a resolution which says that notwithstanding the Board of Railway Commissioners, nothwithstanding the statute that deals with the railways of this country and that permitted the commission to deal with rates absolutely with the exception of certain special cases, that we should come in here and undertake to interfere and disregard the Railway Commission altogether. It is an absolute change of policy. Last year it was, leave everything to the commission. This year, play politics for British Columbia and leave nothing to the commission. That is the position my right hon. friend stands in to-day.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If he will accept now our resolution of last year, that is quite satisfactory to us.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): My right hon. friend is at his old game; he knows the value of consistency too well. My right hon. friend is in this position: Last year he solemnly asked this parliament to commit itself to the proposition that there should be no intereference with the Railway Commission. This year he puts his lieutenant up to ask us to absolutely interfere with and disregard the Railway Commission.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Because you did last year.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Oh, because we did last year? Why, my right hon. friend has been talking for the last two years, day in and day out, about consistency to the extent of even excluding any of his followers from talking about it. Now we have a wonderful exhibition. The changed condition of my right hon. friend is a wonderful exhibition of consistency: Leave everything to the Railway Commission last year; leave nothing to it this year. That is where my right hon. friend stands. What does the resolution mean? My hon friend from Burrard (Mr. Clark) had a resolution on the order paper all during the session to this effect:

That, in the opinion of this House, railway rates westward from the prairie provinces should be reduced to an equality with railway rates eastward from said provinces for similar goods and distances.

Nothing about the Crowsnest pass agreement there; but in order to carry out the policy of my right hon. friend that there should be no interference with the Railway Commission the hon. member for Burrard, in amendment to a motion to go into supply, moves a resolution which declares that what is known as the "mountain scale" of railway rates in British Columbia should be removed, and secondly that the Crowsnest pass railway rates on grain and flour should be made applicable to the whole of Canada.

Mr. HANSON: That is not the resolution.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I am quoting from the resolution which my hon. friend from Burrard sent to the Acting Minister of Railways.

An hon. MEMBER: That is not the resolution.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): In terms it is. At any rate I will quote the other resolution. The one which I have just read deals with two subjects. The second resolution is thus worded:

That, in the opinion of this House all unfair and unjust discrimination against British Columbia, as exemplified in the "mountain scale" of freight rates should be rescinded—

Practically the same thing, only a change of language—

—and the special reduction made by the restoration of the Crowsnest pass rates on the basic productions of the prairie provinces be extended to the basic productions of all other provinces of confederation.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Hear, hear.

Mr. MACDONALD: My hon. friend for Burrard consulted somebody between twelve o'clock this morning and three o'clock this afternoon. The resolution I first read was the resolution which was sent by the hon. member to the Acting Minister of Railways. This is a quick change of policy on the part of this wonderful party. They completely reverse their policy solemnly resolved on last year, which was supported by my hon. friend from West York (Sir Henry Drayton) in a strong argument. All this goes to the winds, and again a policy inaugurated at twelve o'clock in the morning is changed at three o'clock in the afternoon.

The whole burden of my right hon. friend's attack was this: There was something done about the Crowsnest pass rates last year. Because there was something of that kind done you committed a horrible crime, and you now propose to say British Columbia must have her rates dealt with regardless of the Railway Commission or of what the law may be, and we will commit the same crime. That is the policy of my right hon. friend, and he undertook to argue with his usual ingenuity that the provisions of the act of 1897 relating to

what is known as the Crowsnest pass agreement had not been maintained in existence or specially preserved because of the fact that the Railway Commission came into existence. I was very much surprised at my right hon. friend's argument on that point. All he needed to have done was to have turned up the statute passed in 1903 which dealt with the agreements which were to be preserved, and he would have found the provision clearly set forth as follows:

> Unless otherwise expressly provided in this act, where the provisions of this act and of any special act passed by the parliament of Canada relate to the same subject matter the provisions of the special act shall be taken to override the provisions of this act in so far as is necessary to give effect to such special act.

Could there be anything more definite, anything more clear laid down in the statutes —that the provisions of the Crowsnest pass agreement were to override the provisions of the general act relating to railways? I will cite the testimony of a witness on the point (Sir Henry Drayton), a gentleman who has had some experience in regard to railway matters. I would like to call this gentleman as a witness to substantiate the position which I have ventured to take in regard to this matter and also to show how the arguments the right hon. gentleman was advancing this afternoon and evening contrast with those of his desk-mate because that gentleman dealing last year with the question said in this House:

> We have had the very limited rate regulation imposed by this agreement in place of the broad and full regulation given under the Railway Act. The agreement here only has to be considered because under the scheme of the drafting of our general railway act, all the conditions of special acts are made to over-ride the general provisions of the Railway Act and to that extent limit its provisions.

My hon. friend went on to say that it was on account of the provisions of the statute of 1903, which preserved intact the Crowsnest pass agreement that parliament was dealing with that very question. My right hon. friend can turn up the debates of last year and see the arguments of his desk-mate.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think my hon. friend has misunderstood me; I quite agree with that. I know the general provisions in the Railway Act cannot invade the provisions of special acts. I thought I had made that clear.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): My right hon. friend did not say that this afternoon. He was arguing that because the provisions of the Crowsnest pass statute were not preserved this government committed a great wrong last year in infringing upon the powers of the Railway Commission and providing the legislation that parliament passed; and because this government did that my right hon. friend says this year that British Columbia and every other province can come in irrespective of what the law may be to-day. That is my right hon. friend's position; there can be no mistake about that. As a matter of law there can be no doubt that since 1903, since the Act constituting the Railway Commission was passed in this country, under the powers of the commission in regard to freight rates—so far as the territory covered by the Crowsnest pass agreement so-called was concerned—the commission had no power to interefere with the provisions of that special act, and not having any power to deal with the matter parliament had to determine whether or not the provisions of that act should be suspended and if so in what degree. It so decided, as is very well known, and my right hon. friend bases his whole position in favour of this resolution of his colleague upon the fact that we did that last year; we violated some holy law; we infringed upon the powers of the Railway Commission; and that consequently British Columbia can come in and do the same thing although it had no Crowsnest pass agreement.

So also in regard to the Manitoba agreement. My right hon. friend is too good a lawyer not to know that when Manitoba came here with the Canadian Northern Railway Company with an agreement to be ratified in 1901 and submitted to parliament the act they did submit, the conditions which were attached at that time by this parliament to the provisions of that agreement were such as were only fair and proper. Let me say also that if the province of Manitoba and the Canadian Northern Railway Company did not choose to accept those conditions they did not have to come here to get legislation. But they did come, both parties came to an agreement, they accepted those conditions and those conditions were in force from 1903 on. To-day my right hon. friend, after a lapse of twenty years, says that the bond must be broken; that notwithstanding the fact that parliament imposed those conditions twenty years ago we must disregard them because parliament permitted the Crowsnest pass railway rates to come into effect last year. That is my right hon. friend's position when you analyze it. I would like to remind my hon. friend for Burrard in regard to his claim that British Columbia lost its control over C.N.R. rates by the action of this parliament and that the person who took away from that province its right to interfere with rates was

the right hon. gentleman who is his leader. So that is the situation in which the hon. gentlemen opposite stand in regard to the matter.

Where do we stand on the whole question? The province of British Columbia has not the Crowsnest pass agreement to protect it. She stands like all the other provinces of the Dominion, subject to the provisions of the general Railway Act which deals with the way in which freight rates shall be fixed in this country, and the method by which they should be fixed, as parliament knows, is to go to the Railway Commission, and thence by appeal from that Railway Commission to the Privy Council. Let me remind hon. members what took place, Mr. Speaker. The British Columbia government, speaking through their Attorney General, and speaking formally for the people of that province, petitioned the Railway Commission, under the provisions of the act, and asked them to take up this question. The people of British Columbia went to the tribunal, but I fear—although I do not want to charge any bad faith—that my hon. friends have come here not so much with the idea of coming to a proper tribunal, but with the idea of making a little political gain out of it. That is so plain, in view of the situation, that there can be no answer to it. What occurred? The Railway Commission dealt with this matter fully and completely and delivered judgment on the 30th June, 1922. Then they came to the Privy Council of Canada, and they came in these terms:

> The petitioner the Attorney General of the province of British Columbia, acting on behalf of the province of British Columbia, hereby appeals, by way of petition under section 52 of the Railway Act of Canada and asks that that order be varied, and in part rescinded.

They set out twenty-two grounds upon which it should be varied or in part rescinded, and those grounds involved questions of law and fact. They involved the constitutional question whether the terms of union with British Columbia should be carried out, and various other suggestions as to the effect and the weight of evidence, and as to the law which should be applied in dealing with this matter, which inevitably involves the exercise of judicial discretion by the tribunal before which they came. Let me say, however, with the greatest respect for the decision you arrived at, Mr. Speaker, as to whether this motion was in order that I regard the functions which the Privy Council have to perform as being purely judicial. It is well settled law in this country that the king is present in the Privy Council and we inherit by precedent all the powers which the Imperial Privy Council have exercised. The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council was a development in Britain from original powers of the Imperial Privy Council and it was specially created for the purpose of dealing with questions of appeals to the council. My hon. friend may laugh at my argument, but I want to say to him that I would be very glad if it were necessary for the purpose of dealing with this question to discuss that matter at length. I could suggest to him some authorities which he has perhaps forgotten. However I do not want to be dragged into a question of that kind.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think you had better.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): The provisions of the statute, and all matters that can be determined upon the appeal by the Privy Council, are of such a character that they demand the closest possible attention and a great amount of research, and the approaching of the consideration of the matter with those feelings with which any judge should be animated in endeavouring to do that which was fair, proper and right in the interests of the whole country. My hon. friend the former chairman of the Railway Commission last year pointed out the danger of any tribunal or any body attempting to deal with the question of railway freight rates without the fullest inquiry, with special reference to the costs of railway transportation, and yet his right hon. leader had the temerity to come to this House and, after an afternoon's debate, without any investigation, on a short statement such as we have been given here, to say that the Railway Commission did not know what they were talking about, that the whole rate question should be decided in this discussion. I believe that the right thinking people of British Columbia and Canada generally will be prepared to wait for that full and complete investigation which the Privy Council of this country will give to this appeal. It is conceded that this question was adjourned until after the session when it will be dealt with, as agreed with the petitioner the Attorney General of British Columbia, who is the legally constituted representative of the province for the purpose of instituting legal proceedings. And the government will approach the consideration of this matter with absolutely open and fair minds with the desire of doing that which is in the best interests of Canada as a whole.

Hon. H. H. STEVENS (Vancouver Centre): The resolution before the House has two parts to it; one part refers specifically to a

longstanding grievance of a province and asks for a statement or declaration by parliament that this grievance be removed. The second portion of the resolution asks parliament to declare that a certain action taken last year, giving certain advantages to a section of the country, should be extended to the whole of Canada. It has been held from time immemorial, as declared, Sir, by your ruling this afternoon, that the time for the people of the realm to submit their grievances to parliament and for parliament to hear and consider those grievances is when the motion is made for the House to go into Committee of Supply.

We have just listened for a very short time to the new minister without portfolio (Mr. Macdonald, Pictou). I take this occasion, the first I have had, of publicly congratulating my hon. friend upon having at last attained a longstanding ambition. Nevertheless, I want to say to him, as an old friend and associate in this House, that he scarcely did himself justice in the very brief but laboured argument which he has just concluded. I shall not deal with it more than for a few moments. First, I will remind him that it ill behooves the kettle to call the pot black. He rather twitted my right hon. leader (Mr. Meighen) with inconsistency. With that I will deal in a moment, but I would remind the hon. member that last year, in the special Railway Committee having this question under consideration, he fought day in and day out, and night in and night out, away into the wee sma' hours of the morning on one occasion at least, for a certain position that he had maintained, with a few others in his party and with some on the other side of the House, and supported a resolution in that committee for the continued suspension of the Crowsnest pass agreement. It was stated through the House and the corridors that if he did not have his way there was going to be an upheaval amongst the supporters of the government, and there was, at least, a miniature revolt. Now he comes before the House to-day and puts up, as I have already said, an argument scarcely befitting his ability and experience in this House in support of the weak position the government find themselves in.

Before leaving my hon. friend's remarks, let me refer to what he said regarding my right hon. leader. He attempted to show that the right hon. gentleman this year is inconsistent with his position last year. Last year we stood behind the right hon. gentleman and declared ourselves in the form of an amendment to the resolution, and we stood behind this principle: That the Railway Commission, the properly constituted body, should be the body to determine railway rates. We stood there then, and we stand there to-night. But, Mr. Speaker, parliament, under the leadership, if not under the dictatorship of the government, departed from that principle, abandoned that position and arbitrarily fixed rates in defiance of law, or, at least, what was law previous to that, in defiance of this acknowledged principle and in absolute defiance of the Railway Commission and its long recognized power. That is the answer to my hon. friend. Now we come to parliament to-day and we say this —and I shall risk wearying the House by reiteration of what I have already said— "Restore untrammelled, unhampered and free, the jurisdiction of the Railway Board", or if you will not do that then we say, "Extend this rate-fixing power that you exercised last year to adjust grievances that we claim exist". There is a reason for that. I invite the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) particularly to give consideration to this reason.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Where does my hon. friend find the first point he has just mentioned? He says to restore the power to the commission. Where is that in the amendment before the House?

Mr. STEVENS: We do not say so.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend said so this minute.

Mr. STEVENS: We do not say so in the amendment; but my right hon. leader stated in his speech a few minutes ago: "Undertake to restore the complete jurisdiction of the Railway Board, and we will withdraw the amendment."

Mr. CAHILL: It was ever thus.

Mr. STEVENS: The hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Cahill) interjected a remark in an Irish whisper. I did not quite catch it. I was going to say, when I was interrupted, that we have reason to appeal to my right hon. friend. I intend to deal with this matter as broadly as possible, but for the moment I intend to localize my argument. We in British Columbia had this matter before the Railway Board, not for days but for weeks and months. I understand the provincial government spent something over $50,000 in collecting data and in building up its case. That case was before the Railway Board; but we could not get a decision; we were denied a decision, and why? We were denied a decision because the Railway Board were awaiting the action of this government through its committee and its influence on parliament. As a result of the effect of the action of the government, through its

members on the committee, and resulting in the action of parliament in the legislation to which we refer, what occurred? I ask my hon. friends, and particularly the Prime Minister, to follow this. If I had under my hand the decision of the Railway Board, I could read it; but it has already been read, and I am sure my word will not be disputed. In the official judgment of the Railway Commission delivered subsequently, they cite the figures submitted to them by the Canadian Pacific Railway traffic expert, Mr. Lanigan. What are the figures? They are an estimate of the losses resulting from the action of parliament. I want the House to get this. Upon ascertaining what that loss was, the Railway Board go on and give their decision. What is their decision? Their decision was based upon that loss; that is, they lowered the freight rates to a certain degree; but they said: "Because of the action of parliament in arbitrarily fixing the rates on the Crowsnest pass agreement, we can reduce rates only so much." Let us reverse the situation. Had parliament not acted at all in rate fixing, the Railway Commission would have given an altogether different decision as regards the case of British Columbia. They say that we have no grievance. Then it is stated that we did wrong in coming to parliament. It was parliament, the House of Commons that interfered with the just and fair decision by the Railway Board of our case, and it was because of the delay in parliament, a delay caused by the government, that we could not get a decision from the Railway Board until that delay was removed.

9 p.m.

The Acting Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) this afternoon, instead of complying with our request, instead of arguing the case, after the decision of the Speaker that the matter was properly in order, said that his hands were tied; that he was compelled to be silent, and that he did not dare to debate the question. My hon friend's attitude was not reasonable. In other words, last year they bound the hands of the Railway Board, and to-day the Acting Minister of Railways comes before parliament, and deliberately, voluntarily, shackles himself so that he cannot even discuss this question. We had a most lengthy, detailed ruling by the Speaker, and there is no reason under the sun why the question should not be debated in this House.

I wish to turn to the case itself, and I invite consideration of this problem on as broad and general a basis as I can possibly fix it. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) declared that this was an effort to make party politics. Let me say to him that this whole question was launched by the business men of British Columbia. Over fifty business associations were joined together in the associated boards of trade of that province, and they made their appeal. The Prime Minister received a letter the other day from the Vancouver board, setting forth the terms of this matter. There is no division of political opinion on this question in British Columbia, so far as I have been able to ascertain. The Premier (Mr. Oliver), the government, the boards of trade of British Columbia have all set themselves firmly behind this, as regards that province. What is the problem? I will endeavour to discuss it from the standpoint, not of British Columbia alone, but of Canada. Canada has grown just as a human being grows. In its early days, the strength, population, industry, development of the country were all centred around a circle, Toronto and Montreal, in Ontario and Quebec largely, and in the Maritime provinces. There was practically nothing in the West. I remember when I went West thirty years ago, there was very little there at that time. What happened? Eastern influences, eastern business thrust themselves into the West; transportation thrust itself into the West to take care of the business that developed, and it was perfectly natural that every consideration for freight rates should be based upon that movement of trade from the eastern part of Canada westward. As far as I have been able to learn, in the fixation of rates there has never been any scientific basis; rates on commodities have been fixed most unreasonably and illogically. Yet this was done for what reason? Generally speaking, in the interests of the development of the country, as I frankly admit. But as the country grew and developed, as the western part of Canada settled down, the Panama canal was opened, and an entirely new situation arose. It is about time that Canada recognized the economic effect upon this country of the Panama canal. For years the railway transportation system of the United States resisted the construction of the Panama canal and objected to it bitterly. Why? Because the United States transportation system had been developed exactly as ours was later—thrust from the east into the west. All rates, all movements, all centres of industry and organization were based upon that distribution from the east to the west. But they have abandoned that policy, with the result that they have established a new system, that is, a distribution from the two seaboards

inland. That is the result of the opening of the Panama canal. We have a situation very much the same only less accentuated.

Now then, is it possible for Canada to develop its transportation along any logical or reasonable lines? I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it is. First, I would suggest to the House that we ought to take full advantage of our geographical position. What is that position? I want to impress upon hon. members that we are in a wonderfully advantageous position geographically, having in mind the new world that has been coming into being during the last few years—that really we might say, is just being born. In the last three years we have had a more rapid development of trans-Pacific trade than in the previous thirty years, I think I am safe in saying. On the Asiatic continent there is an opening up of trade that perhaps was not dreamed of ten years ago. There is a movement of traffic from Europe across this continent to Asia exceeding anything we have ever experienced in the past. Where do we find ourselves? We are on the highway between this new growing market in the Orient and Europe. And the part Canada ought to play in this transportation system is not only to develop its transcontinental business, but also to develop its distribution from the two seaboards inland, and, further, to develop this trans-Pacific business. By so doing we shall take advantage of our geographical position. We have the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence route—I refer to this in passing, not for the purpose of injecting it into this debate—and everything that we can possibly do to make that great waterway into the very heart of Canada a highly developed and valuable instrument of trade ought to be done. But I say to this House equally as vigorously that everything possible should be done to give to the centre of Canada—I speak as from the Great Lakes west and from the Pacific coast east into that great inland district, the vast agricultural plains of this country—free and untrammelled access to the seaboard in either direction.

Now, all we ask is fair and equitable treatment. So far as British Columbia is concerned we are not seeking any advantage over the rest of Canada; but we submit that we are entitled to fair and equitable treatment. My hon. friend for Burrard (Mr. Clark) made the statement this afternoon that the Railway Commission fixed the rates through British Columbia. How? On a ratio of one to one and a half. That may not sound very significant, but, as he pointed out, it means that for a given number of dollars you can go three hundred miles east of our boundary to two hundred miles that we can haul the same freight in our territory. It is an arbitrary arrangement. The Railway Commission gives no specific reasons for its action, it just simply says, "We will fix that ratio." That is what is known as the "mountain scale." I am going to deal with it very briefly.

I would ask the House to listen to me carefully at this point because I wish to make it quite clear. The argument is advanced that the excessive cost of the Canadian Pacific Railway over the Rocky mountains is accountable for this "mountain scale" or excessive charge. Let me state a simple fact; it will not require argument to emphasize its significance. Up to a few years ago, I think 1908 or thereabouts, a shipper in Montreal could ship a carload of merchandise—I care not what it might be—2,400 miles to the town of Golden, B.C., for exactly the same freight rate as a shipper in Vancouver could ship a similar carload 450 miles to the same point. Was that discrimination? It is true that that disparity has been lessened and we now can get farther eastward. But I want to make this point not so much to show the excessive discrimination as to answer the argument that the cost of the mountain construction was the reason. Here is my answer. I included in the 2,400 miles that the Montreal merchant shipped his goods was what is known as the Big hill; in other words Golden is west of the Rocky mountains. The mountain haul was included in the eastern end of the system. I am going to repeat that. You could ship a carload of freight from Montreal 2,400 miles westward over the Rocky mountains, that is, including the mountain haul, for the same freight rate that was charged you for shipping a carload of merchandise of equal weight 450 miles from the coast to Golden. That answer cannot be refuted as far as basing this mountain differential on the high cost of construction in the Rocky mountains is concerned. I might further inform the House that the two spiral tunnels—not then there, they have been constructed since—but the big Field hill, which I think had a 5½ or a 6 per cent grade, was included in the long end of that haul, that is, on the Montreal end. It is an absolute answer, Mr. Speaker, to the argument in support of the mountain differential. I assert that that differential is a purely arbitrary differential and should never have been imposed.

Another argument advanced is this: Why should the Railway Board—as is evidenced in the judgment referred to by my hon. friend for Burrard this afternoon—base its decision on Canadian Pacific Railway figures or facts; why should they be the determining factor? Why should they not take the Canadian Northern Railway cost of construction? Or

let me put it another way: If they are going to take the Canadian Pacific Railway cost of construction through the mountains—

Mr. FORKE: If I may interrupt my hon. friend? I could not help remembering some of his arguments in the Transportation Costs Committee last year on this same subject.

Mr. STEVENS: The Transportation Costs Committee? What committee is that? I have great regard for my hon. friend and do not want to make him look ridiculous, but I am afraid he is tempting me seriously. I was not on that committee.

Mr. FORKE: Perhaps it was in the House. But I remember hearing the hon. member's arguments at the time, and I think I can find them in Hansard.

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend will have difficulty in doing so, for I did not speak in the House on that subject. I will tell him why. I am glad my hon. friend has brought this up because it gives me an opportunity of explaining my silence. When this question came up in the House—and I am going to revert to my argument later nevertheless—Premier Oliver's counsel, Mr. McGeer was in the city. I had him come to my room and discussed with him the advisability of myself and others taking this position on the report of the committee coming before the House. He advised us not to. He said, "Our case is before the Railway Board, and we are well pleased to have it there. We expect a reasonable and fair decision, but if you people of the opposition take it up you will prejudice our case." We refrained therefore from taking any action. Where is my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald)? Was that political trickery, Mr. Speaker? We did not say a word. And what happened? The result was—well, I was going to use a term that perhaps is not quite parliamentary—but we lost an advantage because we tried to play the game above board. We lost an advantage—we lost a political advantage. And furthermore, we got what I shall not describe as unfair treatment, but we did not get anything like what we expected in the way of treatment in connection with freight rates.

Mr. FORKE: I want to be fair to the hon. member. My memory may have played me false; the argument was so familiar to me that I admit I may have made the mistake.

Mr. HANSON: It was the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) that you had in mind.

[Mr. Stevens.]

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend has been mistaken twice; if he wants to try it again, I will give him an opportunity.

Mr. FORKE: Thank you.

Mr. STEVENS: I have no reason to hide anything, and I certainly cannot recall any such remarks as he has suggested. As a matter of fact I have always taken the stand, and I take it to-night, that this is the business of the Railway Commission, but now that the rights of the Railway Commission have been invaded, we are going to claim the protection of this House.

Let me come back to my argument, if I may be permitted to do so. If you are going to take the Canadian Pacific Railway as the standard or the basis or the determining factor in the matter of freight rates in the mountain section because its cost of operation is the highest and because the load to be carried is the smallest—if that is to be the basis, why not apply the same principle in respect to other centres of Canada? Why not apply it in the case of the National Transcontinental in eastern Canada, which unquestionably has a higher operating cost as related to traffic than that which applies to the congested area of the old Grand Trunk system? But that is not done. So I say that the action taken in this case is an arbitrary act which is not based upon any logical or reasonable argument. The National Transcontinental have a water grade from the mountains giving the people of the interior of Canada, western Saskatchewan and Alberta, access to the sea—and when I say access to the sea I refer to something more than the eastward movement of grain. During the last six months we have handled for the Orient 3,000,000 bushels of wheat. I would like the House to appreciate the significance of that. That is not wheat stolen from Fort William for the advantage of other ports; it is not diverted traffic; it is the development of a new market. Besides the 3,000,000 bushels actually handled in that period, about 2,000,000 are in prospect or are on order. That is an evidence of the necessity of recognizing the right—and this is my chief point—of the shipper in the interior to get to the seaboard on equal terms with other parts of Canada. May I pause to make this assertion—and I do not think even my good friend for Brandon, the leader of the Progressives (Mr. Forke) will dispute it: the main problem of Canada to-day, the greatest difficulty facing my hon. friends to my left in their dilemma in the West, is the transportation question. Their difficulty—let me put it a little differently—is the excessive cost of

moving a product from the heart of Canada to its ultimate market, either in the Orient or in Europe. I had some figures here bearing on that point, but I will not weary the House with them. It is enlightening, however, to note that for the movement of grain from Edmonton to Fort William, a distance of 1,280 miles, it costs 15½ cents a bushel, while for the movement from Edmonton to Vancouver, 620 miles, or half the distance, it is 15 cents a bushel, or approximately the same. Do my hon. friends not see—I know they do—that if they had as fair and equitable a rate westward as they have eastward, there would be 7½ cents a bushel at once which would be coming to them? Mr. Speaker, that means the difference between success and failure, and they know it.

Let us look at the question from a slightly different angle. As the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Hoey) pointed out so eloquently a few weeks ago, you may have a measure of prosperity around, we will say, the province of Manitoba, because they have only a few hundred miles to go to reach the head of the lakes. But by every hundred miles a farm is further removed from the head of the lakes, the cost of transportation is increased and the value of the wheat to the farmer is lowered. So that when you get away up to Edmonton, the return to the farmer is very much reduced. Why, then, should he not have that outlet to the Pacific coast that it would be to his advantage to have?

I wish to turn for a moment to the letter of Mr. Carvell, the Chairman of the Railway Board, I want to preface my remarks in this connection by saying that I do not join with anyone in reflecting upon Mr. Carvell in any way; I have nothing to say on that point at all. But he makes two statements to which I wish to refer. I have already referred to one—he says it is a political move, and in that respect he concurs with the hon. member for Pictou. I want to say that it is not a political move—unless it is a political move by Mr. Oliver, and I have not said it is. There is no difference of opinion on the subject; it is like the oriental question—we are all heartily agreed upon it. However, because Mr. Carvell says it is a political move, are we to be spanked; are we to be punished as a naughty child, and are the farmers of Alberta to suffer, are the merchants of the British Columbia Pacific ports to suffer? Are they not to have the privileges that other sections of Canada have, simply because someone thinks we should be spanked or punished for doing something that is not quite right? But that is not the point to which I wish chiefly to refer. In his letter Mr. Carvell says that the basis of the rate question is the cost of transportation. I think I have dealt with that pretty fully, I have tried to show the House that the cost of transportation is not the factor in the fixing of a rate; an arbitrary method is taken to determine it. In connection with the cost of transportation you have the question of density of traffic. If you have 100 trains a month you can haul that much cheaper than if you have only 25 or 30 trains a month. It has been stated in my hearing that there should not be this lowering of the rates, because the result would be the movement of more cars westward and the hauling back of empties. As a matter of fact, last year and the year before and the year before that the Canadian Pacific Railway hauled thousands of empty cars westward to bring back the merchandise that came in for distribution, to take care of the haulage of lumber, and so on. They hauled these empty cars westward; would it not have been better to send them down loaded with wheat at a slightly lower freight rate, especially if in giving that freight rate no injury was done to any other part of the country? I may say that I sent out for some figures that would verify what I said a moment ago regarding the cost of moving wheat from Edmonton to Fort William and from Edmonton to the coast, and they have now come to hand. I think, however, I have quoted them sufficiently.

I have in my hand an editorial from the Montreal Gazette of March 14, 1923. I want to say that I have always had a very high regard for the Gazette. My hon. friends opposite will say: Of course you have, because you are a good loyal supporter of the Tory party. But that does not necessarily follow unanimously in recent months. However, I do have a very high regard for that journal, and its editorials ought to be given consideration. When it speaks, it speaks with some degree of knowledge and authority. The Montreal Gazette makes three statements to which I wish to refer briefly. I do not refer to them with malice. I refer to them because if they are answered, I think it will largely meet the arguments from many other sources.

They charge British Columbia with this. They call it "British Columbia's Ambitions: (1) To wrest authority from the Railway Commission and transfer it to Parliament." That has been pretty well covered already. My right hon. friend the leader of the government shakes his head, but I think it has been pretty well covered. I would like if it were possible to make that point clearer. I

have referred to it I think three times, and I have referred to it with absolute honesty of purpose so far as I am concerned. There is no desire so far as we are concerned, to place in the hands of parliament the control of rates, but parliament having taken control of rates in some sections to the prejudice of others, then I submit that parliament is called upon to exercise that function in regard to these other cases. I repeat what we offered a moment ago; I repeat it to the Gazette and to all they speak for. Let parliament withdraw from the field; let parliament rescind its action of last year, and we will readily abandon this position and leave the matter to the Railway Board. That is all I think I have to say in regard to that.

Then they say next: "(2) to secure a transportation advantage for British Columbia at the expense of the other provinces." I think I have shown already that that is not the case. I repeat, we are asking no advantage over any other section of Canada, but we resent and we resist, and have done so for twenty-five years, the imposition of penalties upon transportation in British Columbia. That is what we resist. We say: Remove these impositions from us; place us on an equal basis with other sections of Canada, and we have no complaint whatsoever. Mr. Speaker, do not let this House think for a moment that we are just bringing this question up tonight. I insisted on bringing it up in 1912 and again in 1914. It has been brought forward half a dozen times, but we have not been able to persuade the board to meet us and largely because of the policy—shall I say?—largely because of the method by which rates have been fixed from time immemorial in this country, namely having regard to the things established during the growth of this country, and disregarding the effect of the Panama canal and the necessity for changing the basis of our consideration of the question.

In the third place the Montreal Gazette says: " to assert a dangerous political and sectional interference with the Canadian National Railway." That is a pretty serious thing. I answer that with a repetition of what I have already said: Is it fair to take the Canadian Pacific Railway with its expensive cost of movement of freight, its high operating cost, or to take the Canadian Natioial Railway with its best grade? Let me put it differently. Surely we can approach these problems from an economic standpoint. That I know will appeal to my hon. friends to my left, if it does not to the government. Is it not sound business, is it not common right, to base your legislation and your executive action upon that which is the cheapest and the lowest cost to the country? Is not that sound? Is it not good business for any section of the country to seek to move its commerce over that route which is the easiest from the standpoint of physical operation? If that is a crime then this charge or statement of the Montreal Gazette is correct. But I submit with all due deference to the strength and influence of that journal, that the case is not proven against us at all. We ask for the Canadian National Railway to be the basis, rather than the Canadian Pacific Railway, through the mountains, because it is the best and the most economical route.

I wish to conclude my remarks with just a brief summary of these facts and arguments.

We ask for consideration because under the general terms of confederation it was never considered that one section of Canada should be discriminated against by other sections. It was never intended under the terms of confederation that a customs duty, for instance, should be imposed by one province as against another. And what is the difference between the imposition of a customs duty and the arbitrary imposition of excess freight rates superimposed on the normal rate? Tell me that. If you move one hundred pounds of merchandise four hundred miles, and it is met at the boundary with a customs duty, that is an imposition of some kind. If you charge an excess rate of freight on that, amounting, we will say, to fifty cents per hundred over and above the rate charged in other sections, that is equally an imposition. So I say that confederation never contemplated the imposition of penalties on one section of the country as against another.

Then I make appeal briefly on the British Columbia government agreement with the Canadian Northern Railway. I do not make a very strong appeal on that ground, but it ought to be considered. They did guarantee those bonds. They did get control of the freight rates. It was taken from them by an act of this parliament, and I submit that consideration ought to be given to British Columbia just as well as to Manitoba, just as well as to the Crowsnest pass agreement. However, I am not stressing that as the basis of my argument, but I do advance it as a reason.

Then we ought to have the right to the full advantage of our geographical position. That should not be denied us; it should not be denied to any section of Canada. Whatever its geographical advantages may be, any section of the country ought to be allowed to take full advantage of its position. We appeal chiefly on the common ground of justice and for the purpose of promoting the spirit of

unity and tranquillity,—shall I say?—and good feeling throughout the whole of Canada. My right hon. friend the Prime Minister and this House knows that no large section of this country can rest for any great length of time under a grievance, under an injustice, even though that injustice may not be very clearly defined, under a sense of injustice even—I will put it—and still maintain good feeling and unity throughout the country, and every effort ought to be made by the government and by parliament to remove any reason for a feeling of injustice remaining in the minds of the people of any province.

With this summary I ask the government to give serious consideration to this matter—not to treat this resolution as if it was either a want of confidence motion or simply a political dodge, as my hon. friend from Pictou contends, though not I am sure, with the authority of his colleagues. It is nothing of the kind. It is a seriously meant resolution. This matter must be brought to some sort of focus, and we submit it to the government and to parliament with the request that it receive the consideration which is due to it.

Mr. HERBERT MARLER (St. Lawrence-St. George): In rising to oppose this resolution I would like to make it abundantly clear to the House that I do not oppose it from any desire to see any province deprived of any just right. Nor do I oppose it on the ground that I desire to see retained to any corporation, railway or otherwise, any unjust privilege. Nor do I oppose it on the ground that I desire to see one section of the community preferred to another. On none of these grounds do I oppose this resolution; but I do oppose it because, in my opinion, it strikes at the very root of certain legislative enactments of this parliament and threatens the stability which this country is so much in need of at the present time.

It does seem to me, Sir, perfectly useless discussing on the floor of this House the question of freight rates, the question of discrimination, the question as to whether one province is preferred to another, the question whether the mountain scale should or should not be in effect. To my mind it does seem to be useless to do so and why? Simply because we are not competent in this House, constituted as it is, to discuss matters of that description. I doubt, Sir, if there are very many in this House, outside, the member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton) who does understand this most complicated question of freight rates, and who can bring to bear that intelligence which it is absolutely essential to bring to bear in a matter of this description. Therefore, it does not seem to me to be competent to take up this complicated question from the floor of this House. Of course it will be alleged, and it has been urged—and let me in the first part of my argument state only in part what I intend to say later on as regards this particular part of the subject—it has been urged I say that this House did interfere on another occasion with the making of freight rates. Sir, I absolutely deny that statement. The simple denial, I quite admit, is not sufficient and I will elaborate that theory later on. What viewpoint, therefore, should we discuss this question from? We must admit that if this amendment is adopted it must be given the force of law and if given the force of law, this House must of itself interfere in the making of freight rates. Therefore I say the amendment should not be adopted on those lines and this House should not interfere in the making of freight rates. If this House does that it immediately takes out of the hands of the Board of Railway Commissioners all questions as regards the making of these rates. It establishes a precedent; it takes these questions out of the hands of this board which is clothed with most ample powers, which has functioned fairly and equitably in the Dominion, and places the making of railway rates in the melting pot of politics immediately; it places the making of rates—perhaps the most important part of railway management—as I say in the melting pot of politics. Now, if hon. members can view that situation with equanimity I certainly cannot do so, because I do not think that the making of rates should be taken out of the hands of the Board of Railway Commissioners. The situation as brought forward in this amendment does not require a very difficult answer; it demands a simple answer "yes" or "no." If we answer "yes" what do we do? We constitute ourselves into a judicial tribunal to make and unmake rates at will. What will happen if we do? What will happen if we say to this demand of British Columbia "Yes, we will interfere; we will make these rates ourselves". Similar demands are bound to come from other provinces. Another province will come forward at a later date and say "We want relief from certain rates. We want rates fixed in a certain direction." Can we answer "No" to that demand? The reply would immediately come back "You interfered in the case of British Columbia, why not interfere in a matter of this description?"

The question has been stressed to-night, in discussing this amendment, on more than one occasion that last year this House did interfere in the making of freight rates. The statement has been made time and time again that if we did away with what was done last year this resolution might not have been placed before the House; that the government did come forward last year and did interefere in the making of rates. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that that was not the case at all. The government did not come forward of its own volition and change the rates. The government came forward in a perfectly proper way and made an amendment to an act which they were requested to make by the Board of Railway Commissioners.

Mr. HANSON: How do you make that out?

Mr. MARLER: I will follow that up. The Crowsnest pass arrangement, as everybody in this House will remember, was made in 1917 between the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the government of the Dominion.

An hon. Member: In 1897.

Mr. MARLER: I should have said 1897. At that time, in consideration of certain cash subventions amounting to about $4,000,000, the Canadian Pacific agreed that they would make certain fixed rates extending indefinitely on certain commodities. The company carried out that agreement. In fact they extended the agreement not only to the lines primarily affected but also to other parts of their system. In 1918 owing to the war, and the Chicago award in the United States, the Board of Railway Commissioners raised the rates under the Crowsnest pass agreement. In 1919 an amendment to the Railway Act came into effect; in fact a new act was made at that time. When that act was originally drafted section 325, I think it was, had no provision in it which called for the suspension of the Crowsnest pass agreement. As a matter of fact section 325, as originally drafted, gave the Railway Commission free and ample power to override that agreement. Now, if at that time it was desired to leave the Railway Commission free why was this suspension clause put in the act? My right hon. friend was in power at that time. Instead of that an amendment was brought down to that particular clause 325 which suspended the Crowsnest pass agreement for another three years. That clause could have been omitted at that particular time if it had been so desired.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the hon. member not know there was a division between the Commons and the Senate; I speak subject to correction and only from memory. An amendment was added in the Senate. It was not part of the government policy at all. In the collision between the Senate and the Commons the government accepted that. I explained the fact when I was on my feet this afternoon.

Mr. MARLER: I know my right hon. friend did explain it but nevertheless it was accepted by the government of which he was a member at the time.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. MARLER: It is perfectly clear it was accepted at that time and it could very readily have happened that it would not have been accepted. But it was accepted and I think by the influence of the member for New Westminster (Mr. McQuarrie). He recommended that the amendment be accepted at the time and it was accepted and was put into effect. The rates were altered, as I have stated in 1918, and then subsequently the 40 per cent rate case came up and the rates were again raised. That 40 per cent rate case was appealed. The appeal was heard and was dismissed by the Privy Council and the general rates inquiry was instituted. The general rates inquiry being instituted, the Board of Railway Commissioners found that they could not make the rates because of the Crowsnest pass agreement, and therefore they came to the government of the time, and stated that they wanted to know expressly what the government intended to do in regard to the Crowsnest pass agreement. The government took the matter up, appointed a committee of the House, the matter was gone into and an agreement was come to as regards grain and flour. That was not in any way a question of interfering with the Board of Railway Commissioners. That board came directly to this House, asking for advice, and they asked for action by the government under a special statute. But there was no similarity whatever, no parallel can be drawn, and it cannot be said that the government overrode the Board of Railway Commissioners, because they did not. It was distinctly and expressly at the request of the Railway Commission that the government acted.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Why did the government not leave the commission free? And the only way it could do that would be by removing the agreement from its path

Mr. MARLER: No reason why they should have left it free. It was left in the act, not by the present government, but by the government of my right hon. friend.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member has been arguing that it should be free.

Mr. MARLER: I was not arguing anything of the kind. I was taking a specific contract—

Mr. MEIGHEN: Then if there was a specific contract, why is it not continued?

Mr. MARLER: It was continued.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Only a part of it. Why was it not all continued, if there was a contract?

Mr. MARLER: No reason why it should have been continued. It was a special contract, but that is not the point. The Board of Railway Commissioners came directly to the government.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They had to.

Mr. MARLER: And asked the government to act, and they did act by way of a committee.

Mr. MEIGHEN: All of the hon. member's speech up to now has been that the Railway Commission should be free. It is true they came to the government because they had to, on account of it being only a suspension and not a removal. If my hon. friend's first position is right, that the commission should be free, how does he justify the government in refusing to make it free?

Mr. MARLER: They did not ask to be made free.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They could not ask to be made free. They simply had to know the will of parliament. If, as he says, and as he has argued up to this minute, that the commission should be free—and I agree with him—how does he justify the government in declining to take the only step to make it free?

Mr. MARLER: If the will of parliament had been made known by the government of my right hon. friend by leaving in section 325 of the act, which dealt with this particular agreement there was no reason why that will of parliament should not have been varied in whole or in part by parliament itself. This is an entirely different matter. There is no agreement at all in effect. There is not a shadow of an agreement in effect. This is an entirely new thing, and if this resolution is put through, they will have to act as if there had been no agreement at all. That is the difference, and I am surprised at my hon. friend.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is no difference in principle. If the hon. member follows me at all, he will see that the suspension made it necessary to act. The fact that it was a suspension was in no way the will of the previous government. It was something it had accepted from the Senate, just as this government last session accepted what it would rather not have accepted from the Senate. That made it necessary to act. If, when it was necessary to act, the government agreed with what the hon. member has been arguing, that the right course and principle is to leave the commission free, why did they not take the step to leave the commission free?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The government did take that step.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It did?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes, absolutely.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Left the commission free?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Left the commission free.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What about grain and flour?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It did not provide that the suspension should cease completely in one year, but in two years it would be at an end.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Crowsnest pass agreement will be removed at the end of two years?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The government took the rational course of so legislating as not to embarrass existing industrial conditions; it certainly made it clear that after one year the government might have power by order in council to extend the period of partial suspension, but at the end of that time the suspension would be completely removed, and that leaves the commission exactly where it was before my hon. friend's government and his friends interfered.

Mr. MEIGHEN: How does re-imposing the agreement leave it free? The commission can only be free when all agreements are gone.

Mr. MARLER: It is not a question of re-imposing the agreement. The agreement was there all the time. The agreement was agreed to by the government of my right hon. friend. He talks about the senate bringing down an amendment.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We had to agree to that amendment.

Mr. MARLER: The right hon. member did agree to an amendment.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The agreement was made in 1897, and it was agreed to by those who made it. It was a dead letter till 1917, when we sought to remove it, but we accepted the compromise of the Senate suspending it. The late government was never a party to it in any way, and nothing was done till 1917.

Mr. MARLER: My hon. friend is going back to the old argument. I thought everybody in the House understood the matter clearly.

Mr. MEIGHEN: So did I.

Mr. MARLER: How can my hon. friend say that he did not accept this amendment moved by the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. McQuarrie)? I thought I had Hansard containing his words, but I find I do not have it here.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not want to take an advantage, I will admit it. I know there were some who wanted the amendment, but the government took its stand, and only accepted the suspension as a compromise with the Senate. It is unfair to try to make it a matter of government policy on that point.

Mr. MARLER: I am not trying to be unfair, but I think the argument the hon. member advanced to-night is fundamentally unfair, when it is suggested to us "You wipe out what you did last year, because you interfered with the Railway Commission, and we will then and there withdraw this amendment." The whole argument is absolutely and fundamentally unfair. I do not deny anything the hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Clark) has said, or anything my hon. friend for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) has stated. All that they say may be founded on fact. It may be a necessity that they should have lower freight rates and that the mountain scale should be removed; all these things may be necessary, but what I say, and what I repeat, is that fundamentally the argument advanced by the other side of the House is unfair, when they try to impose on this side of the House, and on the government, by saying "Last year you interfered with the Railway Commission; go ahead and interfere with them this year." I say we did not interfere with them. They came to this House and asked for advice, and the agreement on the statute book was varied the same way as this parliament could vary any other act of parliament, and no regulation of the Railway Commission was varied in any shape. I think my argument is a sound one, and the position I still adhere to is that the Railway Commission should be left in charge of rates. It is no doubt the intention to leave them in charge of rates, and the government has no intention of interfering with them at all.

I wonder what attitude the hon. member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton) will take on this resolution. What can the resolution do? What effect will it have? It will have one effect and one only, and that effect will be to remove from the Railway Commission the making of rates. I wonder what the hon. member will have to say in connection with a resolution of this kind. No man in the House knows the question of rate making better than he does. Is he going to support or to favour the resolution? Does he intend to make the Railway Commission into a dried up mummy or into a rubber stamp? What is his judgment about it?

The sum and substance of this resolution means nothing more and nothing less than that the Railway Commission should be done away with, and the railways thrown into the pot of politics. That is the meaning of this resolution and that is one of the reasons why I do not support it. Questions of discrimination and questions of rates have been taken up time and again by the Railway Commission and by no less than four chief commissioners. Starting out in 1909, Mr. Justice Mabee took up the question of western freight rates. My hon. friend from West York took it up, and in a most admirable manner went into the whole question with the utmost care, and brought down an admirable judgment in all respects. Then the 40 per cent rate came along. Mr. Carvell took the matter up in September, 1920, and later on the "General Rates Inquiry" was taken up. Why was the general rates inquiry taken up? It was taken up simply because certain provinces were not satisfied with the 40 per cent rate. I think the hon. member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton) will correct me if I am wrong in that respect. What is the order of the Privy Council that was passed regarding the taking up of that particular matter? This is what is stated in Privy Council Order No. 2434 of the 6th October, 1920, passed by the government of my right hon. friend:

> In connection with this appeal it must be observed that one of the duties, if not indeed the principal task of the Board of Railway Commissioners, is to determine upon application, what are fair and reasonable rates to be charged from time to time for the various services performed by public utilities under the jurisdiction of the board. In such determination there must of course be taken into account, as has been done in the present case all relevant circumstances such as changes in the scale of wages and the cost of materials.

Then it goes on to say, and this is what I desire to point out:

> For Your Excellency's advisers to take upon themselves to weigh the evidence adduced and substitute their own judgment for the judgment of the board upon the question of fact arising on the issue and to be determined upon such evidence would defeat the purpose for which the Board of Railway Commissioners was created and would in the end be highly prejudicial to the public interest.

That is the order in council passed by the government of my right hon. friend, and that is exactly what this amendment to the motion to go into Supply means to take out of the hands of the Railway Commissioners, namely, the fixing of rates. It is not necessary for me to read to the House various extracts from Hansard as to the opinions of different hon. gentlemen opposite regarding the Board of Railway Commissioners, and I do not intend to speak at any greater length respecting this matter. What I wish to make abundantly clear is that, in my opinion, this is not the place to discuss the question of freight rates, nor whether there has or has not been discrimination. This is not the place to state whether the mountain scale should be removed or not. I do say that the question of the mountain scale or the question of discrimination should not be discussed in this House; but I say that these questions should be taken up at the proper time and in the proper place.

10 p.m.

Mr. STEVENS: Will my hon. friend permit me? I do not wish to embarrass him. We were prepared to discuss this question two months ago; but at the request of hon. members opposite, and very largely for the convenience of the acting minister himself, it was put off repeatedly. It is not through any fault of ours that this question is coming up to-day instead of two months ago.

Mr. MARLER: I do not refer to the particular moment of its being discussed. What I mean is that the House of Commons is not the proper place to discuss freight rates. The proper place to lay a complaint with regard to freight rates is with the Board of Railway Commissioners.

Mr. LADNER: Did the hon. gentleman think that way last year?

Mr. MARLER: Certainly I thought that way last year.

Mr. LADNER: Did he vote that way?

Mr. MARLER: Certainly I voted that way last year. I have been trying to infuse into my hon. friend the idea that last year we did not interfere with the Board of Railway Commissioners. Has he studied conditions himself? Is he aware what did happen last year? I am surprised at my hon. friend asking such a question.

Mr. LADNER: If my hon. friend asks for information, we certainly know what happened last year. We know that the effect of the action of the government made it impossible to give to British Columbia that degree of justice which was given to the rest of Canada.

Mr. MARLER: I cannot exactly follow the argument of my hon. friend. Last year we were dealing with a specific act, nothing more and nothing less, an act which had been on the statute book and which this parliament was perfectly right in changing in whole or in part, if it thought fit. Everything in connection with that act, the reason it was changed and the manner in which it was changed by a committee going into the whole question, was fair and equitable in every respect. I am opposed to this resolution, and I shall vote against it for the grounds which I have given.

Mr. A. W. NEILL (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, in the few remarks that I intend to make, I will endeavour to adhere to the resolution more closely than some of the members who have preceded me. There is no question that British Columbia is a unit in demanding justice as regards the discrimination of freight rates against her. She is practically unanimous in that matter; but I fear she is not and will not be unanimous in the presentation of this resolution in this way and in this manner and at this time in this House. British Columbia is as unanimous against the discrimination in freight rates as she is on the Asiatic question, and last year when that was brought up in the House, all the members from British Columbia got together and presented the case with a united front. I think this impressed the other members more because although of different political opinions, we were able to get together on a common ground. I think it would have lent more force to the arguments and prevented the suggestion of partisanship if that had been done in this case to-day; but I fear that would have been, under present conditions, almost impossible, because those members—what shall we call them?—who are non-conservative members from British Columbia, would hardly have lent themselves to the resolution as it is drawn.

A great deal of history has been given in regard to this case this afternoon, and I notice with some surprise that very little credit has

been given to the Hon. John Oliver, Premier of British Columbia. I hold no brief for the Hon. John Oliver. He had the unpardonably bad taste to come into the district where I was trying to be elected and to canvass against me, with the result, no doubt, that he contributed to the sweeping defeat that I sustained on that occasion. At the same time, when a man has done a good and zealous work on any particular matter, it is only justice, whatever his political affiliations may be, that he should be given credit. The history begins in the time of Sir Richard McBride. His friends here were in political sympathy with him, but he was not able to achieve any concrete results. Mr. Oliver took the matter up on its merits; he engaged experts, and he spent, at the expense of the province, some $50,000. I mention this sum to give to the members of the House an idea of what an immensity of detail this highly technical question involved, the investigations that had to be, and the men who had to be employed, before a real grasp could be got of the situation. He employed one counsel to devote his whole time to the matter. Mr. Oliver, himself, spent weeks on the subject, and at last they got a grasp of it, held, I believe, by no other two men in Canada. Perhaps some members of the Railway Commission might have a greater grasp of railway matters as a whole; but on the subject of British Columbia rates, there is no question that the Hon. John Oliver and Mr. McGeer have a grasp superior to that of anyone else. They brought the matter by repeated hearings before the Board of Railway Commissioners, the hearings lasting over a period of weeks. There were no discursive speeches as we have here, but hard facts were brought out by a lawyer and one witness at a time. Finally they got a decision from the Railway Commission, not what they were contending for; but as regards this mountain scale which has been alluded to so much, the decision gave a remission of practically one-half of the discrimination. Where it was $2.50 before, it was reduced to $1.25. There were other matters of discrimination claimed as well; but on this mountain scale rate, Mr. Oliver by his representations before the Railway Board secured that reduction. Why have some of our members from British Columbia not given Mr. Oliver any credit in that regard? I leave that for them to answer. Not satisfied with that reduction of 50 per cent, Mr. Oliver appealed through his counsel to the only appeal he could get, namely the Privy Council of Canada. That case is now under advisement before them. It has been in a manner tried—half tried at any rate—and it is now awaiting further hearing after the conclusion of this session.

Now, I do not wish to reflect upon the motives—I have neither the right nor the desire to do so—of the introducer of this motion, the hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Clark). In passing I may say that I know him to be in the town from which he comes a gentleman of the highest standing and most honourable character. But possibly being a somewhat new member he did not thoroughly appreciate the plow he was putting his hand to; I think he will realize that before the end of this debate. While this motion ostensibly seeks to be in the best interests of British Columbia, I submit that by its wording and the time of its introduction it can only have three results—first, to do considerable harm to the interests of British Columbia; second, perhaps to create a certain amount of embarrassment for the government of the day; and third, possibly—possibly I say—to manufacture a certain amount of political capital of very dubious value for the Conservative party in British Columbia.

One of three things must happen to this resolution: It can be withdrawn, it can be passed, or it can be defeated. I will deal with them individually. We will suppose it is withdrawn. Then we have wasted the time of this House for a whole day at an expense of something like $20,000. We have had no new light thrown on it whatever. The superficial manner in which we have had to deal with it has not affected the question in the slightest. Can we discuss in a few hours in this superficial way and with many of the members out in the lobbies taking no interest in the subject, give it that frank impartial consideration such as our courts will give it after weeks of study of the highly technical evidence submitted to them? It is impossible. We cannot come here and in a few hours decide such an important and intricate question like a meeting of a Young Women's Christian Association dealing with the academic question: Is the pen mightier than the sword? Or something of that kind.

On the other hand, if the motion passes what happens? The defeat of the government follows because the resolution is introduced as an amendment to the motion to go into Committee of Supply, and its passage would mean the defeat of the government. The question is under advisement by the government to-day. We in British Columbia are earnestly hoping for a favourable decision. Will we advance our case much by defeating the government on this motion? Surely

it is the part of wisdom to afford them a chance to give us what we want. Why swap horses in the middle of the stream? We—and I am only speaking of British Columbia—have more to gain by letting this matter go on and seeing what we do get out of the decision of the Privy Council. Then it will be time enough to come to this House if we do not think we have got justice from the Privy Council.

So much for the passing of the resolution. Now, if it is defeated I submit the result will be to very much prejudice British Columbia's case before the Privy Council. The Privy Council consists of what—ten or fifteen men, some of whom are bound to be inimical to our desires, and if we defeat this resolution it will give those members of the Privy Council an opportunity to use this argument: Well, the House, the highest court of Canada, consisting of 234 men, have decided against British Columbia. Why should we, only a cabinet of a dozen or fifteen men decide differently? I maintain that if we defeat this motion to-night it will prejudice our case, and it is for that reason that I deplore the introduction of it, and state with all sincerity that, however innocently it may have been introduced, it was not introduced in the best interests of British Columbia.

I say that the net result of this resolution can only be the production of a certain amount of political capital. Just to show with how little consideration for the interests of British Columbia this matter was brought forward let me quote the original resolution placed on the order paper by the hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Clark), which we would have been debating at that time if it had come up when he expected it would some weeks ago. It is as follows:

> That, in the opinion of this House, railway rates westward from the prairie provinces should be reduced to an equality with railroad rates eastward from said provinces for similar goods and distances.

That would mean that starting in the prairie goods would be carried westward to British Columbia for the same rates as they would be carried eastward from the prairies; but no provision was made at all for dealing with the vital question in British Columbia—the passage eastward from British Columbia of our produce, our fish, lumber, paper and other products. These would have been handicapped worse than they are now because it would have given an opportunity to the eastern manufacturer to ship his goods more cheaply west, whereas we would have had no reductions in shipping east. Take fish, some members in this House were attacked the other day because we asked that the fish canners of British Columbia should gradually introduce white men in place of Japanese in their canneries. We were held up as men trying to injure their business. But what greater injury could be done to them than that suggested in this resolution? Let me show how it works. There is a certain kind of herring—I forget the name—put up in British Columbia. It competes with a similar kind cured in Holland. A manufacturer in British Columbia told me that owing to the freight rates his product from British Columbia could not go any further east than a point some distance west of Winnipeg, say 100 miles, where it came in competition with the product from Holland. The Dutch product could be laid down at that point and the British Columbia product could not compete with it in the Winnipeg market. If this resolution had gone through at that time this point would have been still farther west and would have given a direct advantage to the manufacturer and producer in the East and a direct disadvantage to the manufacturer and producer in British Columbia. To show that that is the case I shall quote a few words from a telegram sent by the Board of Trade of Vancouver to the member for Burrard—and I am not, as was done in a provincial legislature, reading someone else's correspondence, because I am quoting from the newspapers. The Board of Trade of Vancouver is a body which with all moderation I might say contains its full share of gentlemen of the same political leaning as the member for Burrard. I will quote as follows:

> We would point out that this resolution,—

Referring to this resolution I have just read.

> —if carried, would be against the interests of British Columbia's industries. . . . The whole resolution, while greatly assisting grain movement westward,—

Mr. CLARK: I presume my friend is talking about the former resolution which was on the order paper, not the resolution which we are discussing to-day?

Mr. NEILL: My hon. friend is perfectly right.

Mr. CLARK: Then I presume my hon. friend knows that the argument on the other resolution would be exactly the same as the argument on the one under discussion?

Mr. NEILL: That is what I anticipated, that had this resolution in its original form been introduced—he himself has used the words that I intended to use—the argument would have been the same, and presumably the results would have been the same. His object in bringing it forward is, I presume,

to pass it, and if it had been passed in its original form the strictures of the Board of Trade would have been justified for it would have had the effect I have been quoting. It would have created a most serious, if not disastrous, position for British Columbia. Let me quote further from this Board of Trade resolution:

> It would hamper British Columbia's industries. We would suggest that you refer to the provincial government application for removal of discrimination March 18th, 1921, in the hands of the Railway Commissioners—

That is John Oliver's kick

> —to which application we, as a board, are committed and feel that it is in the best interests to press for. Your resolution gives no consideration to goods moving eastward from British Columbia, which is absolutely essential.

I only quote that to show how lightly this matter was decided to be introduced when the Board of Trade in the very home town of the hon. member—the centre and industrial capital of British Columbia—has come out and repudiated the action taken by the hon. member.

Mr. CLARK: May I interrupt again? My hon. friend does not suggest, does he, that my argument for the removal of the "mountain scale" could not have been considered by the Privy Council on the other resolution, which was originally drafted dealing mainly with the extension of the Crowsnest Pass legislation to grain and flour going westward? Does he suggest for a moment that the Privy Council could not have listened to the argument on the "mountain scale" and dealt with it just as they might deal with it to-day or after this session?

Mr. NEILL: I must frankly confess that I do not understand the hon. gentleman's argument, and I think other hon. members do not understand it either. It is an illustration of how incompetent we are in this House to go into a subject of such a highly technical character and lightly pass a resolution upon it.

There is another aspect of this question I want just to touch on—another thing that leads me to question the sincerity of this resolution. I refer to the attempt to wave the flag, as it is popularly termed. I have never known it to fail, when a man gets up to deal with a question that has nothing whatever to do with nationalism or patriotism and proceeds to what is known as waving the flag—that he has a rotten argument and is trying to cover it up in that way. There are some politicians who cannot discuss the removal of a dust-bin from a country post office without waving the flag and suggesting that the opponents of the proposed removal are animated by lack of patriotism. Nothing is more prejudicial to the true and real influence of patriotism than its being invoked in this way for political effect. We have had here to-day the usual flamboyant references to "The British Empire," to "this Great Canada of ours," and the "Virility of the race" that inhabits it. I assure the hon. member that the British Empire would probably have muddled along if this discussion had not taken place at all; that Canada would remain as great, if not have been even a little greater, had we not wasted the time and money that we did this afternoon on this subject, and as to the virility of the race, that, I submit, has nothing whatever to do with freight rates in British Columbia. When we take the facts as we see them here; when we realize that the withdrawal of this resolution renders it useless and that its passage or defeat is calculated to do actual harm to our best interests in British Columbia, I would ask hon. members of this House to consider—and I would go further than that; through the pages of Hansard I would ask the people of British Columbia to consider very carefully—whether this resolution was introduced with the idea of advancing the best interests of the province we come from, or whether it is a piece of political, shall I say, claptrap?

Hon. J. H. KING (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I find myself in a rather peculiar position. Although a member representing British Columbia, I am not allowed to present the arguments that would be expected from one coming from that province. It has already been explained by the hon. Acting Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) that the government of British Columbia, through its Attorney General some months ago made an argument before the Railway Commission of Canada dealing with what they alleged to be discrimination in the matter of freight rates. The government of that province, through its Attorney General, did not accept the findings of the Railway Commission. Appeal was taken to the Privy Council, and, as it has been explained by the Acting Minister of Railways, argument has been partly heard, presented by the Premier of the province and also by counsel representing the people of British Columbia through its government. Joined with British Columbia was the province of Alberta, Mr. McGeer acting as counsel for both provinces. Argument was heard extending over some three or four hours on just one phase of the question, the constitutional aspect. The government having received an intimation

from the Premier of British Columbia and his counsel that it would take from two to three days to present fairly before the government the argument on behalf of British Columbia, it was by mutual consent decided that it would be inadvisable to proceed with the further argument at that time but that the matter should be delayed until after the session of parliament in order that the government might have an opportunity of giving fair consideration to the question, which is an important one to British Columbia and to western Canada generally. The district represented by the hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Clark) has been agitating this question for a great many years, because it was the Vancouver Board of Trade which in 1912 presented the case to the Railway Commission. On that occasion the Vancouver Board of Trade did not accept the findings of the Railway Commission; they appealed to the government of which the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) was a supporter—and with what result? The government of that day advised that the case be again referred back to the Railway Commission. It has been stated in this discussion that the Canadian Pacific Railway should not be taken as a standard or basis for the fixing of rates, but that the Canadian National, built on extraordinary grades through the mountains, four-tenths of one per cent grades —should be taken as a standard in that respect. But I am told that in 1912, when the government of the day referred that matter back to the Railway Commission, they indicated to that body that the Canadian Northern was a colonization road and should not therefore be taken as a standard, but that the Canadian Pacific Railway should be taken as a standard.

Mr. STEVENS: Will my hon. friend permit me? The Canadian National, or the Canadian Northern, as it was then known, was not completed for some years after that application was made.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I quite understand that. It is true that the Canadian Northern was not then a part of the railway system of Canada; it was then under construction. After it was completed it was under the control of the government of British Columbia in the matter of freight rates, but my hon. friends opposite took that control away from the province, saying that as the road was a work for the general advantage of Canada the Railway Commission should control its rates. Now, the hon. member for Burrard has projected a discussion this afternoon with a view, supposedly, of dealing in one sitting with a question which the premier of British Columbia and his counsel have had under the closest consideration for the last two years, a question which they advised the government it would take two or three days to argue. I say that the hon. member for Burrard this afternoon undertook, by an incomplete recital of argument, to convince the House that it should support his resolution—a motion which, if carried, meant the defeat of the government. Is my hon. friend playing fair with his constituents when he jeopardizes the case which the people of British Columbia through their Attorney General and their Premier have taken two years to prepare for the consideration of the Railway Board and of the Privy Council of Canada? I claim that he has not done so. I think it is most unfortunate that my hon. friend has had the hardihood or lack of judgment to throw this case on the floor of parliament with the incomplete study he has given it and the incomplete argument that he has been able to submit to the House this afternoon. He complained bitterly that he was not allowed to introduce the first resolution he had on the order paper earlier in the session because it was not convenient for the government, and he withdrew it. We find now that the resolution he originally intended to introduce was not in the interests of the province, and that his resolution presented to-day is an entirely different one. He did not tell us that in his argument this afternoon, but he insisted on bringing this matter forward on a motion for going into supply in order to force a vote of want of confidence in the government on this question. For what purpose? Surely he did not expect that the members from British Columbia who are supporting this government are going to vote for a resolution presented in the manner he has presented his resolution this afternoon. I think not, I think the people of British Columbia would have preferred my hon. friend not to meddle with this question; I think they would have much preferred that he allow it to pass through the ordinary channels of legal procedure and come before the Privy Council in the ordinary way, where proper argument could be presented. But he has failed to do that. I hope even now that he will have the good judgment and the good sense to withdraw this resolution, rather than let it go to a vote and receive the defeat which I am satisfied it will receive.

Mr. STEVENS: Is not my hon. friend aware that the Hon. Mr. Oliver has repeatedly complained because we have not brought this question before the House? In the same breath might I ask does the hon. member object to the discussion of this question by the House?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I have no objection to the discussion at all, and I have no control over Mr. Oliver. If Mr. Oliver wishes this to come before the House, I say that it is a perfectly proper question to bring before the House, but it never should have been brought before the House as it has been to-day as a want of confidence motion. There is a proper time and a proper place to bring it before the House, and if it had been brought forward at such a time I might have been free to discuss it. My hon. friend was in this parliament in 1912 when this question was before the Railway Committee, and referred to the Privy Council. Did he discuss it at that time?

Mr. CLARK: Is my hon. friend aware of the fact that the government of which he is a member prevented a discussion of this question on the floor of this House as a private member's resolution, and when my hon. friend might have taken part in the discussion? As a member of the government I think he might have tried to see that the matter was given an opportunity to be discussed in this House as a private member's resolution.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): That is not so. My hon. friend's resolution stood on the order paper for weeks and was called and let stand time and again.

Mr. CLARK: That is not so. My hon. friend is wrong.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): But we understand to-night that that resolution was not a fit and proper resolution.

Mr. GRAHAM: Good thing for him he did not get the chance.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): He was taken to task for it by the Vancouver Board of Trade. It is not my purpose to continue this discussion. I repeat, I hope my hon. friend will have the good judgment to withdraw his resolution at this time rather than have it suffer defeat at the hands of the House.

Mr. JOS. T. SHAW (Calgary West): The question of freight rates is one of the most interesting and I think all members will agree with me, one of the most complicated questions which might well be brought before this House for its consideration. With the political arguments which have been advanced I have little concern, but with the desire to secure legitimate reduction in freight rates so far as the western provinces are concerned I have every sympathy, and I am prepared under the proper circumstances to lend my every support. We in western Canada, especially in the interior provinces do, I think it must be admitted, suffer severely from excessive freight rates. But I recognize, that it is a very difficult and a very complicated problem. It is one which requires consideration, not for days, but for months by competent bodies to arrive at a proper conclusion.

The double-barrelled resolution introduced by the hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Clark) this afternoon has two purposes: First of all he wants to eliminate the so-called mountain rate. Secondly in some mysterious way which I cannot comprehend, he desires to grant the benefits of the Crowsnest pass agreement to all the basic commodities produced in every part of Canada.

With regard to the first question, the mountain scale, or differential as it is sometimes called, hon. members will recollect that this differential has been in existence ever since the Canadian Pacific railway was constructed. I do not know where it came from. I suppose it was introduced by way of analogy from the American states to the south, but in any event in 1914, I think for the first time, it was placed upon a rational, logical basis. The then chairman of the Railway Commission, Sir Henry Drayton, in the judgment of the court gave as his reason the high cost of construction of the railway and the high cost of operation, and, let it be said that the British Columbia counsel who were associated with that case concurred with that particular view, that is, that there was a higher cost of railway construction in British Columbia, and in addition a higher cost of railway operation. I am satisfied that any hon. member of this House who has ever travelled over the Canadian Pacific railway in the province of British Columbia in the winter time or in the spring or fall cannot but have come to the conclusion that both these contentions are absolutely sound and absolutely justified. In that judgment the then chief commissioner of the Railway Board held that the differential was not only just, but that it was necessary. To that decision I have not the slightest objection. Not only did the judgment do that but it recognized the existence and the economic necessity of distributing centres not only in British Columbia but also in the adjoining province of Alberta. As a result of that long existing differential confirmed in effect by that judgment of the Railway Commission, distributing and jobbing houses have been built up in several centres in the province of Alberta. We have a large number of such institutions in Edmonton, we have them in Calgary, in Macleod and Lethbridge. Hundreds of thousands of dollars have been invested on the strength of that decision, and

hundreds of men have been employed. Now is this House, on a casual consideration of this question, going to imperil that investment, because that is exactly what would be done if this mountain rate were ruthlessly removed at the present time, and at the same time without giving to the consumers in Alberta or elsewhere any adequate compensation for such a removal.

Mr. LADNER: How does the hon. gentleman arrive at that in view of his statement that the elimination of the mountain rate will strengthen competition but will not help the consumer?

Mr. SHAW: My hon. friend did not catch my remarks. I said the elimination of this mountain rate will imperil perchance—I am not suggesting that it will entirely—the existence of these institutions, and at the same time I suggest it will not give the benefit to the consumer which some people suggest.

Mr. ARTHURS: Does my hon. friend allege that Alberta has not had the benefit of competition?

Mr. SHAW: I am anxious to see competition; I am anxious that primarily consumers shall get the benefit of it.

Owing to the various rate increases this mountain differential was exaggerated; I think that British Columbia did so suffer as a result of these increases. In 1921 British Columbia took its case before the Railway Commission. That case, as hon. members will realize, extended over a period of some two or three months. During its progress much evidence was heard, much argument was given, and in every possible way the case received the fullest consideration. I think some twenty-six different witnesses were heard from the city of Vancouver alone. Representatives were also heard representing Kamloops, Calgary, Edmonton, and all the western centres. It was pointed out by the Vancouver representatives that the rates were so extremely burdensome, that the Vancouver industries and industrial enterprises could not do business under them. In the very next breath some of the witnesses told the commission that industries had increased in Vancouver five-fold since the year 1912; that there were 1,200 industrial enterprises in Vancouver at that time, and that new industries were being added every day. So that in one breath the witnesses told us about the tremendous rate burdens from which they were suffering, and in the next breath they declared they were making this very substantial progress—a progress, I suggest, which cannot be paralleled by perhaps any other comparable centre in Canada. The Railway Commission having heard that evidence came to the conclusion that the mountain scale should be cut in half. Subsequently, British Columbia appealed from that judgment and that appeal is the one that is now under consideration by the Privy Council.

The hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) has spoken of the very grave discrimination from which British Columbia suffers. I have no complaint to make with regard to the presentation of British Columbia's case. I have every sympathy with that province in its demand for lower freight rates; but I do ask the people and the representatives of British Columbia not to put Alberta in exactly the position they are asking to be relieved from. Let me illustrate. Under the conditions existing at the present time, owing to the fact that Vancouver has a special transcontinental rate compelled by water competition and although it is 640 miles farther west than Calgary we find that on all commodities shipped from Montreal, and similar places east, Vancouver has a much lower rate than Calgary enjoys. There is a very grave discrimination against Calgary so far as west bound products are concerned. I am not going to trouble the House with a whole list of these discriminations, but I do want to give just one or two illustrations which may be of some interest. Take the matter of bars, iron and steel bars, shipped from Montreal to Calgary, a distance of 2,240 miles. We have a rate on carload lots of 192 cents per hundred pounds. The rate from Montreal to Vancouver for the same material, a distance of 2,882 miles, is only 65 cents per hundred pounds by carload lots. Shipping the same goods in less than car-load lots to the city of Red Deer which, mark you, is some 95 miles north of Calgary we find that these goods can be shipped from Montreal, through Calgary, to Red Deer, a distance of 2,335 miles, for 222 cents per hundred pounds, whereas similar goods shipped from Montreal to Vancouver and back again, through Calgary, to Red Deer cost 185 cents per hundred pounds. The same situation exists with regard to wire rods, and I could go on and give several instances of such unjust discrimination in so far as the distributing centres of Alberta are concerned. If you take off this mountain differential, then you discriminate to just that extent further against the distributing centres in Alberta which have been largely built up on the faith of the judgment of a former Chief Commissioner of the Railway Board.

Mr. STEVENS: Is my hon. friend arguing for the permanence of the mountain differential?

Mr. SHAW: Not at all. What I say is this: If you are going to remove the mountain differential it is only proper, when these discriminations do exist, to consider the question as a whole and not only one phase of it. My suggestion is that in doing justice to British Columbia see to it that you likewise do justice to Alberta.

Mr. LADNER: Has my hon. friend read the resolution? That is exactly what it aims at.

Mr. SHAW: I am not so sure that that is exactly the terms of the resolution. The resolution does not say anything about giving the distributing centres of Alberta a rate from the east, so far as mileage is concerned, in comparison with the special rate which Vancouver enjoys.

I simply want to point out one or two other things. British Columbia has not done too badly so far as railway freight rates are concerned in comparison with the province of Alberta. I suggest to this House that no province has been discriminated against to the extent that Alberta has. In the first place, as I have mentioned before, Vancouver has the benefit of a special transcontinental rate, water compelled, by reason of her location on the Pacific coast. In the second place she has special commodity rates east bound which are much lower than any possible class rates, or any special consideration, received by the province of Alberta or any part of it. I need only instance the special rate which British Columbia enjoys with regard to the shipment of lumber, the special rate which that province has with regard to the shipment of rice, and several other commodities. In fact I gather—and I think I got the information from the 1914 judgment I have referred to—that 80 to 85 per cent of British Columbia's east bound products enjoy special commodity rates lower than any rates which Alberta enjoys. Not only does British Columbia have these special privileges but, in addition to that, she has her class rates on special constructive mileage. That is, British Columbia is given the right in fixing the class rates of considering 424 miles equivalent to, I think, 290 miles. These are some of the special considerations enjoyed by British Columbia which are not vouchsafed—certainly not to the same degree—to the province of Alberta. Therefore, I say that while I do not dispute the claim of British Columbia for the elimination of this mountain scale, I do say that it cannot be considered as a thing apart; the other provinces must have their special conditions taken into consideration if justice is to be done to the country as a whole.

Now, as to the point I was speaking about a few minutes ago with regard to the question of benefit to the consumer. In the judgment which is now under appeal the Railway Commission decided that the mountain scale should be reduced 50 per cent. I think that the percentage of mountain scale prior to that judgment was some thirty-three per cent. This judgment would reduce it to sixteen or seventeen per cent. One would expect that, with that substantial reduction, there would be a great benefit to the consumer. I have taken the trouble to look up the Labour Gazette containing the prices of many commodities, the prices prevailing so far as Calgary and Vancouver are concerned, and I find not the slightest difference between the months, say, of June and December, last. The consumer has not apparently benefited. despite the partial removal of the differential. I simply point that out. It may be that the removal of this differential, even the total removal, is not going to give the great benefit to the consumer which some hon. members of the House might suggest. Therefore, I say to this hon. House that to pass this resolution would simply mean that, in increasing the preferential treatment to British Columbia, just treatment may not be given to neighbouring provinces. We in Alberta are asking, and I think properly, for a special rate on coal eastward, in order that the product of Alberta may be placed in the markets of eastern Canada where it is so urgently required. How can we expect, under those circumstances, to receive any favourable consideration for that view, if at the same time we place an additional burden on the Transcontinental railway, and increase the deficit which they already labour under? The whole problem, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, is a most complicated and difficult one, requiring months of study and of effort, and it cannot be determined adequately or properly by this House in one session, or for that matter, in many sessions. It occurs to me that the whole matter of fixing rates should be gone into scientifically by the Railway Commissioners. An effort should be made to iron out many of these difficulties and discriminations which undoubtedly exist, and unless this work is undertaken by the Railway Commission, I am fearful that we will never be relieved of the burden of considering rate difficulties in this House.

I have one or two further remarks to make with regard to the Crowsnest pass agreement. Much has been said about that agreement. I want to say frankly, as I have stated before, both in public and elsewhere, that the Crowsnest pass agreement must be preserved. I took the position in the Transportation Cost Committee last year that we should preserve every part of it, that if it is sacred in one part it is sacred in every other part, and it must be preserved in toto for the benefit of western Canada. If one considers the circumstances under which that agreement was entered into, one can readily appreciate how it can be easily differentiated from any other question of freight rates. In western Canada at that time—that is in 1897—the freight rates were excessive. The people of eastern Canada realized, even in those days, that the hope of Canada lay in the West, and it lay largely in the development of the agricultural resources of that territory, not only that, but they realized that, while eastern Canada had special rate controlling, geographic factors and as well American rail competition, western Canada was entirely deprived by nature of such rate controlling factors. We had no water competition in western Canada to save us from excessive freight rates. We had no American rail competition such as eastern Canada enjoyed, and so parliament said in 1897 "We will give these people a statutory rate-controlling maximum, beyond which the railway companies of Canada can never go." That agreement did operate for several years as a rate-controlling factor until 1903. Then subsequently, by reason of the competition induced by the Manitoba agreement referred to earlier in this debate, the railway companies had to meet competitive reduced rates, and as a result, until 1917 the Crowsnest pass agreement did not become effective, although remaining on the statute books, as a safeguard against increased freight rates. In 1917, however, by reason of the 15 per cent increase of freight rates, the Crowsnest pass agreement again became an effective barrier against increased freight rates. It did not long remain, however. The railway companies apparently saw to that, because under the provisions of the War Measures Act the statute was ignored, not by an act of parliament, but under the provisions of the War Measures Act, and then under that act the various increases took place. However, with the conclusion of the war the War Measures Act fell. Prior to its falling parliament suspended the Crowsnest agreement for a period of three years, and that explains why on the 7th July last it became necessary for parliament to determine whether or not the agreement should be further suspended. As I say, this is the only safeguard which western Canada has at the present time with regard to its basic production. That is something which we are not prepared to abandon, and is something which must be preserved in the absence of those natural geographic and competition-compelling factors we do not possess.

The resolution proposed by the hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Clark) suggests that the benefits of the Crowsnest pass agreement shall be made to apply to the basic productions of all of Canada. I do not know how he is going to do it, but if you look at the agreement itself you will find that in connection with certain west bound articles certain stipulated percentage reductions on the then existing freight charges were provided for. With regard to grain and grain products, it was provided in that agreement that a reduction be made of three cents per 100 pounds. How does the hon. member for Burrard propose to apply that agreement to the basic commodities of all Canada? Personally, I cannot understand how he is going to do it. Does he mean that if there is a water-compelled rate from, say, some place in Nova Scotia to Montreal that he is going to reduce that rate, regardless of water competition? Is he not going to take into consideration at all the natural factors which fix rates, and simply impose an arbitrary rate of some kind or other, in some peculiar way or other, which I must confess I do not understand?

I want to make it perfectly clear in conclusion that, so far as the application for reduction in freight rates is concerned, I have every sympathy, and I will on the proper occasion lend every support. I think it is high time the whole question of freight rates be examined into scientifically and carefully and be placed upon a logical and rational basis. But I do not see how we can take a jump in the dark by accepting this particular resolution and hope to iron out the difficulties and the intricacies in connection with our freight rate problems in western Canada.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON (West York): Mr. Speaker, we are, perhaps, getting a little away from the resolution as a whole and what it is really aimed at. I am going to invite hon. gentlemen just to go back again to what was done and said last year and to what has happened since. Last year the government started out with the idea that they did not know anything about freight rates. They were right. They did not. Starting out with that idea, they had a com-

mittee sitting for weeks on the question of freight rates. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) was one of the members of that committee and he took a very strong stand in connection with the deliberations of that committee just upon the lines that the government did not know anything about freight rates and that the Railway Commission was the proper body to consider rates. In fact, the committee as a whole came to the same conclusion, and brought their report in to the committee;—it was never allowed to get to the House—to the effect that as regards basic commodities, reductions ought to be made on all of them, and that those reductions could not be got if the Crowsnest pass agreement was again made operative. That is the committee's report. Then we had a change, and the hon. gentleman representing Pictou suggests politics in connection with this motion. We had that considered report changed against all the evidence, simply because certain interviews had taken place with the government and with hon. gentlemen to my left, as a result of which interviews the government thought it would pay to disregard the evidence, disregard the claims of producers of basic commodities everywhere except in two provinces. So it was that last year we had rates, political railway rates, enforced as regards the very important commodities of wheat, other grain and flour on their eastern movement. There is also no doubt that, probably, of the different commodities that had claims for reductions, there were none that had greater claims—I want to be absolutely fair about this—than had wheat and flour, but after all no greater claims than had the basic commodities on which other provinces were depending, no greater claims, for example, than the claims regarding basic commodities of the Maritime provinces, no greater claims than those of the agriculturists of Quebec who showed that they could not sell their hay.

Hon. gentlemen say that the action of the government had nothing to do with the result as regards all these other claims. Let us see if that is true. Do we not all know that it is not true? In December of the previous year, a 10 per cent cut had been made in those wheat and flour rates without any cut being given at all on basic commodities in the other provinces. According to the evidence, that accounted for $3,000,000. The resumption of the Crowsnest pass statutory rates meant another $14,000,000. This meant a difference of $17,000,000 in revenue which was available for purposes of a reduction, and at that time it was said—I remember very well saying it myself—if this goes through, the suggestion that there will be other reductions made in the railway rates on other basic commodities, is nothing more than a pious wish; it will never and it cannot be carried out. What parliament said is this, that while during the inflation period, all railway costs were advanced as nearly as possible equitably, in the deflation period, the rate reduction shall be confined to the two chief activities of the prairie provinces. That prophecy, which anybody could foresee, has been absolutely borne out. The judgment of the Board of Railway Commissioners themselves refers to it. The House has heard that judgment read this afternoon, and I am not going to take up any more time on it. The fact is that there was the sum available for reductions, and that sum was appropriated by this House for a specific purpose. There is no question that there were heavy advances in grain rates and I am going to give the House a few illustrations of increases in order to show exactly the result of their interference with the freight situation last year, just what the result of the political rate is. The grain rate from Saskatoon, which is pretty well in the centre of the territory, was 24 cents. It was increased to 33½ cents, or an increase of 39 per cent. The rate from Calgary was 24 cents. It was increased to 36 cents, an increase of 50 per cent. The rate from Maple Creek was 21 cents. It was increased to 33½ cents, an increase of 54 per cent. In each case we have the re-enactment, not, of course, of the lowest rate, which was two cents lower in each case, but reducing all those increases to an increase of only two cents. I want to compare that with another basic commodity. We will go back to this again a little later on. We have been told—and there is no doubt that this is true—that down in New Brunswick, where they depend just as much upon potatoes as the Northwest does upon wheat and flour. rates were such that they were digging the potatoes into the ground again; that they could not use them. Let us see how they were increased and whether the West was unfairly treated. The potato rate from New Brunswick shipping points—they take a common rate for long distances—to Montreal in 1917 was 19 cents. That was raised to 34½ cents, an increase of 81 per cent, as against a total increase at Saskatoon of 39 per cent, at Calgary of 50 per cent and at Maple Creek of 54 per cent. The only reduction that was made by the board at all, and apparently the only reduction that they

11 p.m.

could make, was one or two cents, making that rate as left by the Railway Board, an increase of 71 per cent as against a Saskatoon rate, which was reduced by the action of parliament, and which had been increased by only 39 per cent. Where is the fairness in this? What possible justification is there for it, if we are to bear honestly in mind the general provision of the Railway Act that rates are to be fair, just and equitable?

Just another illustration as to whether the western rate was so tremendously out of line. Let us take the Maple Creek rate. Maple Creek has a mileage to the head of the lakes of 1,013. Sweetgrass, Montana, is just south of Maple Creek and has a mileage to its distributing point, Duluth, of 1,004 miles. The Maple Creek rate before it was reduced was 32 per cent less than the Sweetgrass rate; after the action of the House the American rate is 87 per cent greater than the Canadian rate.

Mr. SHAW: Is that a grain rate?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Oh, yes.

Mr. SHAW: Is it not a fact that there is comparatively little grain moving from Sweetgrass in Montana to Duluth whereas there is a tremendous volume moving from Maple Creek?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: All these rates are on a mileage basis. I do not care what points you take, the result is the same. I am only dealing with these two points because they have a similar mileage, that is all. Take any points he likes, the grain rates, as the hon. member knows very well, do not depend upon volume but upon mileage, both in Canada and in the United States. There is no doubt of course that the major portion of American wheat is grown nearer Duluth than is the major portion of Canadian wheat. Now then, I was dealing with potatoes and pointing out that, so far as the potato producer is concerned, he is still trying to do business at an increase of 71 per cent. That rate is not out of line with the others. Montreal was not the significant point, or a point that is treated differently from others. The rate to Toronto was 25 cents, it was increased to 45½ cents, or an increase of 82 per cent; to-day the increase stands at 69 per cent.

There is another feature to consider. We had any amount of evidence as to the great necessity of cutting down the costs of building and making building materials cheaper. The rates on building materials were increased from 61 to 133 per cent in eastern territory, with similar increases in western territory. There is no reduction whatever except some half a cent on building bricks.

Now take the British Columbia lumber rates. We were told they could not do business on account of the high rates. Those rates still stand. But let us get away for a moment from both New Brunswick and British Columbia. The situation is the same all over Canada. Supposing we take coal, which is something everyone is interested in here. The rates on anthracite coal were increased 71, 81 and 83 per cent, and still stand without a single cent's reduction. For example, from the gateway, Prescott, where you get your coal, to Ottawa, the original rate of 83 cents was increased to $1.39, an increase of 70 per cent. Let us take Renfrew, another point in this neighbourhood. The original rate was $1.12, it was increased to $1.80, or an increase of 60 per cent. But the increase applies not only there, but everywhere. Take the rate from the Niagara frontier. To Hamilton it was 55 cents, this was increased to $1.05, or an increase of 90 per cent—not one single cent taken off.

Now, basic reductions. What is basic in Ontario? Why, this action last year was taken presumably in the interests of agriculture. It covered just exactly one-fifth of our agricultural products, that is that part of it that was aided by the rate and prevented any possible relief being given to the four-fifths. Supposing you take butter in carload lots to Toronto from a point near here, for example, Smiths Falls, the rate was 30 cents, it was increased to 54 cents, an increase of 81 per cent. Let us go to another part of the province, Woodstock, the centre of the dairy industry. The rate to the same destination was 23 cents, it was raised to 41½ cents, an increase of 80 per cent—not one single sou taken off. Not only Toronto as a butter-collecting centre gets these rates; look at Montreal. Suppose we go back to Renfrew again which ships butter to Montreal. The Renfrew rate was 29 cents, it was increased to 52½ cents, an increase of 81 per cent. From Peterborough the rate was 33 cents, it was increased to 59½ cents, an increase of 80 per cent—not one cent's reduction. Take this commodity in less than carload lots, and you have the same story—the same increases and absolutely no reduction. Cheese is a commodity which we are all very much interested in. On this basic production the rate from Peterborough to Montreal for export was 25½ cents, increased to 46½ cents, an increase of 82 per cent—no reduction made whatever. From Finch to Montreal the rate of 15 cents was increased to 27½ cents, an increase of 83

per cent—again no reduction whatever. To Brockville, a large cheese centre, the rate from Finch was 17 cents, it was increased to 30½ cents, an increase of 80 per cent. Similarly the Peterborough rate of 22 cents was increased to 40 cents, an increase of 81 per cent. Eggs tell the same story. Everything the farmer handles in Ontario is left in the same position, everything the farmer raises in Quebec is left in the same position, everything the farmer raises in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia is left in the same position—absolutely no reduction whatever made by the Railway Commissioners, just as was pointed out clearly and emphatically from this side of the House. Eggs in carload lots from St Mary's to Toronto enjoyed a rate of 19 cents which was increased to 34½ cents, an increase of 81 per cent. From Smiths Falls the rate of 25 cents was increased to 45½ cents, an increase of 82 per cent. If you are collecting at Montreal, your increased rate is practically the same: from Lindsay to Montreal, 29 cents, increased to 52½ cents, an increase of 81 per cent. From Renfrew, 24 cents, increased to 43 cents, an increase of 79 per cent. In less than carload lots the condition is the same; there are slight differences, of course, in amounts, but the percentage still increases; the additional burden placed upon the farmer stands about the same. St. Mary's to Toronto, eggs, in less than carload lots, 26 cents, increased to 47 cents, 80 per cent increase. Thamesville, 32 cents, increased to 58 cents, 81 per cent increase; Brockville to Montreal, increased from 30 to 54 cents, or 80 per cent; Renfrew, increased from 33 to 59½ cents, or 80 per cent.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What is the inference my hon. friend wants us to draw from all this? Does he wish parliament to correct all these alleged injustices?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The inference is perfectly plain. It is just what I said last year: if you put through that legislation, if you tell the board that the whole of the difference, that $17,000,000, goes in one direction, do not expect anyone else to get any relief.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What is the bearing on the resolution? Does my hon. friend think we ought to remedy all these matters in the way the amendment proposes?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think none of them should be remedied that way, but if you start to remedy them you had better do it right through. If we are to have political railway rates for the voter here, the voter there has a right to ask for them.

[Sir Henry Drayton.]

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Does my hon. friend really mean what he is saying now, that if parliament made a mistake last year it ought now to repeat that mistake in as many directions as it possibly can?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What they ought to do is at least to try to have the matter dealt with with a semblance of fairness; at least to try to undo some of the wrong they did; at least to try to put production on something like an equal basis throughout this country.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is all very well; these are generalities. But come down to the concrete point: Does my hon. friend say that because, according to his argument, an injustice was done last year, this parliament should aim at repeating that injustice in many different directions?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Are you repeating it? If it is good business to say that railway rates shall be put into effect irrespective whatever of cost, irrespective of merit, irrespective of the demands of traffic or anything else, and for the benefit of one set of traders—if that is to be the rule, do the farmers of Ontario not require some assistance?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That was not the ground on which any action was taken last year?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I fail to see, then, what possible justification there is for it. Let us go back to it; we have threshed it out so often that I thought it was clear. We started out with a declaration of parliament—I do not think my right hon. friend was in the government of that day; he was too young to be in it at that time, but he was a supporter of it. But that was a great declaration on the part of the then government. In other words, the administration of Sir Wilfrid Laurier in 1903 said: "Special privilege is to stop; there is to be no further discrimination and unfairness in connection with the railway rates."

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do not want to interrupt my hon. friend, but if he is going back, why not go back to the obligations imposed upon the country by the legislation adopted by parliament in 1897?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Oh, we will get there; I intend to deal with that. I just wish in the first instance to get my right hon. friend's attention centred on the time of the change.

Mr. GRAHAM: December 6th.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Of course it is only a matter of amusement to my hon. friend the Acting Minister of Railways. He can laugh about it; I do not suppose he is at all concerned about this tremendous increase that I have referred to in Ontario. We had that principle declared in 1903. Before that principle had been declared and before we had a method of general rate regulation, we had attempted—not only in this agreement; hon. gentlemen can find other agreements if they want to look for them—to make partial rate regulations. That is all we could do at the time; we had no general rate regulating facilities. Partial regulation was attempted in the Crowsnest pass agreement. Now, what does my hon. friend think would be the right and proper position? Where you have a general declaration of fairness, ought the government to be a party to the preservation of special privileges here and special privileges there, or should it be a case of general fairness everywhere? Should the people as a whole get anything like a square deal in railway matters, or is it right that the government should have special favourites here or there or anywhere? Does my hon. friend think it would have been right in 1917, 1918 and 1919 to increase further the rates on agricultural products everywhere else and leave them untouched so far as the Crowsnest rates are concerned? Was parliament wrong in saying that these necessary advances should be treated on the same basis? Why, they were not even then treated on the same basis, because it was recognized that the increases on the entire haul ought to be somewhat less on grain and flour than they were on those products. And they were—increases of 35 per cent, 50 per cent, as against increases of 80, 81 and 82 per cent; so that they were kept lower. But does my right hon. friend think there should have been no increases at all during that period and that the Crowsnest pass rate should have applied throughout the war? If as a matter of fairness he does not object to that—and I pause for an objection—

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Well, in regard to anything that was done as a consequence of war conditions or arising out of the war situation, that was an exceptional case for that exceptional reason. When conditions were being gradually restored to normal it was reasonable that the government should seek to get back to the former legislation.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Well, let us see. You work up to your peak as the result of war conditions; you are left on the peak—is that not the result of war? Is it not a fact that these high freight rates all over the country are the result of war and of abnormal costs? If it is fair to increase equitably, is it not fair to deflate with some regard to equity? That is what the commission is for. They put up those rates with that permission for that war purpose. That my hon. friend admits is right, and having been there, should not they come down in the same way?

The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) charged us with inconsistency today. I am only saying what I said a year ago, and I am in this happy position that I can turn to a tariff anywhere asked and absolutely justify every remark I made. That is the only difference. Why, it was simply extraordinary, Mr. Speaker, the way the demands of commerce, the way the demands of the farmer everywhere outside of the prairie provinces were absolutely disregarded—simply extraordinary. But to my mind the most extraordinary thing is the accusation made to-night by the hon. member for Pictou, that this talk is all politics when he himself attended on that committee, voted for that first report, supported it right through, and for political purposes turned right about in this House in two days and swallowed it all. And what did he swallow? Is there no trouble down in the Maritime provinces? Are not the rates out of line there? We told you what would happen if you did what you did. Are not the rates out of line there? I am just going to give the hon. gentlemen, the noble sixteen, the result of the wonderful work which they did for their province last year, and I shall take just the articles in which Nova Scotia is tremendously interested. I shall not give very many of them; it is not necessary.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Before my hon. friend does that, may I ask, does he propose to remedy the injustice he is now going to speak of in the same manner that he proposes to remedy this alleged discrimination?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It would be all the same. There is only one source from which reductions can come. Surely my hon. friend knows this much about business, that there is only one way in which a railway can get its revenues, and that is out of the earnings it makes, and if you set to work and apply a whole lot of reductions here, unless you want to bankrupt your system you cannot give them over there. Nothing could be done, nothing was done, because there was an arbitrary withdrawal of funds to one purpose and one purpose alone, amounting to $17,000,000, as a result of the action of my hon. friend's administration. I am not saying that all these reductions would have

been made. Of course they would not have been, but the people of this country at least would know this, that there had been a real survey of the railway situation, not a survey such as is shown in that judgment we had read to-day, just pointing out what the government had done, and as a result of what the government had done the impossibility of doing anything further. You would not have had that. You would have had something like a proper, honest survey of the whole thing, out of which perhaps something like proper equitable treatment could come.

Now as to these rates. I have given enough to show what Ontario and Quebec are suffering under. I am going to give one or two now for Nova Scotia. Fish is a very important rate in Nova Scotia. There is a general fish rate which applies to fish, dry salted, green salted, pickled, smoked, in carload lots. I am going to take a few shipping points given to me by gentlemen down in the district as being absolutely vital to the trade. I do not pretend to know myself that these are the correct points, but some hon. gentlemen in this House from Nova Scotia will correct me if they are not; but I believe them to be important points. The rate from Port Hawkesbury to Montreal was 38 cents; it was increased to 66 cents, a percentage increase of 73 per cent, and that increase stands to-day. From Lockport to Yarmouth the rate was 8 cents; it was increased to 18 cents, an increase of 125 per cent, and that still stands. Then on fresh fish, we will take the rate from Port Hawkesbury again to Montreal. The rate was 48 cents; it was increased to 83½ cents, an increase of 73 per cent, and that still stands.

We have heard a lot about coal, and about the needs of coal. I am sure if the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) were here he would have a fit to think he voted for something that left things in this position. Take the rate from Springhill to Montreal. It used to be 9½ cents; it was increased to 18 cents, an increase of 89 per cent, and every single cent of that still stands. Then suppose we go into business down in the Maritime provinces and try textiles. You have textile factories at Truro and Amherst. Your textile rate from Truro to Montreal was 38 cents; it was increased to 68 cents, an increase of 78 per cent. There is a similar increase from Amherst to Montreal of 78 per cent.

Iron and steel, a most important product in Nova Scotia, had a rate of 22 cents; that was increased to 40 cents, a percentage increase of 81 per cent upon Nova Scotia's biggest industrial activity. They are complaining that they cannot ship, that they cannot sell. Well, there is their increase, 81 per cent, and it still stands. That is on iron and steel, list "A." If you take iron and steel, list "B," which is a higher quality, it is worse. The old rate was 28½ cents; that was increased to 52 cents, a percentage increase of 82 per cent.

The whole fact of the matter, Mr. Speaker, is that the results are just exactly what might be expected from the action that was taken. The government started out by saying: We know nothing about rates; we have no mind on this subject, and they sent it off to a committee. We had evidence taken for weeks and weeks pointing practically to all these conclusions, pointing to what was going to happen, and that was all thrown away. The political question was the only one considered, and if this discussion to-day does nothing else it will do a splendid thing for Canada if hereafter no government is going to try and make rates and take away from the board absolute and full jurisdiction in connection with the rate question. It would be a first-rate thing if it could do that.

Something was said about the inadvisability of making rates here. I would like to know how much better qualified the government is to make rates than is this House? Again, it was contended that the government cannot do anything with this question because it has to do something with it afterwards. Well, I would have thought the government would have welcomed action by this House. Generally it wants to know what the House thinks before it does anything on this, that and the other question. Why, even action upon the subject of oleomargarine has to depend on a resolution being introduced by a private member. I would have thought that the government would be pleased because this matter was being discussed by the House.

We think that the wrong thing was done last year; in fact we know it. We know that those who are producing these essential basic commodities are suffering. The government has put into effect an old statute and something was said about the matter of consideration. The consideration paid in connection with that statute was $3,600,000—that was the whole amount that was paid under the subsidy; and the losses in this one year under present conditions are infinitely greater. But the government brings that act into effect again when it need not. It is idle to say that the government is to be excused because it does nothing here. Surely if the government believes in fairness, and finds special privileges lurking here or there it is its duty

to remove it. It is equally idle to say, if special privilege prevails by reason of the fact that we do nothing, that we are not to blame. The present position is entirely the result of the government's action. Even admitting that this House of all bodies, except perhaps the Privy Council is the most ill-fitted to consider a question of this kind, it has the right to ask something like a similar class of treatment for all the provinces. We were told last year that the action taken would help two important provinces. It did. Those provinces are important, it was right to help them; but there are a whole lot of other provinces that have not yet lost their importance and that are still highly important that require help just as much, and they have a right to expect equality of treatment at the hands of this government.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York): I am only to take up the attention of the House for two or three moments, and I want to make a suggestion which, I think, offers a practical solution of this question. That would be for parliament, and for the government and the Minister of Railways, to readjust the relations between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canadian National Railways in this direction: The Crowsnest pass agreement has produced a condition of affairs that is unsatisfactory to a great many people in this country, and in a great many different places in Canada. The way to overcome that, if the difficulty is based on the higher cost or alleged higher cost of the construction of the Canadian Pacific, is not by lawyers' arguments or by reference to the commission and treating it as a question sub judice, but it is by giving the Canadian Pacific the right to run over the improved grades of the Canadian National. That is where the solution of the question lies. There are many grievances existing in this country to-day which are based on that. The greatest grievance in the province of Ontario is the fact that the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway maintain, in their approach to the city of Toronto, two one per cent grades that are absolutely a hindrance to improved railway service and improved railway rates. Neither company, as far as I can learn will agree on a settlement. The two railways are separated by a distance of four miles—perhaps not that much—and there is a half of one per cent grade between the two. They still fight and maintain those expensive grades and the cost of maintaining them falls on the public. Somebody has got to knock the heads of the two companies together and insist on their using the better grade midway between the two existing grades. That is the solution of the Toronto question and in the same treatment lies the solution of the Crowsnest pass question—simply make the two companies get together and if there is a superior grade let the road with the inferior grade have the use of the improved grade on reasonable terms. There are many similar difficulties all over this country and neither the courts, the Privy Council nor the Railway Commission will ever settle the abuses that are resultant from that difference of grades and that increased cost. The only solution is the one I have indicated. The settlement will not come by law, or by judicial decision, or by argument of lawyers; it will come by action on the part of parliament and leadership on the part of the government to try and find some arrangement for the removal of this grievance. Wipe out the Crowsnest pass agreement in so far as our grade grievance is concerned remove this difference of cost between the two grades and the great advantage enjoyed by the National railway by reason of its improved grade over the Canadian Pacific, and you will experience relief. As a matter of fact the Canadian National railway has absolutely the best grade between Montreal and Winnipeg. That question will come up some day and will call for settlement. The way to settle the matter is to have the two roads come to some kind of understanding. The unnecessary competition between the two roads and the cost which it involves is a source of much difficulty and much waste in the country. The Railway Commission cannot settle it, neither can the Privy Council, but this parliament can. Let me give another instance. Every day there is a great waste of money going on at the expense of the people by running two day train services daily between Toronto and Ottawa. One train would give a more satisfactory service and save expense to both companies. The companies have got to be compelled to get together and where there is an advantage in grades there must be joint use of them; where there is absolutely waste in passenger trains and unnecessary competition they must be forced to make a change. Parliament must force them; The Railway Commission cannot do it nor can it be done by any lawyers' arguments.

A quick settlement of this question of the Crowsnest pass agreement is for parliament to allow the Canadian Pacific to use the improved grade of the National road on suitable terms; perhaps to make some order by which the much better grade between Winnipeg and Quebec can be used over the National road for through transportation, and in many other directions. And if great relief

to Canada in freight rates, or economy in railroad administration, is to be derived by using the Panama canal let that route be used, and let parliament give its assistance. The Railway Commission will never give it. It must come from parliament and by parliamentary action, by parliament taking the two roads, and wherever there is waste as between them, and where through or interprovincial freight is involved, and there is a better grade on one road than on the other, there must be common usage of the improved grade on terms. If we start in on that basis, instead of making it a fight between lawyers, or a question to be submitted to the Railway Commission or to the Privy Council, we may get somewhere, but if it is to be fought out between lawyers, as I suggest, we will have these discussions for a year or two. I do not think a discussion of this kind can accomplish anything; we must have direct action. The country demands it. We get that direct action in parliament.

I agree with the ruling of the Speaker that this question is a parliamentary one. It is not a question for lawyers, or the commission, or the Privy Council, but one for this House. A hundred railroad questions are pressing on the people of Canada to-day, and the solution is in parliament.

The responsible Minister of Railways should find a way to wipe out this differential based on the alleged greatly increased cost of the Canadian Pacific Railway over the Canadian National Railway. As a matter of fact, the Canadian National is prepared to have this Crowsnest pass discrimination wiped out. They know they can do the work for a great deal less and they are anxious to do it. I believe Sir Henry Thornton has said that he is anxious to do it, and if that is the case why leave it to lawyers? Why not let the department introduce an immediate and quick cure, not only for this question, but for a lot of others that may arise? Hon. members may say they do not want to bring up cases of individual rates. Neither do I, nor do I wish to see the time of this House taken up by somebody trying to get a little political advantage for his province or his business. This question should be settled in parliament and the responsibility is on the government, especially if there are two competing lines where the management of these lines will not come to an understanding. In such case let parliament wipe out the unfair condition of affairs and make them come to terms.

Mr. ALFRED SPEAKMAN (Red Deer): I crave the indulgence of the House for about five minutes while I make a few comments upon the method in which this resolution has been presented and upon some of the arguments by which it has been supported. As I understand this question, it is a matter in which the twin sisters, or the two provinces of British Columbia and Alberta, are vitally interested, and so far the two governments have been working in partnership in order, if possible, to have the differential rates under the mountain scale removed, believing it would be for the benefit of both parties in that partnership, to enable those two provinces, and also the province a little further east, to trade together on the same terms on which the other provinces of the Dominion are permitted to trade. We believe it would be for the advantage of the province of British Columbia and the province of Alberta, and we believe also that the removal of that differential would enable the Alberta men to take advantage of their proximity to the sea, and on that ground I and the other Alberta members, and, indeed, I think most of the Progressives in this House, would be solidly behind any bona fide attempt to have this differential removed, whether it is accomplished in this House or outside of it.

But I must confess, Sir, that I somewhat resent the manner in which this matter has been presented to the House at this time. I believe as I said, that this is a matter of partnership between the two provinces, and yet what do we find in the presentation of the case this afternoon and evening? I am not reflecting on the sincerity of the hon. member (Mr. Clark) who introduced the motion, but we find on the part of many hon. members who supported the motion simply a camouflage attack on the Crowsnest pass agreement. That is all it is, and all it is intended for, to my mind, on the part of many hon. members. I think I can say that, and at the same time be absolutely fair in saying it, by simply referring to what was said by the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) and concurred in, as far as I could see, by the party who sit behind him, when he made the offer to the Prime Minister regardless of the other party to this agreement, regardless of the rights of Alberta, that if this government would cancel the Crowsnest pass agreement which it put in force last year, which meant more to Alberta than to any other province of Canada, he and his party would be willing to withdraw their resolution. Is that fair play? Or does it savour more of treachery to the other partner? I and others in this branch of parliament resent the attitude that has been taken, and the camouflage attack that has been made upon what we consider to be one of the charters under which we can work the

charter of our liberty I was going to say, but, at least, one of the safeguards of our possible success.

Mr. STEVENS: Did the hon. member not hear the Prime Minister state that the Crowsnest pass agreement would die by effluxion of time next year?

Mr. SPEAKMAN: If the hon. member understood the Prime Minister in that way, I did not. I understood him to say, in confirmation of what was done last year, that next year, if the Council took the action which they were authorized to do by parliament last year, the whole Crowsnest pass agreement would come into effect, and that the suspension in part would cease.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is what I did say.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: And had the Prime Minister stated otherwise I certainly would have strongly resented any such statement, but the fact remains that the only members in this House who have suggested the abrogation of that agreement have been the hon. members to my right, as a camouflage for securing the differential freight rates as existing over the mountains to British Columbia.

I promised I would only speak about five minutes, but I felt it was necessary for some member in this House speaking for Alberta to take exception to that attitude, and that is why I have spoken to-night. I am not reflecting on the bona fides of the hon. member who introduced the motion. I believe he is sincere in his wish to have that differential removed, but I certainly do not think his judgment was equal to his sincerity in that respect. I believe that had it been the intention on the part of hon. members on my right to have this matter definitely accomplished, to have these differential rates removed, to have trading permitted to be carried on freely and equitably between one province and another, to relieve the province of British Columbia from the disabilities under which it laboured in consequence of that differential, to assist the province of Alberta which is the partner with them in this matter in securing access to the sea, and the use of the port of Vancouver on the most favourable terms, they would have brought forward a resolution worded in a different manner, because the resolution mixes up two distinct questions, first calling for the removal of the differential, calling for the reduction of freight rates over the mountains, to bring them in line with the freight rates existing in other parts of the country, and, second, attempting in a most peculiar manner to discredit the Crowsnest pass agreement.

That is all I need to say, all I wish to say, except that every Alberta Progressive in this House has been, is now, and ever will be, as far as I am aware, solidly behind those two provincial governments which are doing their best to have justice done to those two provinces. At any time in which this matter is brought forward in such a way, you will find us solidly in its support; but when an attempt is made, under cover of a proposed removal of the differential, to attack the legislation passed last year, when an attempt is made to take away from us the benefits of the Crowsnest pass agreement, we will oppose that attempt in this House and out of it at all times.

Mr. L. J. LADNER (Vancouver South): Mr. Speaker, I desire to add a very few words in support of the resolution. The last speaker (Mr. Speakman) is much concerned about what he calls the attack on the Crowsnest pass agreement. The resolution before the House is not an attack upon the advantages which the prairie provinces have received under that agreement; it is an effort to appeal to the justice of parliament for the same advantages and the same principles to be extended to the other partners in confederation. That is the whole proposition in a sentence. I venture to say that every member from British Columbia, faced with the issue involved in this resolution and unable to avail himself of any subterfuge, would have to support the resolution, because the 600,000 citizens of our province appreciate the injustices which have been perpetrated upon them in the past, either by chance or by design. The government last year did play politics, and now they are reaping the retribution of their wrongdoing. Until they rectify the mistake they made then, they will find themselves in continuous hot water from Halifax to Vancouver.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: Does the hon. member mean by rectifying the matter, that they should cancel the agreement?

Mr. LADNER: No, I mean in rectifying it, you adopt the resolution before the House to eliminate the mountain differential, the discriminatory rates, and to give the same treatment to all the members of confederation on their basic commodities. What can be fairer than that? Can any hon. gentleman present stand up and seriously and honestly deny the merit of that contention? Certainly not, and least of all the government. What did they do? They took the first step last

year to smash a well-balanced, judicial body in the way of the Railway Commission, and to substitute for that judicial machinery, political machinery in exactly the same way as we have seen one attempt after another, under different guises, to abolish the Civil Service machinery and to inject political machinery, a process which even now the government may be endeavouring to carry into effect. The duty of every member of parliament is to put his hand flatly against attempts of this kind.

This resolution is being brought before the House on this occasion, largely irrespective of the political aspect, in order to make bare and plain to the government the effect of their action of last year, and the fact that when they gave a special consideration, as they did last year to the prairie provinces—not that I would deny them that at all—they must in duty and justice extend that to the rest of us. What do we find as a consequence of this advantage that was extended to the prairie provinces last year? We find that in playing politics on those freight rates to move the prairie provinces, this year a Romeo left the family circle of the government in Ottawa, in the guise of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell), and hastened away to Moose Jaw to sound his plaintive note; but sad as it may be said, Miss Moose Jaw hooked up with a Farmer. The result is that they are no further advanced than they were before.

Anyone who listened to the discussion last year, anyone who has heard the debate this year, the case ably presented by the hon member for Burrard (Mr. Clark), and the arguments brought out in some very able speeches, must, if he uses his intelligence, his heart and his judgment, admit that the case for British Columbia has been established to the full. We did suffer an injustice; we are under discriminatory rates; we are entitled to have that rectified, and the action of the government last year made it still more impossible to bring about the rectification of the situation in which our province finds itself. This year the government, through hon. members speaking on their behalf, say: "Keep railway rates out of politics; that is a matter for the Railway Board." Why did they not say that last year? This year they say: "We have the matter under consideration"; but for the past two seasons the government have been telling us that they are a democratic government; that when they have a complicated matter of interest to the whole people, they consult all the representatives of the people, they consult parliament, and when parliament has expressed its view, they formulate the conclusion into legislation. These are inconsistencies which must be apparent to every hon. member, and I wish simply to point out, with all due respect to the Minister of Public Works (Mr. King), my good friend from British Columbia, that when he says that the people of British Columbia would prefer if the hon. member for Burrard had not meddled in this question, he is stating just the reverse of the facts. I believe the people of British Columia want every one of its members to advocate its cause before the representatives of the sister provinces of this confederation, because we know that from the time of our admission to the union by the act of 1868, enforced in 1870, we were protected under that act with respect to unfair discrimination. We know that when the Canadian Pacific built their railway, it was especially planned under the statutory laws of that time that that railway should pass through the Yellowhead pass. If it had passed through the Yellowhead pass, and somebody had not made a mistake during the survey and diverted the line to the Roger's pass, the advantages accruing now to the Canadian National would have accrued to the Canadian Pacific, and would have redounded to the advantage of British Columbia and the Dominion at large. These are facts, historical records.

We come down to the present time, and a last effort was made to preserve the protection we had in British Columbia in 1910 in the agreement with the Canadian National Railways. It is not my intention to go into that matter; but in that agreement a special, concrete provision was made that British Columbia would have on rates the protection which she had had in the past, and which she did not wish to be deprived of. The fact is—and no hon. member has made a suggestion to the contrary—that there are discriminatory rates, and we are handicapped without a just cause. Where is the remedy to be found? Parliament last year absorbed by its action $17,000,000 out of the revenues of the railways in order that the prairie provinces might benefit that much. I do not object to their having that; but that is what the result of parliamentary legislation was, and this made it impossible to remedy conditions in British Columbia and to give fair treatment to the other provinces.

So to-day, Mr. Speaker, the government find themselves in the predicament that having injected politics into the question they have to play politics to get out of it. And that is what they are doing. They are appealing

to parliament and saying: "Gentlemen, do not treat this resolution on its merits. This is a want of confidence motion, and if you want to retain your seats support the government. Never mind the merits, support the government."

An hon. MEMBER: Carried.

Mr. LADNER: I put it to the hon. member that shouts "Carried" that perhaps he is afraid of losing his seat. I say to hon. members generally, including my Progressive friends, that we must decide this question on the merits. The resolution simply asks for the elimination of the discriminatory "mountain scale" and the same treatment as the sister provinces of confederation in respect to basic commodities. The government seek to evade the issue by saying, "No, this is a want of confidence motion." I appeal to the conscience, to the political instinct and to the good judgment of all members to determine which course they take. I am confident that a very large number, including many in this part of the House, will determine this question on its merits and not as a matter of political expediency.

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (North Toronto): Mr. Speaker, a general freight rate reduction is necessary for the economic life of the country. From what we have heard to-day we might think that only the province of British Columbia is being discriminated against, but let me assure my hon. friends from the West that the provinces east of the Great Lakes are suffering greater discrimination than any other part of the Dominion.

The question of freight rates should not be made a political football of this party or that; indeed it is a question which should not be brought up in this House at all. The gist of the general Railway Act as to rates is equality of treatment. Consequently the regulation of freight rates is an economic and commercial question, and if we are going to attempt to fix freight rates by legislation and so tie the hands of the Railway Commission, that commission will not be able to function as it should in preserving equality of treatment throughout the Dominion in regard to freight rates.

Last session it was contended that the prairie provinces should have special rates to the head of the lakes for their basic commodities including flour and grain. To-day grain is paying the lowest rates, and this is necessary. But it is not necessary, in order to give preferential rates on those basic commodities, that the other provinces should be discriminated against. We are reminded that when British Columbia came into confederation it was on the faith of an agreement which guaranteed her equal rates with the rest of Canada. Then the Maritime provinces have reminded us that under their agreement to enter confederation they were to have preferential rates in order to enable them to get their products to the centre of Canada. Thus we have the East and the West pressing for lower freight rates, but if parliament goes over the head of the Railway Commission and ignores the economic factor, then we might as well abolish the commission.

In my opinion the fairest solution of the question is to put all the parties back where they were before the war-time legislation which increased freight rates. Let us go back and restore confidence in the Railway Commission, because if this commission to-day is not fulfilling the functions for which it was appointed, if it is not ensuring equality of treatment to all localities, then it is time to get a new Railway Commission. As I read the Railway Act the jurisdiction of the Railway Commission cannot be interfered with. It is clothed with paramount control of freight rates, which it should regulate strictly from the economic standpoint. Its powers are largely similar to the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and that commission is not interfered with by Congress or the Senate. It fixes rates in the United States according to operating costs. That is what should be done in Canada, and until it is done we are bound to have discrimination. To-day Canada has the highest average ton-mile rate in the world, ·751 cents. The next is the United States ·732 cents

Adequate and equitable rates depend very largely on the Railway Commission fulfilling its functions and powers and preventing unjust discrimination.

This question of the "mountain scale" was before the special committee last year. As the case was then pending before the Railway Commission it was urged that parliament should defer taking action until the commission had rendered judgment. Unfortunately, parliament interfered with the prairie rates, with the result that the Railway Commission has not seen fit to harmonize the mountain rate with the prairie rate. This unfortunate result prompts me to ask: Has not the time come for parliament to leave rate control to the Railway Commission? If the commission is no longer a competent body, then let us appoint a new commission. Let us repeal the legislation of last session dealing with freight rates and put all the provinces back where

they were before the War Measures Act interfered with rates.

Let the Railway Commission go into this whole question as the Interstate Commerce Commission did in the United States. The Railway Commission of this country did not wait for parliament to tell them what to do in the matter of raising rates after the Chicago award and the McAdoo award; they made these increases of their own accord, but they are waiting for parliament to tell them what to do in the matter of lowering rates. I agree with the principle of this resolution, because this House laid down the principle last session that the prairie provinces should have special treatment in respect to their basic commodities. If they are to have special treatment, so should the farmers of British Columbia have special treatment, and the same applies to the Maritime provinces and the other older provinces of Canada for their basic products also. The people of the old provinces of Canada—Ontario and Quebec—have paid out their money in taxes for the building of railways to give the West the railway facilities that they have. Ontario has been discriminated against more than any other province in the matter of railway rates since confederation. I say, then, repeal the legislation of last session and put all the provinces on a parity so that the Railway Act can be carried out in its entirety. Equality of treatment should be the principle; no preference should be shown to any one province.

Mr. L. W. HUMPHREY (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, as a very modest member of this House I would like the privilege of addressing my few remarks from this seat. I have not been in the habit of contributing very much to the debates, and situated as I am in the far corner of the Chamber I fear that if I spoke from my own seat some of my remarks might not be heard.

I rise as a member from British Columbia to enter a most emphatic protest against this resolution. The member for Red Deer (Mr. Speakman) has said that as a member from Alberta he considered it was his duty to offer a contribution on behalf of that province. I as a member from British Columbia feel that it is my duty to offer a small contribution on behalf of British Columbia. Although my remarks may not meet with the approval of all on this side of the House, I feel that I have the welfare of my province as much at heart as any other hon. member of this House, and that I represent a class of people who are deeply interested in the welfare not only of their district and province, but of the Dominion as a whole.

Let us review for a moment the question that is the subject of the present debate. The resolution reads:

> That in the opinion of this House, all unfair and unjust discrimination against British Columbia as exemplified in the "mountain scale" of freight rates should be rescinded and the special reduction made by the restoration of the Crowsnest pass rates on the basic production of the prairie provinces be extended to the basic productions of all other provinces of confederation.

If the hon. member for Burrard had been sincere in his professions of regard for the welfare of British Columbia—and I do not doubt his sincerity as an hon. member of this House—he would, in my opinion have been more consistent in the resolution which he had on the order paper under date of February 15. That resolution reads:

> That in the opinion of this House, railway rates westward from the prairie provinces should be reduced to an equality with railway rates eastward from said provinces for similar goods and distances.

I cannot see the consistency of the two resolutions, and I do not see how the hon. member is consistent so far as his alleged interest in the welfare of British Columbia is concerned. In the last several months all the organized bodies of British Columbia, in fact I may safely say 95 per cent of the population of the province, have given their loyal support to those who have been instrumental in setting forth the claims of British Columbia on this railway rate question. A large number of the boards of trade of the province have given their unanimous support to the Premier on the question. The claims of British Columbia have been carried from one stage to another until they are now before the Privy Council, and it is my opinion that this is not an opportune time for the House to take the matter out of the hands of the Privy Council and declare upon the merits of the discrimination so far as it affects British Columbia. If, on the other hand, we have a railway commission that is not doing its duty to the people, I and many other hon. members will be only too glad to see that that particular defect is remedied. But I say that this is not an opportune time to take the matter out of the channels in which it has proceeded. The hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Ladner) has said that the government last year played politics in respect to this railway question. Well, with all due respect to the hon. member and with no prejudice to other hon. members of the House, I would say that in my opinion this question as it is being

handled is nothing else but politics, first and last.

Mr. LADNER: Does the hon. gentleman think that it should be the subject of political play, as he says it has been?

Mr. HUMPHREY: My remarks are addressed to the statement made by the hon. member for Vancouver South that this railway rates question was made the subject of politics last year. I repeat that in my opinion the matter is being handled now as nothing more or less than a political question, and the result is only to prejudice the interests of the people of British Columbia and to bring about a state of chaos so far as their attitude on this question is concerned—and their opinion is now a unanimous one. They are unanimous in their opinion on this question and are giving united and loyal support to those who are taking a sincere and genuine interest in it. But I feel it is not right for any member to bring this question into parliament at this time to be made a political football of at the expense of the people of British Columbia. My experience as a member of this parliament has been short. Perhaps I have not contributed as much as many others to the debates. Nevertheless I have endeavoured as far as I could in my humble way and to the best of my ability to follow the questions that have arisen and to give my best judgment upon each, and particularly with respect to the questions affecting the Dominion. I compare this question to one that arose in the Chamber something like a year ago respecting the returned men of whom I am glad to say, without boasting at all, that I am one. Certain interests of the returned men were under consideration at that time, and I place this particular question on a parallel with that. I think this resolution has been introduced simply to further certain political interests. It has been brought in at this particular time and in this particular way not to further the interests of British Columbia because, however it is decided, it would not do that. If this resolution was carried by the House, we as residents of British Columbia would not gain anything. On the other hand would we gain if the resolution was not carried? I cannot see how in either event, from the point of view of those favouring the resolution, anything is to be gained. The question is entirely in the hands of the powers that have it under their consideration. I do not treat it as a want of confidence motion in any shape or form. I have little concern in that respect for the position of the government on this question, but I have a great deal of concern regarding the people whom I am endeavouring to represent to the best of my ability upon each question as it arises, and taking that stand I cannot in any way support this resolution as it has been brought forward by the hon. member for Burrard.

Amendment negatived.

Motion agreed to and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

Progress reported.

PRIVATE BILLS

SECOND READING

Bill No. 107 (from the Senate), to incorporate Montreal Finance Trust.—Mr. Papineau.

Bill No. 108 (from the Senate), for the relief of Violet Gardiner.—Mr. Sheard.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, the House adjourned at 12.29 a.m. Wednesday.

Wednesday, April 18, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT

EVIDENCE IN MARRIAGE OR DIVORCE PROCEEDINGS

Hon. Sir LOMER GOUIN (Minister of Justice) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 109 (from the Senate), to amend The Criminal Code with respect to Publication of Evidence in Marriage or Divorce Proceedings.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the minister explain this bill? It has a peculiar title.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: The purpose of the bill is to prohibit the publication of evidence in marriage and divorce proceedings without authority from the House or the Senate. It is a bill which comes from the Senate.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

BONDED LIQUOR WAREHOUSES

Mr. CLARK:

1. How many licenses for bonded warehouses for storage of intoxicating liquors in bond are in force in the province of British Columbia?

2. What are the names of the licensees and the dates of the licenses now in force and granted prior to 1920, and the locations in respect of which they were granted?

3. What is the duration of such licenses, and has the government power to cancel or revoke same, and if so, for what reason?

Hon. Mr. BUREAU:

1. There are at present in the province of British Columbia 25 customs warehouses for storage of intoxicating liquor in bond, 9 of which, however are inactive.

There are 3 licenses for excise bonded liquor warehouses in force at present.

2. None of the customs or excise bonded liquor warehouses at present in force in British Columbia were authorized prior to 1920. The Provincial Government Vendor had been granted a customs bonded warehouse at Vancouver prior to 1920, but this bond now stands in the name of the Provincial Government Liquor Control Board.

3. A customs bonded warehouse for storage of intoxicating liquor is only granted upon unconditional consent of provincial authorities and remains in force until cancelled by the minister for cause or withdrawal of provincial consent.

License for an excise liquor bonded warehouse is granted under similar conditions for a period not extending beyond fiscal year in which granted, but may be renewed with consent of provincial authorities, and is subject to cancellation for any infraction of the Inland Revenue Act.

CATTLE DISEASES

Mr. SPENCER:

1. How long has the present system of condemnation insurance been in vogue in Canada?
2. Is the per cent dockage the same for both cattle and swine?
3. Is the per cent dockage the same for all parts of Canada?
4. Is it the same for cattle and swine of all ages?
5. What data have been collected to ascertain whether the amount of dockage collected is greater or less than the losses sustained because of condemnation?
6. What data have been collected to determine whether or not disease is more prevalent among cattle over 5 years old than among those under 5?
7. How is the loss sustained because of condemnation arrived at?
8. Have any data been collected with a view to ascertaining the average amount of salvage from a condemned carcase?
9. If so what is the approximate ratio of the salvage to the first cost of the live animal?
10. Is it the purpose of the system of condemnation insurance in vogue in Canada to reimburse the butchers for animals condemned whether the ailment for which the animal is condemned is visible to the buyer or not?
11. In what countries other than Canada, is a flat rate of dockage collected regardless of age, class, or point of origin of the animals?
12. What is the custom in Great Britain with respect to these matters?

Hon. Mr. MOTHERWELL:

1. Since 1907 or thereabouts when inspection of meats first become operative in Candian packing plants.

2. The tax works out at ½ of 1 per cent on both cattle and swine. At Toronto cows are docked 50 cents per head other cattle 20 cents and shop hogs ½ of 1 per cent.

3. Yes. It works out at ½ of 1 per cent.

4. Yes.

5. Understand that the packers have collected some data.

6. Nil.

7. Information available from the packers.

8. Nil.

9. Information available from the packers.

10. It may not be the purpose but it is the effect.

11. No information.

12. No information.

NOTE.—This is an insurance practice adopted by the packers and the trade generally at the stock yards to protect themselves against loss from diseased animals which disease is only revealed on post mortem examination. If it were abolished by law as it could be it is feared that it would only result in buyers reducing their bids by a greater amount than that now charged the producer on account of this condemnation insurance.

T. B. TEST

Mr. KELLNER:

1. What was the cost of the T. B. test in Edmonton from 1921 to date?
2. What was the amount of compensation paid to owners of reactors?
3. What was the amount paid to officials for service?
4. What was the amount paid to officials for travelling expenses?
5. What was the distance travelled by officials?
6. What was the number of cattle tested?
7. What was the number of reactors?
8. What was the cost per head of cattle tested?

Hon. Mr. MOTHERWELL:

1. From the date of commencement, May 1st, 1922 to February 28th, 1923.

Compensation to owners..	$50,712.83
Salaries..	8,703.00
Travelling expenses..	6,866.00
Supplies, thermometers, tags, etc..	1,181.70
Tuberculin..	3,663.27
	$71,126.80

2. $50,712.83 obligation incurred but not all yet paid.

3. $8,703.

4. $6,866.

5. Mileage by road, 36,830; Mileage by rail, 4,031; total 40,861.

6. 11,817 cattle tested once, but 16,783 first and subsequent tests applied.

7. 1,381.

8. On first test alone including compensation, $6.02; On first test alone excluding com-

pensation, $1.73; On first and subsequent tests including compensation, $4.24; On first and subsequent tests excluding compensation, $1.22.

RAILWAY COMMISSIONERS

Mr. COOTE:

What was the address and the occupation of each member of the Board of Railway Commissioners, previous to his appointment?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

Hon. F. B. Carvell, K.C., Chief Commissioner, Minister of Public Works, Ottawa.

S. J. McLean, Asst. Chief Commissioner, Professor of Economics, and Transportation, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ont.

Hon. W. B. Nantel, K.C., Deputy Chief Commissioner, Barrister, St. Jerome, P.Q.

A. C. Boyce, K.C., Commissioner, Barrister, Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario.

Dr. J. G. Rutherford, C.M.G., Commissioner, Supt. of Agriculture and Animal Industry, Dept. of Natural Resources, C. P. Ry., President, Western Canada Live Stock Union, Calgary, Alta.

Calvin Lawrence, Commissioner, Legislative Representative, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Ottawa.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—DIRECTORS

Mr. COOTE:

1. What are the names, addresses and occupations of the directors of the Canadian National Railways?
2. For what length of time are they appointed?
3. What is the salary of each?
4. Is the amount of salary fixed by the government? If not, by whom are these salaries fixed?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Major General Sir Henry Worth Thornton, K.B.E., President and Chairman, Canadian National Rys., McGill Street, Montreal, Que., Railroad President.

John H. Sinclair, K.C., New Glasgow, N.S., Barrister.

Major G. A. Bell, C.M.G., Vice-President, Canadian National Railways, Ottawa, Ont., also Deputy Minister Railways and Canals.

Gerard Ruel, Vice-President, Canadian National Railways, McGill Street, Montreal, Que., also General Counsel.

Richard P. Gough, Sellers-Gough Fur Company, Limited, 244 Yonge Street, Toronto, Ont. Merchant and Banker.

James Stewart, 500 Grain Exchange, Winnipeg, Man., Grain Merchant.

Ernest R. Decary, Director General, Title Guarantee & Trust Co. of Canada, 224 St. James Street, Montreal, Que., Vice-President and Director General Title Guarantee and Trust Co., of Canada.

Frederick G. Dawson, Prince Rupert, B.C., Merchant.

Tom Moore, President, Trades & Labour Congress of Canada, 172 McLaren Street, Ottawa, Ont., President, Trades and Labour Congress of Canada.

Col. O. E. Talbot, 27 St. Stanislas Avenue, Quebec, Que., Collector of Porvincial Revenue, Quebec.

2. "The directors shall hold office from one annual meeting to another or until their successors are appointed, unless removed by the Governor in Council for cause,"—Clause No. 2 of the Incorporating Act, Chapter No. 13 of 1919.

3. The remuneration received by the directors has (provided in Clause No. 5 of the above mentioned Act) been approved at $2,000 each per annum.

4. The directors may be paid by the company such sums for their services as the Governor in Council may from time to time approve.

GRAIN SHIPMENTS

Mr. COOTE:

1. What was the amount of grain of each kind shipped from the port of Montreal in each of the years 1920, 1921 and 1922?
2. How much of this grain was Canadian grown and how much American?
3. How much of the 1922 Canadian grain crop was shipped from Montreal in 1922?
4. How much grain was handled by the Grand Trunk elevator and how much by the elevators owned by the Montreal Harbour Commission in the years 1920, 1921 and 1922?
5. Has the Montreal Harbour Commission recently purchased from the Canadian National Railway system the said Grand Trunk elevator? If so, what was the price paid for same?
6. What is the storage capacity of this elevator?
7. What is the storage capacity of the other elevators owned by the Harbour Commission and what was the total cost of these elevators?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: The answer to this question involves a long statement. It would be a rather voluminous document to insert in Hansard, and I would ask that the question be changed into an order for return, which I now lay on the table of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: Stands as order for return.

RELIEF OF BASIC INDUSTRIES

Mr. MAYBEE:

1. Is it the intention of the government this session to allow a further consideration of the motion of Mr. Hodgins, (Middlesex), re assisting the wool combing basic industry in Canada?
2. Will the government consider some relief of the duty on machinery necessary to be brought in for such a basic industry and elimination of the sales tax and duty on tops?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING: There is no motion on the order paper in the name of the hon.

member referred to. I assume the reference is to a motion that stands in the name of the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Drummond). In the opinion of the government we can hardly profitably discuss the motion in its present form. It speaks of certain reforms which are desirable, but it devises or suggests no particular means of carrying out the hon. member's desire. I suggest that if the hon. member will consult with the Law Clerk, who will be available, and will put his motion in the form of a bill, an opportunity will be given at a later stage to bring it forward.

MIRAMICHI SMELT FISHING

Mr. HANSON:

1. What number of smelt bag-net licenses were issued to fishermen on the river Miramichi and its branches for: (a) the season 1921-22, and (b) the season 1922-23?
2. On what date did the open season for smelt fishing on the Miramichi river expire in 1923?
3. Did any officer of the Department of Marine and Fisheries patrol the river Miramichi after the close of the smelt fishing season?
4. If so, were any fishermen found to be engaged in illegal fishing for smelt?
5. How many, if any, were found so engaged, and were they all prosecuted for the offence?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. In Miramichi river and bay the number was 1,305 in 1921-22 and 1,756 in 1922-23.
2. February 20.
3. Yes.
4. & 5. No fishermen were so found; but seventeen nets that were being illegally used were found and confiscated.

OTTAWA RIVER POWER

Mr. BINETTE:

1. Is the government aware as to whether the Quebec and New England Hydro Company intends to develop the water power on the Ottawa river at Pointe Fortune?
2. If so, is it the intention of the government to encourage this project?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM: The Quebec-New England Hydro Electric Corporation (formerly the Montreal Public Service Corporation) has secured the right to develop the water-power on the Ottawa river at Carillon, now leased to the National Hydro-Electric Company, Limited, under which lease development must commence on or before the 1st of December, 1923. Date of last lease, December, 1921.

LIQUOR WAREHOUSES

Mr. McQUARRIE:

1. How many excise warehouse licenses for storage of intoxicating liquors are in force in the province of British Columbia?
2. What are the names of the licensees who obtained licenses prior to 1920 which are still in force, and the dates and the locations in respect of which they were granted?
3. Are such licenses renewable from year to year, and is the consent of the provincial authorities required before renewals are granted?

Hon. Mr. BUREAU:

1. Two.
2. None.
3. Yes.

NORTHWEST TERRITORIES ACT

Mr. SHAW.

Does the government propose to repeal by proclamation or otherwise those statutory provisions in the Northwest Territories Act (Revised Statutes 1906, Chap. 62), relating to procedure in criminal matters, in so far as they apply to the province of Alberta?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: The matter is under consideration.

RIORDON PULP AND PAPER COMPANY

Mr. SHAW.

1. Have the arrears of business profits and other taxes, payable to the government by the Riordon Pulp and Paper Company, and its subsidiary companies, for which promissory notes were taken by the former government, been collected either wholly or partly?
2. If so, when were collections made?
3. What was the amount of such collections?
4. What amount is now outstanding and unpaid?
5. If there are arrears unpaid, what action has the government taken to collect same, or what has it in contemplation?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING: In view of pending arrangements respecting the Riordon business, it is not deemed expedient in the public interest to make any statement on this subject at present.

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

GRAIN SHIPMENTS

Mr. COOTE:

1. What was the amount of grain of each kind shipped from the port of Montreal in each of the years 1920, 1921 and 1922?
2. How much of this grain was Canadian grown and how much American?
3. How much of the 1922 Canadian grain crop was shipped from Montreal in 1922?
4. How much grain was handled by the Grand Trunk elevator and how much by the elevators owned by the Montreal Harbour Commission in the years 1920, 1921 and 1922?
5. Has the Montreal Harbour Commission recently purchased from the Canadian National Railway system the said Grand Trunk elevator? If so, what was the price paid for same?
6. What is the storage capacity of this elevator?
7. What is the storage capacity of the other elevators owned by the Harbour Commission and what was the total cost of these elevators?

UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR PAPERS

GOVERNMENT PRINTING

Mr. BLACK (Yukon):

For a return showing the names of newspaper companies and printing companies who have received fed-

eral moneys for printing, since January 1, 1922, with the respective amounts received by each of said companies.

MEYER BRENNER

Mr. JOS. T. SHAW (Calgary West) moved:

For a copy of all correspondence, documents, letters, applications, petitions, and memoranda, leading to and concerning the release on parole of one Meyer Brenner, who was lately discharged from Prince Albert penitentiary after serving approximately one year on a seven years' sentence.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Mr. Speaker, I do not think this motion should be adopted, because it would be a departure from a well established rule that has been in force in England for many years and in this country since at least the days when Sir John Thompson was Minister of Justice. All the successors of Sir John Thompson—Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, Sir Allen Aylesworth, Right Hon. Charles Doherty, and Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier speaking as leader of the Opposition, when they had occasion to express their views on the subject, were of the opinion that such documents should be treated as confidential and that it would not be proper or advisable to make them public. The practice in England is well defined by Todd, and I think that one citation from that authority will be enough to cover all that has been said on the question. I quote from Todd's Parliamentary Government in England, page 557:

No interference by either House of parliament with the exercise of this prerogative is justifiable, except under extraordinary circumstances. It was said by Macaulay, that he would rather entrust it to the hands of the very worst ministry that ever held office than allow it to be exercised under the direction of the very best House of Commons; and by Sir Robert Peel, that he would leave this prerogative in the hands of the executive considering that it was the right and duty of the House to interfere only if there be a suspicion that justice is perverted for corrupt purposes.

In this special case, Mr. Speaker, I have read the record. I do not see anything extraordinary in it, and I do not see why we should make an exception in this case. Taking into account such a rule and such a practice I would ask my hon. friend not to press his motion.

Mr. SHAW: In view of the authorities cited by the hon. Minister of Justice I have no desire to press the motion.

Motion withdrawn.

EMIGRATION TO UNITED STATES

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. BIRD: I would like to draw the attention of the government to an article appearing on the front page of the Free Press of April 16th, in which among other things it is alleged that over six thousand people left Winnipeg for the United States this winter. It is also asserted that owing to the serious condition of agriculture in the West at the present time, trade is practically crippled in Winnipeg. The situation seems to be so serious that the article urges upon the three members representing that city, including, I suppose, the member for North Winnipeg (Mr. McMurray) to take urgent steps in order to right the wrongs of the farmers of the West. In view of this serious situation I am very anxious to know whether the government is fully apprised of the seriousness of these conditions, and also whether they are contemplating a policy to deal with them.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question of the hon. gentleman cannot properly be put on the Orders of the Day. Questions put on the Orders of the Day should be by way of personal explanation by members or questions asked by the leaders upon some pressing matter of public importance. I do not think that the present question is opportune at this stage.

SASKATCHEWAN WHEAT IN STORAGE

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. GOULD: I wish to draw attention to a reference made in the morning paper to an address alleged to have been delivered in the city of Montreal last night by one of the ministers in the Saskatchewan government. The despatch states that the minister said that the last Saskatchewan budget speech contained the statement that the farmers of Saskatchewan still had in their possession 505,000,000 bushels of wheat. This may be a clerical error, but certain it is that the farmers of Saskatchewan cannot have that amount on hand as the total amount they raised was only 300,000,000 bushels. I merely call the attention of the press to that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I do not think that is a proper question to put before the House on the Orders of the Day.

CANADIAN GOVERNMENT MERCHANT MARINE

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. MacLAREN: I wish to refer to an item which appears in the public press to the effect that the government is now negotiating with a syndicate of ship owners for the sale of its entire mercantile fleet, and that a condition of these negotiations is that special arrangements should be made on behalf of the syn-

dicate whereby it should carry on especially the business of the transportation of Canadian grain. I therefore wish to ask the Acting Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) if he can state to the House whether negotiations are going on for the sale of the Canadian mercantile fleet, if so what the conditions of the sale are and if it is correct that the arrangement will contain a special provision whereby Canadian grain will be accorded special treatment.

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM (Acting Minister of Railways): As the House well knows the Canadian National Railway Board, with the consent of the government, is offering for sale 27 of the smaller ships. So far as I know there are no negotiations for the sale of the larger seagoing vessels.

Mr. MacLAREN: Can the minister state whether arrangements are being made between the government and the syndicate for the handling of Canadian grain?

Mr. GRAHAM: What syndicate? I understood my hon. friend to say that he based that part of his question on the answer to the other part—that is to say the reply to the question whether arrangements were being made for the sale of the merchant marine. My reply is that so far as I know there are no negotiations taking place for the sale of the larger vessels.

Mr. MacLAREN: As regards the 27 vessels which the minister spoke of, are special arrangements being made for the handling of Canadian grain?

Mr. GRAHAM: I cannot say. Up to date, I think, no offer has been made for these ships, and the vessels of smaller tonnage, possibly, would not be suitable for the purpose to which my hon. friend refers.

CANADA COLONIZATION ASSOCIATION

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. GARLAND: I wish to ask the minister concerned whether a formal agreement has yet been signed between the government and the Canada Colonization Association, and if so whether that agreement will be laid on the Table of the House.

Hon. CHARLES STEWART (Acting Minister of Immigration and Colonization): I informed the House when the appropriation relating to this matter was going through that there would be no agreement signed. The only agreement is the provisions embodied in the memorandum for the method of paying out the moneys. That memorandum already appears in Hansard.

Mr. JACOBS: Merely a gentleman's agreement.

DEMAND FOR FARM LABOUR

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I desire to ask if the Acting Minister of Immigration and Colonization is aware that there are a thousand families in Winnipeg, the heads of whom have had practical farm experience and are willing to settle on the land and if so, what steps are to be taken to settle those families?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): In answer to the hon. member I may say that applications have been received from western farmers for nearly three thousand farm labourers and we would be delighted to send them out to Winnipeg if they are available. All they need to do is to apply to Mr. Jelly, immigration official at Winnipeg.

GRATUITIES TO GRAND TRUNK DIRECTORS AND OFFICERS

On the Orders of the Day:

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN: Can the government tell us whether it has appointed the royal commission to make that inquiry into the gratuities granted to the Grand Trunk directors and officers, and if so who are the fortunate appointees?

Mr. GRAHAM: I may say, Mr. Speaker, that the appointment has not yet been made but those appointees will be in the singular—one.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Just one?

ECONOMIC AND IMPERIAL CONFERENCES

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. MEIGHEN: May I ask next when the government will give us some information as to the agenda of the Economic Conference and of the Imperial Conference. The Prime Minister states that as respects one he could lay the papers on the Table; as respects the other he needs some authority. None of the papers are on the Table yet although the question was first asked about a week ago.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I may say to my right hon. friend that when I spoke with the deputy of the department as to the papers requested, he mentioned that he thought it would be advisable to ask the permission of the British government before any of them were brought down. That permission was

asked immediately but no response has been received as yet. I will have a further cable sent expressing a desire that consent be given as soon as possible.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I wish to protest against this character of answer and against the suggestion that this House should wait for the permission of the British government before knowing the agenda of the Economic Conference. We have a right to know that and to know it at once. It does not concern the British government when the agenda of the Economic Conference shall be known to us.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am very glad to hear what my right hon. friend has just said, because I have been protesting very strongly against having to ask for permission to lay on the Table of the House a great many of these documents which seem to me ought to be public property as soon as received. However, I am told that such is the method that has been customary as regards communications between the British government and our government, and that it has been so not only in recent years but at all times. I am simply following the procedure that has been held out as the right and proper one; but I may say to my right hon. friend that if the conference is held this year, as is anticipated, I certainly intend to have this matter brought up as one of the subjects for discussion.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I wish to point out again that what the Prime Minister states has not been the practice with respect to all subjects and I venture to say that if he will look at the records of two years ago he will find that at the first request for information as to the agenda I gave it and I made no prior application at all for permission to do so.

CORRECTION—HON. MR. GRAHAM

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM: I wish to make a slight correction. On April 16th, in answering a question by the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Parent) as to the Demers contract in Quebec I stated that the price was 60 cents per hour. It should have been 65 cents.

FRENCH TREATY

Hon. W. S. FIELDING moved the second reading of Bill No. 23 respecting a certain Convention of Commerce between His Majesty and the French Republic.

Mr. J. D. CHAPLIN (Lincoln): A few days ago, in discussing this treaty, I pointed out to the House the great disadvantage that certain of the farmers in the part of Ontario I come from would labour under if it went into effect in its present form. I have particular reference to the farmers in my district who are interested in the growing of grapes and in the manufacture of wine. It seems to me that a grave injustice has been done to these people. I cannot comprehend how any government would undertake to put the residents of a foreign country in an absolutely better position than their own people. In the present case the people in my district are paying to the revenue of the country a tax of 30 cents a gallon on wine, and under this treaty the French article is to be allowed to come in at a tax of only 15 cents a gallon. In other words, the producer in a foreign country is at a direct advantage in this country's market of 15 cents a gallon. I do not want to stress the matter but the thing is self-evidently unjust and I believe it must be taken care of.

I also referred briefly to a matter of importance to our particular section, and that was the silk industry. I do not want to unduly emphasize this point, but I want to look into some of the points of interest in connection with the treaty and ask this House to judge whether it is of any advantage to Canada.

The first part of the treaty I wish to take up is what is known as section A, which gives a list of goods of Canadian production that are allowed to enter France under their minimum tariff. I might say incidentally that while this schedule A is the minimum tariff of France, last year we had almost the whole of it as the minimum tariff of France. I mean, that all the goods that we wanted to ship last year of that class and variety entered France practically under the minimum tariff. Before I go into the details I want to point out that the imports to Canada from France for the year ending 31st March, 1922, amounted to $13,500,000, whereas the exports from Canada to France for the same period amounted to $8,000,000. I wish to explain to the House that, in making my calculations, I have not taken into account the colonies of France, for the reason that there were so many small items spread over half a dozen countries that it made the work too heavy, and I did not have any clerk from the department to help me. Just for comparison's sake, I wish to state that during the same period we exported to Holland $9,500,000. I am taking four or five countries with exports about similar so that hon. members can see at a glance what the significance is. During that period we exported $9,500,000 to Holland and we imported from Holland $4,000,000. I am only giving the round figures. Then we exported to Belgium $12,400,000 and

we imported from Belgium $3,800,000. We exported to Italy $15,000,000 and imported $1,300,000. We exported to Japan $14,800,000 and imported from Japan $8,000,000. To these four countries we exported $52,000,000, and imported from them $17,000,000, leaving a balance in our favour for these four countries of $34,000,000, whereas the balance against us in France was $5,000,000.

I think possibly I will have to apologize to the House for taking up considerable time in going through these items, but inasmuch as the two ministers spent five months on the job, I think possibly the House can hear somebody else for an hour. The first item in schedule A is horses. We had the minimum tariff of France last year for horses, and there has been no change this year from the tariff of last year. We exported last year horses to the value of $1,000,000, but we did not send a dollar's worth to France. I ask the minister if he did not send any horses to France last year, and there has not been any change to our advantage, what chance will there be next year? The price of horses was low last year and we might have had an export.

The next item is No. 17 "Ham, boned and rolled, cooked ham, meats, salted," for which I could not find a number, but I can say that in all pork products, including bacon and sides, the total amount of import was $23,000,000, and we sold to France under all of these items $9,000 worth. The tariff has not been changed under this item but is the same as last year. We have no advantage at all under the treaty which we did not have last year without it. Poultry, truffled; we had no exports under that item. Meat, preserved in tins; we shipped $216,000 worth and France took nothing. There has been no change between last year's tariff and this year's treaty and we have no advantage under the present arrangement. Extract of meat, in cakes or otherwise; we exported $3,500 worth last year, and France took nothing. Under the next item, No. 20, we exported nothing. Bed feathers; we exported nothing. Lard; the exports were $691,000, and France took $44,000. Eggs of poultry and game; our exports were $2,050,000, and France took nothing. Cheese, Canadian; our total exports were $25,440,000, and France took $14. Belgium took from us 3,091,000 pounds of cheese and France took 40 pounds. We got the minimum tariff on that item. There is no difference between the tariff last year and the item in the treaty.

I will go through the different items and call attention to all items where there has been a reduction. Bone black (animal black) there were no exports. Fresh fish (fresh water and sea water) and fish, dried, salted or smoked; we exported $20,000,000 and France took $35. The next item will come under the head of "fish." It is lobsters, fresh, preserved or prepared. We exported under that item $5,181,000 and France took $820,000. Fish oils; we exported $141,000 and France took nothing. Spermaceti; no exports. Roe of cod and mackerel; there were no exports. Casein, hardened, etc.; our total exports were $1,400 and France took nothing, but we imported $20,000. It is a good thing to have the treaty because we import some of that product. Wheat, spelt and meslin (grain, flour); under that item our total exports were over $179,990,000, and France took $1,278.000. Just for comparison's sake, I will tell the House what Belgium took. Belgium took within the same period $5,557,000, and Italy $14,000,000. Of wheat flour, our total export was $53,000,000 and France took nothing. Then we have the following items:

No. of French tariff	Products	Total exports	France imported
69	Oats (grain, meal).. ..	$19,000,000	$455,000
	Oatmeal..	2,525,000	3,000
70	Barley (grain, meal) ..	9,000,000	nil
71	Rye (grain, meal).. ..	3,000,000	3,000
72	Maize (grain, meal).. ..	172,000	nil
73	Buckwheat (grain, meal)	362,000	"
84	Table fruits, fresh, apples and peaches..	8,856,000	"

This consisted principally of apples.

No. of French tariff	Products	Total exports	France imported
85	Table fruits; dried or drained..	$ 536,000	$ 71,000
86	Table fruits; candied or preserved..	1,304,000	121
91	Sugar..	11,000,000	667,000
93	Syrups, bonbons, candied fruits	nil	nil
96	Coffee, roasted or ground	12,000	nil
110	Oils: linseed, etc... ..	100,000	nil
115	Tar, pine tar..	1,400	nil
117	Balsam..	18,000	nil
128	Woods		

In three groups.

No. of French tariff	Products	Total exports	France imported
	Common logs rough..	14,746,000	nil
	Lumber and timber, hewn and sawn.. ..	55,911,000	14,000
	Wood manufactured and products, which include pulp..	39,211,000	765,000
130	Stave wood..	14,000	nil
131	Splints..	745,000	68,000
132	Hopwood and prepared poles..	747,000	nil
133	Perches, poles and staffs..	nil	nil
135	Logs of 1 m. 10c. in length..	nil	nil

No doubt these items were included in the other items.

No. of French tariff	Products	Total exports	France imported
135 bis	Resinous woods in logs,	nil	nil
136	Charcoal and charred boon..	$ 1,500	nil
158	Cabbage for sauerkraut	nil	nil
164	Fodder, turf for litter and dried beetroot pulp..	nil	nil
168	Cellulose pulp		

This comes under the head of woods, and I have given those figures.

No. of French tariff	Products	Total exports	France imported
178	Corundum in grits, emery, in powder	39,000	nil
178	Emery paper, etc.. ..	nil	nil

This completes one page, and this one page represents of Canada's exports over $480,000,000, out of a total of $753,000,000, or practically 65 per cent of our total exports. I will give the items on which there is a reduction. All the items that I have mentioned went into France last year in exactly the same figures that they will go in this year when the treaty comes into force, with the exception of six items. The first one is truffled poultry, of which we had no exports. Imagine truffled poultry being exported from Canada. Yet this item has been reduced. The next item that has been reduced is casein, of which we exported $1,400 worth, but none to France, and we imported $20,000 worth. Yet this item has been reduced by France to bring it down to the minimum tariff. The next item is apricots. I come from a district in which we grow pretty nearly everything in that line, and we do not grow any apricots except a few trees for our own use. British Columbia may grow them, but they do not appear in our exports. Yet this item has been reduced. The next item is balsam, which is a resinous property found in trees. We did not send any to France, but France has kindly made a reduction in this item.

Mr. MEIGHEN: How much?

Mr. CHAPLIN: Brought it down to the minimum tariff. The next item that has been reduced is sauerkraut, and this will be a great boon to the farmers of Canada.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Did we export any of that?

Mr. CHAPLIN: We did not export any cabbage at all. The next item is corundum, of which we exported $39,000 worth, none to France. The ministers who made these treaties might, as regards reductions, have just as well stayed at home. They did not need to spend five months on a page like that. On six items we get a reduction to the minimum tariff.

I might say further that in schedule A there are forty items of which we never exported a dollar's worth. Last year when speaking in this House, I got in wrong, and a gentleman from the West rose in his place on the Orders of the Day and complained, on a question of privilege, that I had used the word "padded" because he had done certain things in connection with the exports of Canada. I hope, Mr. Speaker, you will not call me to order for using a similar word. This list of forty items that we do not export is of no use; it is "padding," nothing more and nothing less.

As regards the next page, I will call the reductions as I go along.

No. of French tariff	Products	Total exports	France imported
190	Coal..	$13,000,000	$112,000
192	Coal tar..	248,000	115,000
194	Mineral wax..	12,000	591
197	Petroleum, schist and other mineral illuminating oils..	941,000	578
198	Heavy oils..	nil	nil

This is probably included in the previous item.

No. of French tariff	Products	Total exports	France imported
263	Aluminium..	$ 1,188,000	nil
221	Copper, pigs..	365,000	nil
	bars..	18,000	$1,600
	wire..	447,000	3,000
	Bronze powder.		

I cannot imagine why on earth bronze powder should be put down in a treaty with France, when we never made the article and have always imported it. I have used it in my business for forty years, and we never bought any in the country. Nevertheless it appears in this list. We exported none of it, but we imported $45,000 worth.

No. of French tariff	Products	Total exports	France imported
222	Lead, pig lead..	$ 1,543,000	$2,500
	ore..	176,000	nil
224	Zinc, ore..	2,388	nil

Under the same heading as zinc comes the item of spelter. The minister has with him his expert, and I might suggest to the minister that, in looking up these items, I found a very inadequate index. I looked for zinc and I found it. I was amazed at the small proportions of the exports. Then I had to go all through the list and find what all the other things were, and I found that spelter

was there, which the ordinary individual would not know was zinc. I found that of spelter, there was a total export of $2,246,000, of which France took none. I might make a further suggestion to the minister, seeing that his assistant is with him, and that is, that if he would only embody the two indexes in his book into one and use the middle of it for exports and imports it would enable anyone to see at a glance just what are exports and what are imports. This idea is carried out in trade returns and I find it very much easier under that plan to get at whatever information I need. The next item is antimony. Of this we had no exports, but we imported $37,000 worth. Why on earth we are allowed to export to France something that we have to import is a matter I do not quite understand; but possibly the minister or his deputy may be of the opinion that this is an article which we shall produce some time in the future. The next item is 021, other ammonia salts. We imported $75,000 worth of this, but exported none; and it is free of duty.

Mr. MANION: Free to France?

Mr. CHAPLIN: Yes, and into Canada. Next, oxides of nickel, we had no exports, and of sulphates of nickel there were apparently no exports either. There were no exports of oxide of zinc, but this is free into France under the treaty. The next item is 0187 ethyl chloride, of which there were no exports, but of the next item 0194, methylic alcohol we exported $210,000 worth. Of item 0199 hexamethylenetetramine and its derivatives, there were no exports; the next item is solvents with an acetone and methyl acetate basis, of which there were no exports; the next is 0204, acetic anhydric, of which there were no exports; the next is 0373 wood creosote, of which we exported $82,000 worth, none of it going to France. Of chemical products not specially mentioned, there were no exports. The next item is 298, varnish and assimilated paints. We exported $17,000 worth of this but sent none to France. Of paints, we exported $283,000 worth and France took $700. Of talc pulverizer we exported $138,000, France taking nothing. Of soaps other than perfumed we exported $230,000 of which France took nothing; and of distilled waters there were no exports. Item 316 is "not specified", but we exported mineral and aerated waters to the value of $63,000, none of which went to France. Of starch we exported $1,000, but none of it went to France. We imported $130,000 worth of this article ourselves, but we are permitted to export it. Item 324 is glue, of which we exported $11,000, France taking none of it. The duty, however, has been reduced; that is one of the items they have reduced. We imported glue, however, to the extent of $218,000, and imported from France $47,000 worth. France has kindly reduced the duty on our glue going into that country. Item 347 relates to porcelain. Why on earth we have the right to export porcelain is something beyond me. So far as I can ascertain we had no exports, but the duty has been reduced by France. We imported $260,000 worth of this article, of which France supplied $157,000. The next item, 359, is bottles, etc. There were no exports of such but the duty has been reduced by France. Of glassware we exported $250,000 but none of it went to France. However, we imported bottles, table ware, chimney globes, etc., $460,000 worth, taking $18,000 of it from France. France has kindly reduced the duty on that article. The next item is 361, incandescent electric lamps, of which we had no exports. The French duty in my opinion is pretty high, although they have reduced it. But I want to give an illustration of how the minimum tariff works out on certain articles, of which this is one. I might observe that in seeking this information I found that although the book, apart from the particulars the minister has given us, was no doubt as complete as it could be made, it is difficult to ascertain what a tariff means precisely, when the duty is placed specifically on the weight of an article, for example, at so many francs per hundred kilograms. This article is an illustration of this point. I find that 700 incandescent electric lamps will weigh 100 kilograms, or 220 pounds. I take these lamps at a valuation of 15 or 20 cents each; I am putting it at the higher figure, taking it wholesale. The value of these 700 lamps, therefore, would be $114. Now, the duty on them, according to this new and improved tariff, would be 1,890 francs per 100 kilograms—that is to say, for the 700 lamps—which means in other words that the duty amounts to $132.30 as against a value of the lamps themselves of $114.

4 p.m.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Under the improved tariff?

Mr. CHAPLIN: Yes, under the new treaty. I am not saying that I do not find some items here that will be of advantage to the people of Canada and to the manufacturers. I am neither afraid nor ashamed to point them out when I come to them, and I will say just where I consider the duty is

fair. But this is one article in regard to which it is very much the other way. Of glassware for lighting we exported $55,000 of which $27, went to France; but at the same time we imported $575,000 worth of which $2,000 came from France. That item has also been reduced. Of linen yarns there were no exports, but we imported $165,000 taking $8,000 from France. This is one of the articles we are allowed to export to France. Of linen thread we imported $295,000 worth, taking $8,700 from France. That is another article we are allowed to export under a comparatively high duty. The next item is yarns of phormium tenax, etc. Inasmuch as that is an article we do not produce and of which evidently we have no exports, I could not find anything in reference to it. The next item is ribbons, inked, etc., for typewriting machines, of which there are no records of any exports. But France has reduced the duty on this article, of which we imported $48,000. Item 461 refers to paper board of which our exports were $2,306,000. Of this amount France took $383. Of writing paper our exports were $84,000, of which France took $175. Of other paper we exported $201,000 worth, of which France took nothing. I might say in reference to the paper items that a reduction was made on several of them, but the duty is yet so high that I doubt whether any exports will be made in those lines. Of duplicating paper we had no exports, but France has reduced its tariff. The next item is albumenised photographic paper, sensitised. We had no exports of this article, but France has reduced its duty. However, we imported of this article $268,000, of which France supplied $15,000, the idea being, I suppose that we could send it back to France under a reduced duty.

Cigarette papers: We do not export any to France, but France sent us $74,000 worth. The duty remains the same, and this item appears on the list of goods that we are allowed to export. I think hon. members will agree when I say that the list is somewhat padded. Cardboard: no exports, but we imported $125,000 worth. I assume that cardboard might also be included in item 461, paper and card. Artificial leather: no exports, but we import $26,000 worth. France reduces the duty on that article. Peltries, prepared, etc., that is, furs, skins and hides: we exported $19,376,000 worth, of which France took $48,000 worth. Movements of table and wall clocks: no exports, but we imported $132,000 worth. We imported clocks to the value of $576,000; France reduces the duty. Electrometers, no exports. We imported electrometers to the extent of $238,000; France reduces the duty on this article. Tower clocks, no exports from Canada, but France reduces the duty. Steam engines: we exported $106,000 worth, of which France took goods to the value of $7,000; the duty remains the same. Traction engines: no exports, but we imported $1,800,000; the duty remains the same. Tenders for steam locomotives: there is no such article exported from Canada so far as I can see, but there is an item of export designated as "locomotives and parts" of which we exported $1,317,000. France lets the duty remain the same, although we did not export any of these articles to that country. Printing presses and machines: of linotype machines we exported $163,000; France reduces the duty. We did not send any of these to France. We imported printing presses to the extent of over $1,000,000. Agricultural machines: total exports, $5,500,000; France lets the duty remain the same. France imported from Canada last year agricultural machines to the value of $675,000. Of machine tools our total exports were $438,000 of which France took $13,000, and she reduces the duty. On typewriters weighing 40 kilograms the new duty is 300 francs. On the basis of 7 cents that is a duty of $21 on a 40-kilogram machine, which is the ordinary typewriter. That is a pretty stiff duty. The next item is 525, machines for rinsing, corking, etc.; no exports. Open boilers, 526, no exports; duty reduced. Item 533, component parts of machines, no exports. Item 535, copper: I gave the figures respecting exports of certain classes of copper, but they did not include manufactured articles.

Of all copper, and that would include brass and brassware, we exported $6,329,000 worth, of which France took goods to the value of $5,200. The next item is dynamo armatures and component parts; it is one item in connection with which it may be possible to do some business. Our total exports were $171,000, and the duty is now about 2½ francs per 100 pounds. I do not understand therefore, why we do not export more of these goods to France. Item 537, tools with or without handles: we exported $195,000 worth, of which France took nothing. I wish to give an illustration here in connection with mattocks. It takes about two dozen and a half mattocks to weigh 100 kilograms. On 2½ dozen the duty is 72 francs, which, at 7 cents a franc, is $5.04, figuring out at about $2 a dozen. Two francs duty on an article like a mattock is a pretty heavy duty. Item 539, stereotype blocks, plates, etc.; we exported $37,000 worth of which France took $50 worth. Pins: our total export was $50,000; France took nothing. Buckles and clasps: the duty

is 325 francs per 100 kilograms, which at 7 cents a franc is $22,75 per kilogram, or 220 pounds. In other words, the basis of duty on an article that is worth 18 or 20 cents a pound is 50 per cent. Just here I want to say that this very same item of buckles and clasps appears in the list of goods that France sends to us. They are admitted into Canada on a 25 per cent tariff, and on the same class of goods exported by us to France, a duty of 50 per cent is paid. And that is not the only case of that kind.

The next item is, manufactures of case-hardened cast-iron: no exports. Building materials, structural steel: our exports were $160,000, nothing went to France; the duty is reduced to $44.10 per 100 kilograms. That figured out on a 100-pound basis, is 20 francs or $1.40 a hundred on structural steel. That is a pretty stiff duty. Is it any wonder that we could not ship any structural steel to France? And I do not think there is any more chance of doing so under this tariff than there was before.

Iron works for carriages: no exports. Locks and padlocks; a manufacturer in my district advises me that under the tariff as it exists he thinks he can do some business. I did not stop to figure it out at all; I am satisfied to give that information to the minister. Household wares and all artticles of iron, steel, etc., exports, $32,000; France took $800. Coffee-mills, no exports. Apparatus for water closets, no exports. Lamp-makers' and tinsmiths' wares, no exports. Detonators for mines, and the next item, miners' fuses, under the head of fulminates and explosives, we exported $2,200,000 worth of goods, France took nothing. The duty has been reduced, but it is still very high. Furniture: the duty remains the same in some cases; in other cases it has been reduced. But even as it stands there is no chance of doing business in this line. The minimum tariff of France does not mean anything if the duty is an adequate protective duty, and that is what it is in very many cases. In the case of furniture we exported $239,000 worth, and France took nothing.

In doors and windows and stuff of that kind we exported $120,000 worth, and never sent France a nickel's worth. In small wooden wares, item 602, we shipped $602,000 worth, and nothing to France. In bobbins there was no export. Then we come to item 604, upright pianos, duty 35 per cent. Here is an article that is also on both sides of the treaty. France is allowed to send upright pianos and all kinds of pianos into Canada and we are allowed to ship pianos to France. When we ship pianos to France the duty is 35 per cent, and when they ship to us the duty is 25 per cent. I ask if there is any fairness in that? If there is to be a treaty, let us have a treaty on real reciprocal lines.

In musical instruments, including pianos, France took nothing of what we exported. We imported musical instruments to the value of $2,258,000. France sent us $61,000 of these goods under a 27½ per cent duty, less the 10 per cent tariff that will be in existence when this treaty goes into effect. The treaty tariff will be 27½ per cent, less 10, which is practically a 25 per cent tariff, against a tariff on our stuff going to France of 35 per cent.

Then we come to automobiles, item 614. We exported $14,596,000 of automobiles and France took $2,800 worth. Some Canadian over there apparently wanted a car. The duty on our automobiles going into France is 45 per cent, and when the minister goes over to France he makes an arrangement whereby France can send her automobiles into Canada under a 25 per cent duty. I ask again, is that a fair proposition? Is that a treaty or is it a give-away? Then we come to item 620, india-rubber sheets, pure, not vulcanized. We have no exports as such, but we exported India rubber manufactures not specified under that heading to the amount of $296,000 of which France took $191 worth.

In manufactures of asbestos, item 620, our total exports were $4,800,000, and France took $30,000 worth. The duty is the same as it was. Item 620, mica in sheets; our total exports were $240,000, and France took $2,000 worth. The French duty is too high, and they took nothing but the rough plates. With a duty of 87½ francs against us on every 220 pounds, it is no wonder we did not export any mica. Item 635, observation, geodetical and optical instruments; of these we exported $286,000 worth, and France took nothing. France has reduced her duty on this item.

The next item, No. 641, is small wares, of which we had no exports as far as I can see. We had no exports under the next item, No. 642, of tobacco pipes.

I have now completed schedule A, and on practically all the items I have read there is hardly a reduction that gets us any place at all; there is hardly a reduction that is worth anything to us. We had everything that this treaty provides so far as this schedule is concerned, before the treaty was made. All these goods with a few minor exceptions went to France this year on as good terms as they will under the treaty. The minimum tariff of France, as I have shown, is in my opinion an

adequately protective tariff. What have we got that we did not have before? As far as this schedule is concerned, the ministers might just as well have stayed home, and if we do not get any advantage under schedule A where do we expect to get any advantage out of this whole treaty? It is only in schedule A, because that is the minimum tariff. When we get to schedule B, it is no longer the minimum tariff of France, but an increased tariff. So if we get no advantage out of the minimum tariff what good is the whole treaty to us? I ask again, where does our advantage come in? I am not one of those who in making a bargain wants to see an advantage for us in everything. But we in this treaty are giving substantial advantages to France, deducting 10 per cent from the duty in a whole list of goods, and giving them low specific duties on other articles. We have given them substantial advantages as will be shown by the imports from France into this country in the past, and we are not getting any countervailing advantages in return. I say that in making a treaty it is only reasonable for those making it to look for some countervailing advantages.

There is another thing to be taken into consideration, and it is this. In giving this reduced tariff to France you are depleting your revenue. Now where is the advantage going to accrue to this country by taking so much off your revenue? Who is that going to accrue to, and where is that going to be made up? The only thing that I can see is that it will have to be made up by somebody else doing some business as against this extra business France will do, and if France does extra business with us under this reduced tariff will not that still further deplete our revenue? If France by these concessions that have been made does further business with us, that must necessarily take the business from another quarter which would yield us a higher revenue. I do not know, but it looks to me as if the loss of revenue alone will be over half a million dollars, and probably more. Then, of course, there has to be added the loss of inland revenue on wines, because I cannot conceive that this government and this parliament is going to fasten that wine duty upon the wine producers of this country. I cannot understand how they can do anything else but place our own wines on the same footing as French wines coming into this country. So, as I said before, unless we get some advantage out of schedule A, which is the minimum tariff, surely the minister will not claim that we are going to get any advantage out of schedule B, because that is an awful lot worse than the other. If you think some of the items I have read are bad, I think I can show as I go on that this new diplomacy probably of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries did not do us an awful lot of good when he was over in the Old Country helping to make this treaty. Now I want to go through the list of items in schedule B.

An hon. MEMBER: Brass tacks.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I did not catch my hon. friend's remark. Although what I have already said is probably painful to my hon. friend; he will find it even more painful when he hears some of the criticisms I am about to offer.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It is not painful at all.

Mr. CHAPLIN: It is not painful yet? Well, let us take items 4, 5, 6 and 7 dealing respectively with oxen, cows, bulls, steers, bullocks and heifers.

An hon. MEMBER: "Bulls" is the right term.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I thought the Minister of Agriculture was in his seat but that is not his voice. Our total exports of live stock in these classes amounted to $8,538,000 and France took none. For fear they might take some the Minister of Finance and his confrere, who says it does not hurt, signed a treaty under which the tariff is raised. They raised the tariff from 20 francs per kilogram to 21½ francs. It was impossible for us to do any business with France in any of these items out of a total of $8,000,000 but we will do a lot now, I suppose, when the duty has been raised 1½ francs per kilogram against us. Now let us take item 8 dealing with calves. The duty on calves has been lowered from 40 francs per 100 kilograms to 27·2 francs which still leaves the duty at practically $2 apiece. The next item is rams, ewes and wethers. Our total exports amounted to $600,000 and France took none. The duty has been somewhat reduced but it represents $1.50 apiece. The duty on lambs has also been reduced. However, we exported none of these classes of live stock last year. Our total export of pigs amounted to $70,000 but we exported none to France. France has reduced the tariff a little and we may do something yet. Of live poultry our total export amounted to $798,000 but we sent none to France. But the Minister of Finance, with his confrere, signed a treaty by which the duty on poultry is raised from 20 to 25 francs. I would like to put this proposition to my hon. friend: If we do not sell any live poultry under a tariff of 20 francs how much can we sell under a tariff of 25 francs? I now take item No. 16,

meat, fresh, including meat preserved by freezing. Our total exports of this commodity were $4,670,000 and France took none. The duty has been raised on pork from 25 francs to 27¼ francs, and on other meats from 35 francs to 37¼ francs. The same proposition could be propounded to the two ministers: How much more pork will we sell to France because of the higher duty? Of pork products we sold $23,000,000, and France took altogether $9,000. Poultry, dead; we exported $872,000 and France took none. For fear we might sell them some poultry France has raised the tariff from 20 to 25 francs. Now we come to margarine. France lowered the duty on margarine probably because we were not exporters of that commodity. I would not like to make that statement definitely. We did import $260,000 and we did not export any. However, France reduced the duty on margarine from 35 to 29 francs per 100 kilograms. I would like to know which of the two ministers agreed to the reduction of the duty on margarine.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I hope the hon. member is aware that he will not be even allowed to manufacture it by the end of next month.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Item No. 35 is of condensed milk of which we exported $4,881,000. To France we sold $568,000 of condensed milk and I guess we must have sold that country too much because the tariff has been increased 50 per cent, from 5 francs to 7½ francs. Still it does not hurt. Butter: fresh or melted, or salted; we exported of butter a total of $3,228,000 and France took butter to the value of $45,000. On the fresh butter that we do not ship to France the duty is reduced from 30 francs to 22½ francs; on the salted butter that we do ship the duty is raised from 20 to 22½ francs. Still it does not hurt. Honey: We exported honey to the amount of $12,000 and sent $500 worth to France. We imported $86,000 worth of honey; the duty remains the same. Fish: preserved by pickling, or otherwise prepared; I note that our exports amounted to $6,400,000, principally canned salmon. France took $1,700,000 worth of this canned salmon and the duty is promptly raised from 25 francs to 35 francs per 100 kilos. I do not know whether the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is responsible for that or not, and probably it does not hurt, but still it is a fact just the same—the duty has been raised from 25 francs to 35 francs on a commodity that we sell a fair amount of in France. Probably France thought that she was buying too much. We exported malt to the amount of $237,000. France took none but raised the duty from 15 to 21 per cent. Groats, grits, (coarse flour) pearled or clean grain; we have no export of these commodities as such. Neither have we any exports under the head of "Pulse" which is a mixture of grains. Now we come to item No. 83, Potatoes, and I am sorry that the hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Caldwell) is not here. We exported potatoes to the amount of $2,938,000. France did not take any but nevertheless raised the duty from .40 to .79 francs, pretty nearly doubling the duty. With a little more effort they would have doubled the duty exactly. Seeds for sowing; we exported $1,810,000 worth of clover seed and France took $11,000 worth, and promptly raised the duty from 25 to 30 francs per hundred kilograms under this treaty. Of other seeds we exported in all $615,000, and France took $2,000, and the duty remains the same. Chocolate; we had no exports, although the item is there to provide for them, but we imported $202,000 worth, and France let the tariff remain, probably with the idea that we will send some chocolate back to them. Under item 110, fixed oils, boiled and oxodized our exports were $146,000. The duty had been lowered from 300 francs to 172½ francs. The duty is still high—too high for us to make any export into France. Of alimentary vegetable fat; we exported $86,000 worth, and none went to France. That fact may account for the reduction of the tariff. We got a reduction from 35 to 29 francs because we did not export any. Wood, squared or sawn, less than 80 millimetres but exceeding 35 millimetres in thickness was given in full under another heading. Of paving blocks there were no exports. Straw or wool of wood; there were no exports, but the duty has been raised by the treaty from 4 to 6 francs per 100 kilograms. Of vegetables; fresh, salted or pickled, preserved, dried, we exported $1,104,000 worth, and France took nothing. The duty has been raised from 48 to 54 francs. Hops; we exported $381,000 worth. The duty remains the same. We did not send any to France. The duty is the minimum tariff. Imagine, 35 francs on 220 pounds. That is a pretty fair duty and it is no wonder we did not export any. Under item 160 we imported $742,000 worth; exported none to France. Under item 161, lupuline, we had no exports.

Bran, from any kind of cereals; France let the duty remain the same. We exported $1,104,000 worth and France took none. The duty is high enough to prevent us sending any bran. Cement; we exported $578,000 worth

and France took none. The duty is the same. Bitumen and asphalt tiles, paving blocks or slabs; we had no exports, but we imported of bitumen and asphalt $515,000 worth, and France reduced its tariff on an article on which we had no exports. Paraffin, vaseline; the tariff has been reduced, but we had no exports. We imported $343,000 worth of it and the tariff has been reduced. Of cast iron, we exported $50,000 worth, but sent none to France.

Under the item of white-manganese iron, the tariff was reduced, but we had no exports. We exported $54,000 worth of ferro-silicon, but none to France. The item has been very materially reduced, and it is quite possible that article might go into France. Of ferro-manganese we exported $26,000 worth but none to France. Iron, crude steel in ingots; we exported $912 worth. The tariff on this item has been reduced by France. We imported $331,000 worth. Iron or steel, rolled or forged in blooms, billets or bars; we exported $303,000 worth and none went to France. The duty has been slightly reduced but not enough to be of any benefit. In regard to item 207 special rolled articles, I can find no exports. Of fine steel for tools, and special steel, there were no exports. Iron or steel, machine; no exports. Hoop iron or steel not rolled; no exports. Flat sheet; we had total exports of $5,000. Now they have reduced the duty on iron and steel hoops but the minister and the House know that there is no hoop steel or band steel made in this country. There is only one small mill making parts of sheets in the whole country. It seems to me it is all very well to have this listed in exports It does not do any harm, but it certainly does not do any good. Iron, tinned (tin plate) coated with copper, lead or zinc; we may be able some day to export some tin plate. We have not made any yet. Wire of iron or steel; we exported $271,000 worth, but none to France, and France raised the duty 3 francs per 100 kilograms. Iron shavings; we exported $707,000 worth. Being scrap, France reduced her duty, but she does not take any and did not take any last year. Rails of iron or ordinary steel; our exports amounted to $719,000 worth—none to France. The duty has been considerably reduced and may result in some benefit. Wheels, tires and wheel centres of iron or steel; there were no exports. The next two items 215 and 216 are "Straight-axles for railways and tramways, axles not specially mentioned, of iron or steel" and "Crank axles for locomotives, of iron or steel". Under the heading of "Locomotive parts," I gave this item before. Our exports were $1,317,000 worth but France took none. As to axles for automobiles, of iron or steel I can find nothing.

Now hon. members will notice that when you get to item 217 you come to a different class of items. The minister, in giving us the particulars of the items under this treaty, mentioned:

> —a few chemical products which are of importance to the Canadian trade.

I want to go over this list first, and pick out some of the things he left out. The first item referred to is ·019 in the book of particulars, sulphate of ammonia, crude. Our total exports under this item were $785,000 and France took nothing. The duty is $11.25 a hundredweight, although the minister told us that these were items that were important to Canada. It does not look to me as if he thought so when he was overseas, because I do not see any chance of our selling any of this product to France.

With regard to the next item 033, carbide of calcium, he said it was an important item to Canada. Well it was important. We imported $2,261,000 worth, and France took nothing. So important was it that the minister signed the treaty with France increasing that duty 50 per cent.

The next item is 0197 "Formic Aldehyde in solution of 40 per cent." I could not find that item, unless it had some connection with formaldehyde. The next item is 0198, an item with a long name. It is not indexed, and it is not in our exports. I cannot find it. The next item is acetone, of which we had no exports, but we imported $8,000 worth. The next item is 0203, acetic acid; we exported $22,000 worth and none went to France. The next item is 0210, acetate of pyrolignite of sodium, crystallized or hydrated. I might say that this comes under the item of sodium. I am going to treat all the sodium compounds as one, and we will come to that presently. We exported of sodium compounds $1,493,000 worth, and none went to France. The last item which the minister referred to as being important is guaiacol, which I cannot find as being exported at all and which I do not believe is made. This takes us down to about the middle of page 21 of the treaty.

I want, however, to go back and consider some of the items of the treaty which the minister has missed, or to which he has made no reference in his book of particulars. Of item 04, soda and sodium compounds, we exported $1,493,000 worth and France took none. Of nitric acid we had no exports. Of sulphate of ammonia we exported $151,000 worth, and France took none. Borate of sodium (refined

borax) is down on this list as an article that we can export. I do not understand why anybody should insert borax as an exportable article from Canada. We have never made it. I have used that article in my business for forty years in large quantities, and I have always imported it from Holland or Britain. Lately one has been able to get it from the United States. Why is that article put down as an article that we can export, when we imported $132,000 worth.

The next items are 038, cyanide of potassium, and 039 cyanide of sodium, which are inserted as articles which we can export. As a matter of fact, these are in exactly the same category as borax. We imported $380,000 worth, and yet we are allowed to export these to France. The same thing applies to chlorates of borium, out of which peroxide of hydrogen is made. We had no exports, and we imported $29,000 worth. Chloride of calcium we did not export; we imported $48,000 worth.

Let us take the next item, iodine, crude and refined, and iodoform in another place down the list. We did not export these; we do not make them. We imported $30,000 worth. Yet in this treaty we are allowed to export these to France. Of phosphorus and chlorides of phosphorus we imported $40,000 worth. We did not export any. Those are in exactly the same category. Of sulphuric acid, on the other hand, we exported $63,000 worth and we did not export any to France. Bismuth salts are inserted in the list of articles which we can export. We imported $5000 worth.

The next items are 0118, 0119 and 0120, and as regards these I should like to get some information from the minister, because no information is given in the book of particulars. These are oxides and other salts of cobalt. What I should like to know—and the minister can give me this information another day—is whether any change has been made as regards cobalt or any of the oxides or other salts of cobalt in going to France. Are there any changes up or down? This is an important matter to us as we are exporters of these articles.

The next item, 0130, is oxides of iron. We exported $63,000 worth, and of this none went to France. The next item is 0139, sulphate of magnesium, of which we exported $5,000 worth and imported $35,000 worth. The next item is salts of mercury, of which we had no exports, but we imported $11,000 worth. The next item is carbonate of lead, of which we exported $84,000 worth, none going to France. The next item is crude potash, of which we exported $5,000 worth, and the next caustic soda, of which we exported $542,000 worth.

The next item is bicarbonate of sodium, of which we imported $147,000 worth, and we had no exports. Radium is inserted in this group as an article that we can export. As a matter of fact, we did not export any radium, and on the contrary we imported $72,000 worth. Of coal oil we exported $850,000 worth, and France took none. Chlorals and their derivatives are inserted as articles that we can export, but as a matter of fact, we imported $248,000 worth. Iodoform comes under the same heading as iodine which I mentioned a little while ago. Of glycerine we exported $5,000 worth. Glycerine is inserted as an article we can send to France. We imported $88,000 worth, and of that $88,000 worth we took $66,000 worth from France.

I have now come to practically the end of page 20, of the treaty and at the top of page 21, we find item 0237, sulphate of methyl. I am not going to weary the House with a description of the different chemicals and drugs contained on pages 21 and 22. I said a little while ago—and I think I have already demonstrated this—that I thought a good many of these articles were padding. I looked up my Webster's dictionary, because I must confess I was not acquainted with many of these articles, but I could not find them here. Then I got a friend of mine to consult the British Pharmacopoeia, and he could not find them. I applied to a gentleman in one of the best chemical importing houses here, and I sent him a list of the articles on page 21, beginning with 0237 and ending on the next page with 0379. This is what he says:

> Regarding the list you have sent me, there is hardly need of my answering each question individually according to the list.

I sent him a list, each with a number of it, so that he could give me a detailed answer.

> The items on the list you have sent me are practically all coal tar derivatives, and none of them made in Canada. The only exception I would make is that of collodion, which is made in Canada from materials brought from the other countries. These coal tar derivatives I think are now all made to a certain extent in the United States, but up to recently in England and on the continent, mostly in Germany. Of course, I do not know for what reason you require this information. If it is for the purpose of buying I could perhaps put you in touch with some of the better places either in the United States or abroad.

Mr. RYCKMAN: We are allowed to export them now.

Mr. CHAPLIN: These fillers represent articles that we are allowed to export to France. They clutter up the book and incidentally give some of us a great deal of work.

Mr. FIELDING: That is the sad part of the matter.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Now we come back to item 300 on page 22. I have few words to say on these articles with the long and unpronounceable names. Item 300, however, refers to blacks of different kinds, such as ivory, bone and lamp-blacks of different descriptions. We are allowed to export these articles to France. But we made no exports at all, while on the contrary we imported $258,000 worth of them. France has kindly reduced the duty, possibly hoping that we might send some of these things back. The next item, 301, is pencils of which we had no exports. We imported, however, $721,000 of which a few thousand dollars' worth came from France. Item 302 relates to carbons. I find no exports of this article, but on the other hand we had imports amounting to $58,000, and, as usual France when we have nothing to export, reduces the duty. The next item is 308, colours ground in oil. Of this we exported $238,000 worth, and again France has reduced the duty. She bought only $700 worth. I am not thoroughly acquainted with this line, and we may perhaps be able to do some exporting under this item. I doubt it, however, speaking from my experience in regard to other items. The next item is 311, under which the same duty obtains as previously. Of soaps we shipped altogether $225,000, but France took nothing. France may well keep the same duty, because she is herself a soap manufacturer and perfumery maker, and she is likely to keep the duty she has so that her manufacturers may not be jeopardized. Of chicory there are no exports, although this is one of the items on the export list. On the other hand, we imported $15,000 worth of this article, and as usual France has reduced the duty. The next item refers to dextrine. We had no exports of this article but we imported $90,000 worth. The duty has been reduced in France, but it is still too high even if we could export this article. Of candles we exported $2,000 worth. France has reduced the duty, but we imported $131,000 worth, a quantity of it coming from France. The duty on item 322 has been reduced. This relates to wax and stearic acid of which we exported $10,000, but none of it went to France. The next item I gave before, but it appears again. This is casein, of which we exported $1,400 and imported $20,000. None of what we exported, however, went to France. Under item 330, blacking, we had no exports. The French duty has been reduced very much on the item but we have no exports, although we imported $253,000. I come next to insulators of porcelain. Under this item France has reduced the duty. We had no exports, but we imported $625,000. I understand that it may be possible for us to do some exporting in this line. This article has been made in Canada during the last year, but whether we can export it or not I am not able to say. Item 349 refers to glass articles for electric lighting, of which we had no exports; and the next item 359 relates to bottles. France has reduced the duty, but we had no exports while France supplied us with a lot of bottles. I regret to say I have lost the figures in regard to this item. The next item on the list is in regard to glazed yarns, which article comes under item 367. We had no exports of this but we imported large quantities. The next item is 404, tissues of pure cotton. We exported $75,000 worth of this. France has reduced the duty, but she took nothing from us. You will observe that while we had no exports France has reduced the duty. In all the reductions that France makes in this schedule there is not one item in regard to which she brings her duty down to the minimum. Everything is above the minimum, because it would be in the other class if it were not so. And I can say to the House and to the minister without any fear of successful contradiction, except in reference to a few lines, that that minimum tariff of France without any addition to it is in every case, or almost in every case, an adequate protection. Let us take the next item, blankets of cotton under 418. We had no exports of this, but France has reduced the item. Of other manufactures of cotton we exported $422,000, of which France took the sum of six dollars. Of incandescent mantles under item 428 we had no exports, but we imported $70,000 worth. France has reduced the duty, but she does not reduce it to the minimum. Under item 441, tissues of pure wool, we exported $139,000. France reduced the duty somewhat on these items. Under item 451 we had no exports, but we imported $150,000 worth, but none from France. Of the next items in cloth we had no exports but we imported $1,600,000. We exported nothing to France in either case. Of wall paper we exported $445,000 of which France took $317. We had no exports of cardboard under that name; but of paper board we exported $2,306,000. Of this sum France took $383. Under the heading "paper" our total exports were $69,000,000, and of that amount France took $8,000. The duty on paper has mostly been increased, as it has been increased in the case of any article we are ex-

5 p.m.

porting in a large way. The next item is 469, rolls or bands for cinematographs. We imported of these articles $1,727,000, some of which we took from France. On the other hand, we exported $2,300,000 worth of which France took $1,800. This article comes into Canada from France on a basis of so much per foot. When it goes into France, however, it goes in on a weight basis and no one has any chance in the world to keep any check on it. It pays at the rate of $14 per pound, and if anyone can tell me what a particular film weighs I may tell him whether the duty is large or not. But I think the minister might get us the information on that score; I should like very much to have it. From my experience in regard to other things which I do know about I am quite sure that France is not allowing that material to enter that country at as low a rate as we are allowing the same thing to come in here. Item 476, skins and hides prepared; in this case France has lowered the duty. Our total exports were $19,000,000, of which France took $48,000 worth, principaly in furs. But even now, with the reduction, the duty is equal to 25 per cent. Item 477, artificial leather: we do not make it here, therefore we do not export it. On the other hand we imported it to the extent of $26,000. Why artificial leather should be included in the list of articles that France is allowing us to export is beyond my comprehension.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is the result when articles appear in two and three different schedules with different rates? This article has been in at least one schedule before.

Mr. CHAPLIN: If my right hon. friend will examine closely the book of particulars he will find that several things may come under that head; they are different articles, but they come in the same class or category. You will find a number in both A and B, but they relate to different classes of the article —perhaps different stages of manufacture, one more advanced than the other.

Item 484, gloves. The duty is reduced; our total glove export was $10,000 of which France took nothing. Our imports from all parts of the world were valued at $430,000; we took from France $53,000 worth—and France reduced the duty on gloves. Items 485 to 489, harness and saddles: our exports were $36,000 of which France took $55 worth. Of harness and leather goods we exported $360,000 worth, principally in leather, of which France took nothing. Item 511, steam engines: our export was $106,000; France took $7,800 worth. The duty on these articles has been considerably reduced. Internal combustion engines: we exported $285,000 worth of which France took $12,000 worth. Item 520, paper making machines, and 521, machines for folding, etc.: no export, but we imported $2,075,000 worth—and France reduces the duty. Item 522, sewing machines: we exported $746,000 worth of which France took nothing. There is an increase of duty from 32 to 41 francs to 143 to 205 francs, according to the grade—a very considerable increase. Item 524, dynamo-electric machines: we exported $171,000 worth and France took nothing. As I have said, I think there is a possibility of doing some business in this line. Item 524, electric apparatus: exports, $686,000, of which France took $788. The duty has been reduced; I think there is a chance here also. Item 525, general machinery: exports, $2,400,000 of which France took $100,000 worth; the duty remains the same. Item 526, heaters and stoves, exports amounted to $68,000 of which France took $35 worth. Item 527, refrigerating apparatus, no record of any exports, and the same is true of shafts. Item 533, balls for ball bearings: we do not make these in Canada. We imported $38,000 worth. I noticed in the book of particulars that in connection with this item, 533, schedule B, under the head of balls for ball bearings there are two or three interrogation marks; the minister might take an opportunity to explain that later. Item 534, springs of steel for carriages, no exports, but the duty has been reduced. Item 535, wires and cables, insulated; in this case there has been a reduction of duty. We exported of these articles $439,000 worth of which France took $3,000 worth. Item 536, electric arc-lamps: the duty has been increased. Wire gauze of iron or steel, item 541, no exports. The French duty has been increased 50 per cent on these items; we imported $158,000 worth, and we took some from France. This is another case in which we are allowed under the treaty to export to France and France is allowed to export to us; and the goods come to us at a different rate of duty from that which applies when the goods are imported by France from Canada. I do not think that is fair; it would not be considered fair by anybody. The same remarks apply to wire gauze of copper or brass, item 542. Although we have no exports, France increased its tariff 50 per cent, and we imported $289,000 worth, and some of it came from France. We exported of cutlery $813,000 worth; we imported, on the other hand, $1,500,000 worth. The duty is reduced; it now stands at 600 francs per 100 kilograms, which is equal to $19.25 on every 100 pounds. That looks to me like a

very heavy duty. What chance would there be of our doing any business with France, even with the reduction? Item 552, railway chairs, no exports reported. The next is item 554; the duty has been increased. Our exports were $210,000, none to France. Item 562 chains. Chains of 15 millimetres or more carry a duty in France of about 50.4 francs, equal to $3.53 for 220 pounds. That makes the duty on chains about 1½ cents a pound. With a duty of 1½ cents a pound there is not much chance that I can see of doing business.

The next item is horse nails, No. 563. We exported nothing. Of other kinds of nails, Item 564, we had exports of $105,000, and nothing to France. The duty has been reduced on that, and under the reduced tariff of France the duty is 45 francs per kilogram or 220 pounds, which is about $1.40 a keg. We understand it better when it gets down to that basis. That is a pretty good duty.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What would they be worth?

Mr. CHAPLIN: I took one of the medium nails, so it would probably be something around a 2½ inch or a 3-inch nail. I cannot tell you what they are worth.

Item 565, wire nails; the duty on this has been increased 50 per cent. We exported $123,000 worth, and none to France. The duty is 66 francs per 100 kilograms, or 220 pounds; that is equal to $2.10 a keg. That gives you an idea of how the thing works out.

Our exports of screws, eyebolts, scrap hinges, etc., under item 566, was $14,000 worth, and France took nothing. The duty has been reduced, but I know that the rate as compared with other articles is too high. The treaty might go into effect, but we would never do any business under that duty.

The next item is 567, tubes of iron and steel. We exported $1,250,000 worth. What I want to convey to the minister is this, and it is significant. We were working under an arrangement last year and we exported $1,250,000 worth of tubes, but not a dollar's worth went to France. On the other hand, we imported some seamless steel tubing at 10 cents per pound. Our duty is 5 per cent, and the French duty on this article is 20 per cent. Now I ask if that is a fair proposition? Is that a treaty or is it another hand-out?

The next item is 571, buckles for saddlery. We had no exports. The duty has been reduced to 133 francs per kilogram. That will amount to $4.25 per 100 pounds. I was informed by a maker of these buckles that if they were saddlery buckles of some dimensions the price was about 15 cents a pound. That looks a pretty good duty. I do not know whether I skipped an item inadvertently, but there was an item for small buckles that I seem to have passed over. There are two items for buckles in the list, and on the small buckles I was told by the same manufacturer that the duty was 50 per cent of the value—and this is supposed to be a duty on which you can do some business. If the duty France imposes is altogether protective, one that keeps us out entirely, why that makes all the difference in the world. It is no treaty at all then; it is worthless. The next item is lead pipes and manufactured lead. Our total exports were $1,718,000, and France took $2,518 worth, and she raises the duty. The next item, No. 577, is tin pots and other manufactures of tin. We exported $33,000 of these goods, but none to France. France reduces the duty under the treaty, but it is still too high to do business.

Of aluminum articles or products we exported $1,500,000, and France took nothing. The French duty has been reduced on this article, and it may be that we can do some business, but I want to point out to the minister that we are still a long way above the minimum tariff of France on this article, and if other countries that are supplying aluminum happen to be on the minimum tariff basis, what chance have we got? That is an article of some consequence to this country.

The next item, No. 590, is furniture. We exported $239,000 worth, and France took $200 worth, and that $200 item came to us through the United States. It was not of our manufacture, but came from the United States for re-export. The tariff on furniture, as I said on another item, is too high. You could not send furniture to France under the present tariff at all. Item 597, builders "and cartwrights" wood; we had no exports, and the duty has been raised. Item 603, handles for agricultural instruments; of these we exported last year $240,000 worth, and France took nothing. Judging only from what appears in the tariff I cannot see why we should not sell France some of these goods. The duty is only 10 cents per dozen, and I do not see why we should not sell something under that duty. There may be some mistake. I would like to have the minister look at that item and see whether I am wrong. Item 614, carriages; we exported $11,000 worth, and France took nothing. Of cycles, under Item 614, we exported $10,000 and France took nothing. The next item is vessels. We exported several vessel products. In one group we exported $3,242,000, and France took $3,000 worth. In

another group we exported $45,000, and France took nothing, and in another group, motor boats, we exported $82,000, and France took nothing. On two of these groups the duty has been reduced, and on the other it has been raised. Of manufactures of rubber, item 620, we exported $4,248,000, and France took $18,000 worth. Now in the face of that large export and a not too large import by France, France raises the duty on these manufactures 50 per cent straight. Of braces, the next item, probably under item 620 also, we exported $52,000 worth, and France took nothing, and immediately raises the duty 50 per cent higher. Of boots and shoes we exported $358,000 worth, and France took $500 worth, and promptly raises the duty 50 per cent. The next item is inner tubes. We have no exports of such, but under the head of tires we exported $2,700,000 worth, and France took $69,000 worth. Of solid rubber blocks under the very same item there are no exports. Of felt we exported $56,000 worth. France took nothing and the duty has been reduced. Of the items from 621 to 625, dealing with manufactures of felt, our exports amounted to $98,000 but France took nothing. The duty has been reduced but is still too high, much higher than the minimum tariff. Take item 644, paint and other brushes; we exported these goods to the value of $94,000. The duty has been reduced but France only took articles under that head to the value of $34. We exported corsets to the value of $710,000 and France took none. We imported corsets to the amount of $272,000 and some of these came from France. The duty is still there although it has been considerably reduced.

Now, that exhausts the two schedules of goods that we are allowed, under this treaty, to export to France. I now wish to refer for a moment, but only in a general way, to some of the articles that France is allowed to sell Canada under this treaty. I would ask the Minister of Finance why shrubs, grape vines, gooseberry bushes, and trees of all kinds of which we have good growers in this country and of which we export considerable quantities are allowed to enter Canada at two cents apiece whereas similar provision has not been made for Canadian trees and shrubs on the part of France. It seems to me that there should be extended to us the same privileges that the other party to the treaty enjoys, otherwise this arrangement cannot be considered in any sense as a treaty. The same thing applies to other articles. The Minister of Finance admits French automobiles to Canada at a duty of 25 per cent, whereas the Canadian automobile going into France is subject to a duty of 45 per cent. The French piano is admitted to Canada at 25 per cent, but when the Canadian piano goes into France it must pay 35 per cent duty. In view of this discrimination, this arrangement does not look to be very much of a treaty. Now take buggies. The rate of duty on a Canadian buggy entering France is 35 per cent; the duty on the French buggy entering Canada is only 25 per cent. The same thing is true of buckles, needles and pins, braces and suspenders. The duty is lower on the French articles entering Canada than it is on the Canadian articles entering France. Why is it that buttons that are manufactured in this country cannot enter France on the same terms as French buttons are admitted to Canada? There is no use in going over the entire list of articles that enter Canada from France. All these goods that I have enumerated enter Canada under special terms. Now this is going to have a prejudicial effect on the revenues of Canada and we shall not enjoy any countervailing advantage, because, as I have shown, under this treaty no greater volume of Canadian goods will be admitted to France than went to that country last year What advantage are we going to get in return for this loss of revenue? I can quite understand that there might be some advantage to us if the effect of this treaty would be to increase the volume of our exports to France, but such will not be the case.

Having occupied so much time in dealing with this matter I feel that I owe an apology to the House. However, as two members of the government went to Europe and spent some months in the negotiation of this treaty, perhaps not very much complaint can be made if a few hon. members should occupy an hour or two in criticizing the provisions of that agreement.

Mr. FIELDING: I shall not at this late hour enter into any lengthy reply to my hon friend. I will deal only with one or two points and then ask that six o'clock be called, because if I got into a detailed discussion of the question at this period of the afternoon it might be inconvenient.

I have difficulty in quite understanding the basis of my hon. friend's criticism. If I may sum it up—and I hope I sum it up correctly—what he means to argue is this: Our trade with France is so inconsiderable that it is not worth our while to have a treaty with that country. I think that is a fair summary of my hon. friend's statement. If I have correctly defined his position in that regard all I have to say is that holding that view he will

be wise if he records his vote when the time comes against the adoption of this treaty; there is no other course open to him. But in doing so my hon. friend will cast some little reflection upon some distinguished statesmen who have figured in this matter in the days gone by. Hitherto it has been assumed in Canada by every government, by every party, that it was desirable to have a treaty with France. It was for that reason that, long ago, Sir Charles Tupper was sent over to negotiate a treaty. It was for that reason that other members of the Conservative party were sent to negotiate a treaty with France. It was for that reason that the late government, not many months ago, made a treaty with France, a treaty to which some of the hon. gentleman's criticism applies today. It was for that reason my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) declared in this House that it was desirable we should have a treaty with France. It was for that reason that they put in their last trade agreement the announcement that such treaty was only of a temporary character, and that there were to be negotiations for a larger and more comprehensive convention. So when my hon. friend has established to his own satisfaction that owing to the inconsiderable volume of our trade with France we should have no treaty at all, then I say, he has done it at the expense of the reputation of the distinguished statesmen of the Conservative party in years gone by.

My hon. friend has talked about another question. He repeatedly said that in this treaty we are giving a certain rate of duty to French goods coming into Canada, while France will not give us the same rate of duty. "Why," he says, "Is that fair? Is it fair that France should send an article into Canada at a rate of 20 per cent while our goods from Canada are charged 35 per cent?" Triumphantly my hon. friend asked that question and I suppose he thinks he has got the answer to it. Well, Canada has her own fiscal policy. She has a moderate tariff policy with an inclination downward. France, on the other hand, has a high protective policy with an inclination upward. Does my hon. friend think he can change the whole fiscal policy of France at a breath? We have the greatest respect for his knowledge, and even for his skill, as a business man. But does he think that if he had gone over to Paris, like the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe) and myself, he could have changed the whole fiscal policy of France, and that he could have got France to say, "We made a mistake. We are a protective country and, owing to the war, and other reasons, we had to increase our tariff on account of the conditions which resulted, but we were wrong and we are quite prepared to revise our whole tariff policy." Does my hon. friend think he could have accomplished that in Paris? If he does not think so then his criticism with regard to the inequality of the duties falls to the ground. Canada is a low tariff country. My hon. friend opposite may not think so; but we think we have a moderate tariff policy as against the high tariff policy of France, and if we are to trade with France in any degree we have to accept that condition; we have to accept the conditions she lays down and that is one of the vital things that my hon. friend has ignored.

The one great object, and the greatest object we had in negotiating the treaty, was this; we knew very well that we could not get low rates in France, but there was the danger that our great competitor and rival, the neighbouring republic, would get better rates, and the main policy we had in view in the negotiation was to be in a position to declare that, though the rates were high, we got the best rates that were going, the best rates granted to our competitor, the United States. That was the main feature of our tariff policy in the treaty negotiation and that has been carried out to the uttermost. I move that the debate be now adjourned.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

At 6 o'clock the House adjourned, without question being put, pursuant to rule.

Thursday, April 19, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

MEMORIAL TO THE LATE LIEUT.-COL. BAKER, M.P.

Mr. W. F. KAY (Missisquoi) moved:

That the first report of the special committee appointed to confer and act with the like committee of the Senate in further considering and determining the form of the memorial to be erected in the Parliament Buildings to the late Lieut.-Col. George Harold Baker, M.P., for Brome, be concurred in.

Mr. SPEAKER: This, of course, must be by leave of the House.

Motion agreed to.

ECONOMIC AND IMPERIAL CONFERENCES

PAPERS PRESENTED

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I beg to lay on the table

copies of correspondence and agenda of the Imperial Economic Conference, 1923, and of the Imperial Conference, 1923.

ROYAL COMMISSION ON PENSIONS

MOTION FOR PRINTING INTERIM REPORT

Hon. H. S. BELAND (Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment): By leave of the House I beg to move:

That 1,000 copies in English and 200 copies in French be printed of the interim report of the Royal Commission on Pensions and Re-establishment, and that Rule 74 of the House of Commons be suspended in connection therewith.

Motion agreed to.

IRRIGATION ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. CHARLES A. STEWART (Minister of the Interior) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 112, to amend the Irrigation Act.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Explain, please.

Mr. STEWART: This bill is for the purpose of making a slight amendment to make it clear that there shall be no conflict as between the rights of lease holders for mining purposes and the provisions of the Irrigation Act as they apply to streams, lakes or even sloughs. Some difficulty has arisen with respect to the claims of parties holding leases having the right to mine under existing water courses, lakes and sloughs, and this amendment is for the purpose of clearing the matter up.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST READINGS

Bill No. 110 (from the Senate), for the relief of Frederick Fong Young.—Mr. Stewart (Hamilton).

Bill No. 111 (from the Senate), for the relief of Thomas Percy Eversfield.—Mr. Ryckman.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

DUTIES ON AGRICULTURAL AND ANIMAL PRODUCTS

Mr. ANDERSON:

What was the amount of duty collected in the first eleven months of 1921-22 and 1922-23 respectively on the following:—(a) Agricultural and vegetable products mainly foods; (b) agricultural and vegetable products other than foods; (c) animal and animal products?

Hon. Mr. BUREAU:

Customs duties were collected in the eleven months ended February, 1922 and February, 1923 as follows:

	Apr. 1, 1921, to Feb. 28, 1922	Apr. 1, 1922, to Feb. 28, 1923
(a) Agricultural and vegetable products, mainly foods.....	$18,535,282	$23,191,974
(b) Agricultural and vegetable products, other than foods..	12,639,691	13,481,762
(c) Animals and animal products.....	4,339,758	4,241,108

IMMIGRANTS REJECTED

Mr. ROSS (Kingston):

1. How many immigrants have been refused admission to Canada during the fiscal year ended March 31, 1923?
2. From what countries did these people come?

Hon. Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Statement showing rejections of immigrants, by nationalities, at ocean ports, and along the international boundary, during the fiscal year ended March 31, 1923:

	International Boundary	Ocean Ports	Totals
Albanian	9	2	11
Arabian	1	1	2
Argentinian	9	...	9
Armenian	47	49	96
Australia	1	...	1
Austrian	397	...	397
Belgian	66	2	68
Bermudian	.....	...	
Brazilian	4	...	4
Bulgarian	42	1	43
Chilian	2	1	3
Chinese	8	115	123
Czecho-Slovak	23	1	24
Dutch	38	3	41
Egyptian	.....	1	1
Esthonian	1	...	1
Finnish	119	7	126
French	86	5	91
German	107	5	112
Great Britain and Ireland—			
English	366	53	419
Irish	12	12	24
Scotch	19	15	34
Welsh	.....	2	2
Greek	330	22	352
Haytian	1	....	1
Hebrew—			
Hebrew, N.E.S.	1	...	1
" Lithuanian	.....	1	1
" Polish	.....	3	3
" Roumanian	.....	5	5
" Russian.	.....	1	1
Hindoo	6	4	10
Hungarian	100	1	101

	International Boundary	Ocean Ports	Totals
Italian	888	125	1,013
Jamaican	4	...	4
Japanese	5	23	28
Jugo-Slav	90	9	99
Latvian	1	...	1
Luxemburg	1	...	1
Lithuanian	33	2	35
Maltese	27	6	33
Mexican	33	...	33
Negro	1	...	1
Newfoundland	3	43	46
New Zealand	1	...	1
Persian	1	...	1
Philippino	.....	1	1
Polish	647	12	659
Portuguese	22	...	22
Roumanian	277	15	292
Russian	734	3	737
Scandinavian—			
Danish	49	1	50
Icelandic	1	1	2
Norwegian	57	10	67
Swedish	111	7	118
Spanish	76	1	77
Swiss	32	1	33
Syrian	108	3	111
Turkish	54	...	54
Ukrainian	22	2	24
U.S.A. Citizens	8,849	4	8,853
West Indian	2	14	16
Totals	13,924	595	14,519

HON. WILLIAM PUGSLEY

Mr. CHARTERS:

1. Has the Honourable William Pugsley, late Minister of Public Works for Canada, been recently engaged by the Dominion government?

2. If so, for what purpose has he been engaged and what are his duties?

3. Who has been performing these duties up till the time of Mr. Pugsley's engagement?

4. What remuneration is Mr. Pugsley to receive, from what source; and what amount, if any, has he already received on account?

Hon. Mr. COPP:

1. The Hon. William Pugsley was appointed a commissioner under The Inquiries Act by Order in Council P.C. 165, dated the 13th of March, 1923.

2. The Hon. William Pugsley was appointed a commissioner to investigate and report upon:

(a) Claims of persons residing or carrying on business in Canada who have been subjected to loss and pecuniary damages arising through the destruction of life and property through the illegal warfare of the enemy; and

(b) claims for damages to which persons residing or carrying on business in Canada have been subjected for breaches of contracts, which contracts were prevented from being carried out owing to the operation of the statutory list of persons in neutral countries with whom such contracts were declared illegal;

for the purpose of determining whether such claims are within the categories in the first annex to section 1 of part VIII of the Treaty of Peace with Germany, and the fair amount of such claims, and to make such findings as may be of assistance to the government in determining which, if any, of such claims should be paid, and the extent of payment thereof.

(c) applications from ex-enemy nationals for the release of their property upon the grounds that they are necessitous, suffering and in hardship.

3. The Hon. Sir John Douglas Hazen was appointed a commissioner under The Inquiries Act for the first two of the purposes above stated, but requested to be relieved of his duties shortly after assuming them.

4. The sum of $500 on account of travelling expenses has been paid out of the appropriation for the adjustment of war claims and no further sum has been paid to the Hon. Mr. Pugsley.

The remuneration payable to Hon. Mr. Pugsley has not yet been fixed.

SALES TAX ON AUTOMOBILES

Mr. ANDERSON:

1. What is the regulation governing the sale of automobiles which have been used as demonstration cars by dealers, with regard to the sales tax introduced in the budget of last year?

2. When was such a regulation passed by the department?

3. Were automobile dealers notified by the department of such regulation? If not, what means were taken by the department to inform dealers of the existence of this regulation?

4. How many dealers paid the sales tax introduced in the budget of last year on cars in their possession on May 24, 1922, and what was the total collection from this source?

5. Has there been any organized protest from automobile dealers against the payment of this tax?

Hon. Mr. BUREAU:

1 and 2. No regulation was issued in respect of demonstration cars. Each case was dealt with separately after being reported upon by the local collector of customs and excise.

3. A circular dated 23rd May 1922, was issued to collectors of customs and excise containing instructions to have officers assigned to call upon dealers in their port and secure an inventory of all taxable automobiles on hand on the 23rd May, 1922. Each dealer was required to submit a statutory declaration in support of such inventory.

4. 613 dealers paid excise tax on cars on hand on the 23rd May, 1922. Excise tax collected, $90,661.70.

5. No organized protest made to Department of Customs and Excise against payment of this tax.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAY—PURCHASE OF TORONTO PROPERTY

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

1. Has the Canadian National Railway Company bought or given to the owners an offer to buy the block situate at the northwest corner of King and Yonge streets, Toronto?

2. If so, what is the purchase price or price offered?

3. Why is the Canadian National Railway at this time buying this exceedingly high priced property?

4. Is the company not now the owner of property situate opposite the King Edward Hotel, Toronto?

5. Is it not quite ample for, or easily made quite ample for the needs of the railway company?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. The Canadian National Railway Company is arranging to buy the property in question.

2. Price must be approved by Exchequer Court, and nothing definite can be announced at this time.

3. It is essential to the interests of the Canadian National Railway, if it is to continue in passenger business in Toronto, to be as well located as its principal competitor. Under the circumstances, the property is not regarded as high priced.

4. Yes.

5. This property is not satisfactory for purposes of passenger ticket office.

L. R. STEEL COMPANY, LTD.

Mr. MICHAUD:

1. Was the L. R. Steel Incorporation incorporated under the laws of the Dominion of Canada to do business in this country?

2. If so, what steps, if any, does the government intend to take in order that in future any similar companies may not take advantage of the people of Canada in canvassing to buy stock without first assuring the public that said companies are organized on a sound basis.

Hon. Mr. COPP:

1. (a) The L. R. Steel Company, Limited, was incorporated by letters patent issued under the Dominion Companies Act on the 28th October 1919, on the application of Peter White, James Moffat Forgie and Craig Allan St. Clair McKay, barristers-at-law; Willis Bertram Sturrup, office manager; Thomas Stewart Hagan Giles, accountant; James Ramsay Morris, student-at-law, and Annetta Rose Brown, stenographer, all of the city of Toronto; the company was capitalized at $2,000,000 divided into 20,000 shares of $100 each, of which 10,000 shares were preferred under conditions set out in the charter.

[Mr. Bureau.]

(b) Supplementary letters patent were issued to the company on the 6th January 1921, increasing its capital from $2,000,000 to $8,000,000, by the creation of 40,000 preference shares of $100 each and 20,000 common shares of $100 each.

(c) The Steel Realty Development Corporation, Limited was incorporated on the 23rd of December, 1920, on the application of Peter White, Bert Henry Luther Symmes and William Osmond Gibson, barrister-at-law; Thomas Stewart Hagan Giles, accountant; Willis Bertram Sturrup, office manager; Millie Croucher, clerk, and Annetta Rose Brown, stenographer, all of the city of Toronto, with a capitalization of $10,000,000 divided into 50,000 preference shares and 50,000 common shares.

(d) Supplementary letters patent were issued to the Steel Realty Development Corporation, Limited, on the 18th August, 1922, extending its powers to enable it to act as agents or brokers, etc.

2. Under the provisions of the Companies Act, chapter 79 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, companies incorporated thereunder selling securities to the public are required to file prospectuses, for the purpose of assisting the investing public to form a judgment upon the financial standing and future prospects of such companies. The said act further provides penalties for infractions of its prospectus clauses. The act makes such provisions as parliament considered effective for the protection of the public, and if its requirements are not fulfilled, or if misrepresentations are made, the enforcement of the statute is in the hands of the parties interested therein. There is no provision in the said act casting upon the government or any department thereof the duty of enforcing the clauses referred to.

DUTY AND DRAWBACK ON STEEL, COAL AND WOOLLEN IMPORTATIONS

Mr. BANCROFT:

1. For the last fiscal year, what was the amount of duty paid on steel, coal and woollen goods, and what drawback was repaid on steel, coal and wollen goods, imported by: (a) International Harvester Company; (b) Ford Motor Company; and (c) Massey-Harris Company?

2. What other drawbacks, if any, were allowed these companies?

Hon. Mr. BUREAU: I do not think this question ought to be answered as it appears on the order paper, for the reason that the answer would disclose the private business of the firms that are mentioned. The question calls for the importations made by the Massey-Harris Company, the Ford Motor Company, and the International Harvester Company, and the drawback paid. It has

always been deemed advisable to keep information of this kind within the department. If my hon. friend wants any particular information, I shall be willing to give it to him at the department for himself, but I do not think it would be advisable to answer publicly the question in the form in which it is.

Question dropped.

LABRADOR GOLD RUSH

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. GAUVREAU: I would like to ask the government a question on what I believe to be a matter of public interest. In view of the fact that a rush will be made this spring to the Labrador coast by many thousands who are attracted by the gold fever, and in view also of the fact that the money of the people is pouring into the pockets of gold schemers in this country, does not the government think that a statement should be given to the public at large by the Department of Mines as to the possibilities of finding gold in Labrador? A true statement by the Department of Mines would be a safeguard for many people who are blinded at the present time by companies desirous of gathering money for their schemes

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I can scarcely answer the hon. gentleman's question, but I may say that the department has taken this precaution: We have at the moment an inquiry in progress to get as far as possible any information that may be available with respect to the reported discovery of gold in the area referred to. The report of that investigation is not yet in my possession but I expect to receive it within a short time.

WEDNESDAY EVENING SITTINGS

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. GAUVREAU: Is it the intention of the Prime Minister that the House shall sit on Wednesday evening commencing next week?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I think there is a disposition on the part of a number of members of the House to have Wednesday evenings retained for a little time longer. The government had not thought it advisable to sit next Wednesday evening. However, as to the time of resuming the Wednesday evening sittings the government will be pleased to consider the general wishes of the House as they may be represented to us.

CLOSING OF BRANT HOSPITAL

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. ANDERSON: I would like to ask the Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment if the article appearing in the Hamilton press intimating that the Brant military hospital is to be closed in July next is correct?

Mr. BELAND: This question, Mr. Speaker, is now under consideration, but no definite decision has, as yet, been arrived at.

FRENCH TREATY

BILL TO RATIFY—DEBATE ON SECOND READING CONTINUED

The House resumed from Wednesday, April 18, the debate on the motion of Hon. Mr. Fielding for the second reading of Bill No. 23, respecting a certain Convention of Commerce between His Majesty and the French Republic.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, in the few remarks which I made on this motion last evening I pointed out that the only logical conclusion to the criticism offered by my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Chaplin) must be, first, that this treaty is a very foolish one, and furthermore, that in view of the inconsiderable volume of trade with France it is not worth our while to make a treaty at all. I think I was not mistaken—

Mr. CHAPLIN: May I be allowed to say to the minister that I do not want the impression to go abroad that I am not in favour of a treaty with France. On the contrary, I am in favour of a treaty provided it is a fair one.

Mr. FIELDING: The hon. member will have the opportunity of recording his vote against this motion and I hope he will remember that when the division comes. Let me say, though, that if I have the misfortune to run counter to the views of my hon. friend in this matter I can comfort myself with the thought that in endeavouring to make an arrangement for trade relations with France I am but following the example of the distinguished public men of this country for the last forty years. Though I have, with great reluctance, to differ with my hon. friend from Lincoln, I comfort myself with that thought.

I pointed out last evening the importance of recognizing the difference between the French fiscal policy and the fiscal policy of Canada. My hon. friend again and again

quotes cases in regard to which he says "The duty which France imposes is high and the duty which Canada imposes is low," and on the assumption that that is wrong he denounces the present treaty. Now, it is utterly impossible to conduct treaty negotiations with France upon any such basis. My hon. friend's argument, again and again, is this: He quotes some item in which the duty in France is high and the duty in Canada is moderately low, and he triumphantly asks "Is that a fair treaty?" I want to remind my hon. friend that under the existing condition of affairs he has himself voted for a treaty which controls the present relations between Canada and France, and if he will examine that treaty he will find that there are frequent cases where the duties which we impose in Canada are very much lower than the duties which are imposed on the other side of the Atlantic. So that this idea of reciprocity in duties which the hon. gentleman had in his mind, and on which he bases much of his argument, is utterly untenable; it is not tenable as respects our present condition, it cannot be tenable as respects the future.

Let me take one single item, which he mentioned himself in his speech, that of automobiles. Our rates of duty are 22½ per cent under the preferential tariff, 30 per cent under the intermediate tariff, and 35 per cent under the general tariff. According to my hon. friend's contention that must be the same condition in France. We must have the same rates as in France otherwise he would not support the treaty, otherwise he would say "How can this be a treaty at all when the rates are so unequal?" Surely the rates granted in France were the same, were they not, before my hon. friend consented to vote for that treaty?

Mr. CHAPLIN: I would just point out to the hon. minister that I was not here when the other treaty was made, and following the continuance of that treaty my understanding of the matter was that there was to be a new convention by which some of these anomalies would be corrected.

Mr. FIELDING: If the hon. gentleman says he was not present on the occasion referred to I must accept his statement. My impression was that he was here when the new treaty was adopted. I accept my hon. friend's statement. At all events the treaty was made by the government that he supported. Although he may not have voted for that treaty himself the party which he supports made and supported it. But let me give an illustration, and I can give it in a minute.

[Mr. Fielding.]

We admit automobiles into Canada to-day at the rate of 35 per cent, and if a Canadian automobile goes into France the duty is—these duties are specific but by converting this into an ad valorem duty it is approximately 180 per cent. That is the condition existing to-day under an arrangement made by the government of which he was a supporter even if he did not himself vote for it. My. hon. friend surely cannot realize the utter impossibility of doing what he asks us to do and that is ask the French government to fix the same rates as we have in Canada. I could give the same illustration for many other items but that one is sufficient for the purpose.

Mr. CHAPLIN: The minister succeeded in getting that duty, under this treaty reduced to 45 per cent. Why not have had a little further reduction, if he could accomplish that much.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman is entitled to put a question, with the consent of the member speaking, but he cannot indulge in discussion.

Mr. FIELDING: I do not object to my hon. friend's interruption. There are many other cases to which I could apply the same illustration. However, my point is this: The argument advanced by the hon. gentleman, that because the duties imposed in France were higher than the duties we imposed in Canada the treaty is unfair, is utterly unworthy of him and should not have been used. If my hon. friend will apply the same test to other classes of articles to which he referred he will find that the existing order of things is entirely against his own argument.

Now, I do not want to dwell too much on details of that nature. My hon. friend has quoted repeatedly the high duties that are imposed on articles in France and he asks with an air of triumph "Can we expect to do any business under these terms?" Well, I frankly admit that when we are doing business with any protectionist country the restrictions on trade operate to our disadvantage. I grant at once that we are not likely to do as much business with France under the present treaty, under the existing arrangement, or under the new treaty, as we could if France had a moderate tariff. But is that a reason why we should not endeavour to do what we can. We cannot undertake to change the whole fiscal policy of France; we must do business with France on the basis that she has that protective system, that her duties are high. But surely because we cannot do all

the business with France that we would like is no reason why we should not endeavour to do whatever is possible. What concerns us most is to see that we get the best terms that are offered to others. I suggested that yesterday but I want to repeat it again. I realize that under the high duties of France we cannot expect to do a very great trade, but certainly we will do less trade if we are placed at a disadvantage as compared with foreign countries. Our great competitor in Europe is, and will naturally be, our neighbour to the south, the American republic, and if we cannot get low duties in France surely it is worth our while to see that nobody else gets any better treatment than we do. That was one of the vital points of our object in going to Europe and that point, as I shall show further on, we have fully accomplished. The United States now has some advantage over us. I will take occasion to refer to that later. Our object in this treaty has been to terminate these disadvantages under which we suffer, to get the best terms that are now available, and to get a guarantee that in the years to come the United States shall get no greater advantages than are given to Canada. Is this not a worthy object?

My hon. friend made a passing allusion to a question of perhaps local importance to him, the duty on wines. He points out that under this treaty we are reducing the duty on wine. That is absolutely correct. We did so before. You could not make a treaty with France unless you were prepared to make some concessions in the matter of wines; but the hon. member talked of the Canadian wines and the duty imposed upon them. That is a different question. I stated in the first stage of the discussion of this measure that the duty set forth in the treaty with France might necessitate some readjustment of other duties, and I still stand by that statement, but we are not called upon to deal with that to-day. We are dealing entirely with the duties imposed on goods from France, and the taxes we shall impose on commodities made in Canada or any goods imported from other countries into Canada is another question, which we are not called upon to deal with at this moment.

My hon. friend for Lincoln said we should have had in a larger degree the French minimum tariff. I agree with him that that was desirable. It would have been a good thing if we could have had the whole minimum tariff and not have had to resort to the schedules at all, but we cannot get that minimum tariff from France. France will not grant the whole minimum tariff to any country. She uses her tariff as the instrument for commercial negotiations. Since we cannot get the whole minimum tariff, what should we do? Should we endeavour to get as much as possible, or should we let the whole matter alone and say that it is not worth trying to get? Our view is to get as much of it as we can, and if we have some articles mentioned in the list that are of no great importance, putting it at the lowest point of argument, what harm can come to any Canadian if we put in some articles which we do not export?

The hon. member spent a great deal of his time in dealing with the character of our exports. He mentions a number of things we do not export. He says there are certain articles which we export to other countries, which we do not export to France, and why bother with France at all? That is his argument. Well, it might strike most of us to look at it the other way. If there are articles which to-day we are exporting to other countries, there seems to be a fair chance that we might export them to France. That looks logical and reasonable, and we are desirous of the opportunity of exporting them to France. In the second part of my hon. friend's argument he read page after page, for hour after hour, of a long list of items which we do not export. He tells us of some things which he knows about personally. He says "We do not send these things to France" and therefore the inference is: Why bother about them at all? According to his argument, the proper preparation for a treaty would have been that we should have looked at the articles that Canada is exporting, and we should have said that if we provided for these, that was all that was necessary. That was not our notion. I am glad to tell my hon. friend that we proceeded along a different line. We thought it would be wise to ascertain by inquiry, not only what we are exporting, but what we might hope to export if the trade came to us. We were making a treaty not for to-day alone. True it is terminable on short notice, but we hope it will last a long time, and so we are putting in a list of articles which we might possibly export in the future. He speaks of many things with scorn and derision. He spent a large part of his time mentioning certain articles, and getting the laughter of his friends, and saying "We do not export a dollar's worth of that particular article." I do not think that was a sound argument. It might afford as much amusement to the friends of the hon. member when I tell him that some of the very articles he spoke of with scorn and derision were put in that list at

the request of the Manufacturers' Association, of which he is a member. My hon. friend was content with a small, narrow vision. If we are not exporting a thing to-day, we never will export it—that is his method of argument. That does not suit us on this side of the House. If he has the idea that the manufacturers of Canada are standing still and are not expanding, we differ from him. We think the manufactures are expanding to-day. We think they are making many things to-day they did not make before, and there are many things turers are expanding to-day. We think they will make in the near future. At any rate we think we are right in trying to open the doors of the French market to these articles. However, if our anticipations and expectations are too great in this regard, what harm is done by putting them in the list? Surely it is our duty to provide, not only for the things we are exporting to-day, but for the things we hope to export in the future, having regard to Canada's expanding manufacturing industries.

My hon. friend made merry for a long time when dealing with the articles we were not capable of exporting. I have already stated that some of the things were put in the list at the instance of the great association of which he is a member, but I think I will have to get a little closer to show how rash he is in his efforts to find fault with this bill. I know in his heart he believes in this treaty. He must approve of it in regard to the business with which his own community is connected, but he has allowed himself, for party purposes, I regret to say, to be carried to extremes. He referred to the articles that are mentioned in this long list—this padding as he calls it—and he says "I cannot imagine why on earth bronze powder should be put down in the treaty with France, when we never made the article and have imported it. I have used it in my business for forty years and we have never bought any in this country. Nevertheless, it is put in on this list." That is one of our crimes. We put in this list, as a possible thing which may be made in Canada, the article of bronze powder, and my hon. friend laughs us to scorn because we did so. I will give him an answer to that statement. Here is a telegram, addressed to myself, dated, Montreal, April 19th, which reads:

> Bronze powders have been made continuously in Valleyfield since you were there in 1906 on tariff inquiry. Our business increased with France in consequence of French treaty, and since opening office there, exporting 80 per cent of our product to foreign countries and increasing our capacity.

[Mr. Fielding.]

That is signed by R. E. Thorne, president of the Canadian Bronze Powder Works, Limited. I think my hon. friend would have been wiser if he had given a more thoughtful study to these matters before he made the rash statement which he did make. Only one day has elapsed since my hon. friend made his speech and this telegram reached me this morning, but I suppose others who have heard the criticism may be moved to say "We are not accepting his views, but we are going to give a chance to the Canadian manufacturer to make the things which we are not making to-day but which we may make in the near future".

Mr. CHAPLIN: May I ask a question?

Mr. FIELDING: Yes.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Would the hon. minister say, if bronze powder has been exported, why it is left out of both the customs and export returns?

Mr. FIELDING: The export returns have not been prepared by me, but have been prepared by the government which the hon. member supported. If he has any criticism to offer on that score, I would remind him that the last public returns produced were made under the direction of my predecessor, and I am not going to find any fault with them. I suppose they did what they thought to be best. My hon. friend spent so much time in dealing with those goods which are of no importance that he forgot the larger question which he might have taken up. I will put the question to him. What odds, if all these things which he calls padding are put into the treaty? In this case we show him why, and in many other cases we can show the reason. But suppose he is right, suppose we not only do not export but cannot export, will you tell me what harm comes from putting them in the treaty so that if our manufactures develop we will have the opportunity of exporting them. What harm comes from it?

I want to put a better question that he might have put. He might have asked us why we have not inserted this, that, or the other item in the treaty. If my hon. friend can show that one single item of importance to the export trade of Canada, an item that we are exporting to-day or have a fair chance of exporting, is not covered by this treaty; if he could ask me that question and I was not able to answer it, then I would admit that we were open to criticism. This treaty may err in the matter of covering too much ground; but I state with confidence that there

is not an item that Canada is exporting to-day or has hope of exporting in the early future, that is not covered by this treaty. If it is covered and if we get the best possible terms as compared with our neighbours in the United States, why should we complain of that?

My hon. friend asked some questions. He said: "We are to have no advantages over the present treaty. What have we that we did not have before? We have everything now without the treaty. Why then," he argues, "make a treaty, if things are as they are?" The leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen), in his speech delivered in this city yesterday evening, according to a report in the press, fell into the same fallacy. He said: "Mr. Fielding took over to France a better French treaty than the one he brought back."

Mr. MEIGHEN: A better French tariff.

Mr. FIELDING: I beg pardon. A better French tariff. That is to say, better rates as applied to Canadian produce than we have to-day. In a few cases that is correct.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In virtually all that count.

Mr. FIELDING: My right hon. friend has overlooked a very important thing. He speaks of the tariff that I took over, meaning the present rates. My right hon. friend, like his friend for Lincoln, forgets that these are dead or under sentence of death, because notice has been given by France that these rates are no longer to apply. He assumes that these rates are going to continue. He should have remembered that the French government long ago gave notice that they were not prepared to continue these rates. They denounced their treaties in all quarters, and they increased their tariffs as it was their right to do. We are, therefore, not justified in making comparisons to-day between the present rates and the rates that are going to be put into effect, except in a distant way. The great question to-day is not a choice between the duties set forth in this treaty and the duties we have to-day; it is a choice between the duties set forth in this treaty and the duties of the French general tariff which are very high duties. If this treaty fails, then we fall under the French general tariff which is a very high one. It is more important to Canada to-day to have this treaty than it is to France. Why? The differences between the French general tariff and the French minimum tariff are very large. The difference between the duties of our intermediate tariff and our general tariff are small. They run from 2½ up to 5 per cent, and in a few cases probably more. If we make no treaty with France to-day, all that happens to France is that she comes under our general tariff, which is a moderate tariff, while we come under their general tariff which is in most cases an exorbitant tariff, in many cases four times as much as the duties under their minimum tariff. Thus the right hon. gentleman will see that it is vastly more important to us to make this treaty with France to-day than it is for France to make it.

The hon. member for Lincoln said that the French minimum tariff gave what he called adequate protection. There is force in that. As a rule it is a higher rate than ours, and if we can not do business under the minimum tariff of France, what chance shall we have of doing business when their general tariff, their maximum tariff, is applied? If this treaty fails to-day, France need not worry much about it, because she would come under our general tariff which is a moderate tariff. My hon. friend for Lincoln would say that it is too low. At all events France would get the benefit of the moderate tariff. But if we do not adopt this treaty to-day, we come under the provisions of the French general tariff which is, in many cases, four times the rate of the minimum tariff.

It is true that our relations with France are good—

Mr. MEIGHEN: Before the hon. gentleman leaves that point, has he brought down or submitted to the House a notification, if there is one, from the French government, terminating or expressing an intention to terminate the arrangement that was in effect when he went over?

Mr. FIELDING: The notice to terminate the treaty between France and Canada? I know of the notice to terminate the original treaty that was passed years ago.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I mean the notice to terminate the arrangement in effect when he went over, to succeed the original treaty.

Mr. FIELDING: I do not know if there was any formal notice; but the terms of the treaty set forth that it was only a temporary arrangement and that representatives of the governments were to meet together for the purpose of drawing up a larger and more comprehensive treaty.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It was a status quo with continuance for a certain time. A certain time was to be given in case of a desire to cancel the treaty.

Mr. FIELDING: The first clause reads:

Pending the conclusion of a new commercial convention, with a view to which negotiations will begin immediately, the French and Canadian governments have agreed to the following provisions.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is there not a clause providing for cancellation of that?

Mr. FIELDING: The agreement was made by the French government only on condition that it was a temporary agreement, and that both governments were to commence negotiations for a broader treaty. Is that not a notice to quit? My right hon. friend knows that the French consul in Montreal applied to his government for a resumption of negotiations; but they were postponed. The agreement itself shows that it was only a temporary thing, and that it was the duty of both governments to enter into negotiations respecting a more comprehensive treaty.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I referred to it in that language myself; but I do not see any reason why Canada should press the temporary part of the clause, especially to get a worse condition of affairs than we have under the present agreement.

Mr. FIELDING: My right hon. friend does not see any reason why Canada should fulfil her obligations to enter into negotiations.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly.

Mr. FIELDING: I do. I think there is an obligation on the Canadian government to enter into negotiations, although the right hon. gentleman neglected doing so. I do not blame him for that, because he was busy with other things. Although he neglected this, we on our side did not neglect it. We felt that that was an obligation which we were called upon to fulfil and we have done so.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I asked the hon. gentleman, I thought in courteous language, if there was not a clause providing for termination of the temporary agreement. Instead of answering me, he entered into a round of something pretty nearly abuse. I will now read the clause, if he will permit me.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Hon. gentlemen do not want to hear this.

Mr. FIELDING: I do not object.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand the hon. gentleman has allowed the question.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Strange proceeding, I must say. Article 6 reads:

[Mr. Meighen.]

The present arrangement shall remain in force until the conclusion of a new commercial convention, but either of the high contracting parties may denounce it after four months' notice.

I asked if either of them had denounced it or expressed an intention to do so.

Mr. FIELDING: Speaking from memory, I do not think any formal denunciation took place. But I say that we are bound by the first clause of that agreement, which distinctly declared that it was of a temporary character, and being so bound we agreed to enter into negotiations to make a more comprehensive treaty. I know, as a matter of fact, from information given to me that the French consul in Montreal desired to enter into negotiations in the time of the right hon. gentleman's government. I am not complaining that my right hon. friend did not do so. His government were engaged with important matters. But when we came into power and the French consul asked us to resume negotiations, we felt that that was an obligation, and we gave him the assurance that we were ready to fulfil it.

I have pointed out that under the high French tariff, the volume of trade that we can hope to do is not very big. I have frankly said that from the beginning; but that is not a reason why we should not make an effort to do what we can in the matter. Our chief objective in this matter was to get on even terms with our brethren of the American republic. If we could not climb over the French tariff, you may say that they could not. Well, they are very energetic, very enterprising, and their agents are scouring the continent of Europe to-day in an effort to make favourable trade arrangements. My hon. friend for Lincoln said that we already have everything that we shall get under this treaty, and the leader of the Opposition said last night that I took over a better tariff arrangement than I brought back.

Mr. MEIGHEN: A French tariff.

Mr. FIELDING: I am glad my right hon. friend does not dispute that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But I do. What I said was that the Minister brought back a higher French tariff than existed before.

Mr. FIELDING: Well, the tariff I took over was a dead one.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh, no.

Mr. FIELDING: Oh, yes. It was absolutely dead; sentence of death had been carried out upon it. The only question we have to consider is whether the terms and

conditions of this treaty are better than the general tariff of France under which we shall operate if we do not accept the treaty. Now, the hon. member for Lincoln said, and he repeated it half a dozen times, that we have more to-day than we shall get under this treaty, and he wanted to know of what use the treaty was. "What do we want with it?" —he said; "we have everything already that we can get under it." Have we? I will give my hon. friend some evidence on this point. I think he had better attend the meetings of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, of which he is a member. He occasionally gives expression to some of its views, but evidently he conveniently forgets many important things that they say. Here is a statement which was made by representatives of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association who waited upon the government of Canada on February 22nd, 1922:

French Treaty

The French government, although not obliged by treaty to do so, has exempted United States goods from increases applicable under the French general tariff, while it continues to apply those increases against Canadian goods.

The result is that on Canadian goods (other than the few lines which, by treaty, are subject to the French minimum tariff rates) France levies double to three times as much duty as she levies on similar goods imported from the United States.

That is the condition to-day, which the hon. member for Lincoln thinks is all right, and he tells us that we are not going to get anything as good as that now.

We placed these facts before the previous government (see appended copy of letter to Minister of Trade and Commerce) but, so far, France has made no change in these arrangements of her tariff.

The following Canadian products, among others, now suffer under this tariff discrimination if shipped to France:—wrought iron, iron bars, steel bars, tubes welded or not, furniture, pianos and organs, phonographs, varnishes, machine tools, locks, many forms of hardware, metallurgical alloys and substances, spirits, valves, brass goods, agricultural implement parts, shafts, screws, bolts, link belting, spark plugs, etc.

Follows a list of details bearing on this representation. The representation then concludes:

We respectfully urge upon your government the necessity of pressing for the immediate removal of said tariff discrimination.

That is what we have done by this treaty. Every item mentioned in this list submitted by that representation of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, and which has been subject to discrimination in the past, is now placed upon even terms with the same article coming from the United States. That is one of the conditions that will exist under this treaty; and perhaps my hon. friend would like further information along the same line. Well, let me show him how the present condition of affairs, which he says is so satisfactory, applies to one particular industry in this country. Here is a comparative statement showing the difference between the duty levied on parts for agricultural machinery imported from Canada and the same duty on these machinery parts imported from the United States. This is a statement of the tariff now in force:

	U.S.A. Francs	Canada Francs
Binder canvasses	211.20	654 70
Canvas straps	312.00	832.00
Magnetos	300.00	840.00
Ordinary cast iron spares	25.00	80.00
Straight solid steel shafts		
10 kilos or less	90.00	240.00
10 kilos to 100	72.00	192 00
Tubular bored straight shafts, also bent and crankshafts, any description		
10 kilos or less	135.00	360.00
10 kilos to 100	90.00	240.00
Parts composed of two or more metals		
1 kilo and under	40.00	100.00
1 kilo to 10	35.00	87.50
10 kilos to 50	30.00	75.00
50 kilos to 300	20.00	50.00
Screws, bolts and rivets not lathe turned, cotter pins:		
less than 3 mm	126.00	336.00
3 to 8 mm	108.00	264.00
8 to 12 mm	81.00	204.00
12 to 18 mm	63.00	168.00
Articles in iron or steel		
Link chain belting	44.20	137.02
Seats, Mower tool boxes	46.80	105.08
Coil springs	52.00	161.20
Spark plugs, each	0.36	0.96
Spirit levels	180.00	480.00

That is the present condition as affecting one particular industry in this country, namely, that engaged in the making of agricultural implements. For some years past, under an arrangement which my hon. friend for Lincoln evidently supported and with which he seemed to be so well pleased yesterday, every one of these items has suffered from a heavy discrimination against Canada. Under the present treaty every one of them will go into France on even terms with the United States' product. And that was really the main purpose of the agreement. We knew that France was a high tariff country and that in all probability we should not be able to do a great deal of trade with her. But in view of the representations made to us in regard to the disadvantage under which we were labouring, we considered, in face of the fact that France was a high tariff country, and in the face of our knowledge that the United States was enjoying a great advantage over us, that it was well, in justice to Canada and all interests in this country, that that discrimination

should be removed; and that is one of the features we present to the House in the present treaty. That was the main object we had in negotiating this treaty, and in that we have accomplished all that can be reasonably desired. I think, therefore, that my hon. friend for Lincoln, on reflection, will discover that a good many of these items in this tariff are not padding after all.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON (West York): Mr. Speaker, what a great pity it is that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) is not the diplomat and the negotiator that he is the orator and the debator. But after all, is it not a very easy thing to seize upon a little slip here and there and exploit it? Take for example, bronze powders. Apparently the amount of this article exported is so infinitesimal as to make it not worth while devoting a line to it in the customs papers. The minister seizes upon something here and something there of this description and takes the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Chaplin) to task, the whole offence of that hon. gentleman having consisted in giving the exact facts regarding the different items covered by my hon. friend's treaty. The hon. gentleman for Lincoln did not say that there were no items of any use in the treaty. He said in connection with several items that there was an opportunity for trade. But the hon. member for Lincoln took a position that the Minister of Finance cannot understand.

Mr. FIELDING: Hear, hear.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: He took an honest position against the interests of his own trade because he thought the general good of Canada demanded that he should take that position. That is what he did. But I know something of the inception of this matter, and my hon. friend could have gone further. He could have shown that in connection with some of these items, purchased at such great cost to the common people of this country—purchased at the sacrifice of the interests of our agriculturists—he could have shown, I say, other items, especially asked for by the hon. member for Lincoln, which would have tremendously helped him in his business. Is it a very, very heinous offence for an hon. member of this House, forgetting his own personal interests and the interests of his association, to say something on behalf of the rest of the people?

4 p.m.

Now, let us take the hon. minister's next point, it is that the attitude of the hon. member for Lincoln was that our trade with France being so infinitesimal it was not worth while trying to develop it. So far as we in this quarter of the House are concerned, we have not taken that attitude. The Minister of Finance is perfectly right—our government wanted a treaty with France, some tariff arrangement that would enable the commerce of both countries, not of one country alone, to be advanced. It is quite true that we always wanted such an arrangement; but it is entirely another thing to say that we wanted something which involves all that this treaty involves against the interests of Canada. We would like to do everything in our power to help the French republic. I do not know whether the hon. minister is advancing this treaty just on that score alone, or whether he thinks that the benefit the few favoured manufacturers who are helped is the real ground why this treaty is brought down. I repeat, we would like to help France as much as we possibly can, but we still think that our first duty is to Canada—helping France as much as we can without the direct sacrifice of Canadian interests. That was our attitude then, and it is our attitude to-day.

We find, Mr. Speaker, some extraordinary things growing out of this discussion. Why, we have learned from the mouth of the Minister of Finance that Canada is a low tariff country; that we have no excessive tariffs, simply low tariffs. When my hon. friend said that he was dealing of course with his own tariff, because it has always been continued. And he was telling us the truth about that tariff. For it is a low tariff. It is high in regard to some items, I admit, one or two here and there that might be lowered, but it is a low tariff. It is a great thing to get the truth sometimes. Look at the records of this House and observe how often my hon. friend has moved resolutions demanding the reduction of the tariff which he and his supporters then described as high and extortionate. Why, what was the last election fought on? In some districts it paid my hon. friends opposite to fight it on the ground that our tariff was a high tariff—as high as Haman's gallows. But once anyone takes the trouble to look into our tariff he must admit, if he would be honest about it, that it is dwarfed into pallid insignificance compared with tariffs elsewhere. That is one thing we have learned—ours is a low tariff.

My hon. friend makes a lot out of the treaty of 1921. Well, that was a temporary treaty. It was not a treaty that we took five months to evolve, anyway, nor was it a treaty that we sent emissaries overseas to look after. That treaty negotiation was merely incidental to other work and was the best we could arrange. And certainly it is much bet-

ter than the treaty now before us. My hon. friend says that France wants to have a tariff that will enable her to negotiate proper business transactions. Very well, why should not Canada have a similar tariff? Why should not Canada look after herself just as well as France looks after her own interests?

Mr. FIELDING: Why did you not do it?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend asks: "Why did not we do that?" Of course, that is the cheapest of all kinds of questions. Had we been given an opportunity, had we come back to office, we would have done it.

Mr. FIELDING: Oh, yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend says, "Oh, yes." Does he give me no other reason why Canada should not look after her own commercial interests except that we did not do it?

Mr. FIELDING: Oh no, I do not give that reason.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Very good. France is looking after herself, and that is not a crime. But just let us look at the spectacle that is presented to us. Here we have these two gentlemen going over to negotiate a commercial treaty with a view, presumably, of doing something to help Canadian trade; going over to deal with a country which, according to the Minister of Finance, was already committed to high tariffs. Without the slightest preparation, without the slightest thing to help them in negotiating, they go over, committed by their public utterances here not to any higher tariff to enable Canadian trade to be looked after, but committed to a lower tariff. Then the French ministers, who understand their country's business so well, say to our representatives, "Well, yes, your tariff is coming down instead of going up, but ours is going up, and if you wish to do any business with us you have got to come up so much." And then we are told by the Minister of Finance that it is impossible to do anything. The representatives of France are business men, men looking after the interests of France, and for my hon. friend to tell me that he cannot do anything when France has a very large balance of trade in her favour is equivalent to saying that either the French representatives care not for that balance of trade, or else that he never appreciated the strength of his position. Generally when you have one country with a heavy balance of trade in its favour, and the other therefore with a correspondingly adverse balance, what is tried to be done is to adjust those balances so that interchange of commerce may be rendered more easy. But what my hon. friend has done is to make very sure that the adverse balance will be greater than it has been in the past. It is perfectly true so far as the particular lines of activity which my hon. friend has referred to are concerned we will sell more of them, but so far as the big, basic exports of this country are concerned, if this tariff has any effect, we are going to sell far less of them. I only know one real argument, that is, if the good of the majority be served here, in favour of this treaty, and that argument is the Liberal platform. I am going to refer to that dishonoured and much abused document again, Mr. Speaker. One solemn resolution read:

> Be and it is hereby resolved (1) That the serious nature of the country's financial situation calls for the profoundest consideration of all patriotic citizens, and the exercise of the severest economy by the government.

I am not now pointing out that economy is entirely forgotten and that the only change in the situation is that we are just so much more in debt, but I have to give the House the run of the whole resolution:

> (2) That increase of revenue must be sought from an equitable and effective imposition and collection of graduated taxes on business profits and income applicable to all incomes above reasonable exemptions; (3) Taxes on luxuries—

Taxes on luxuries. You know, Mr. Speaker, we are told that there is so much bad in the best of us and so much good in the worst of us that I would point out to my hon. friend, although he had nothing whatever to do with that platform, although he has on the floor of this House discarded it, that there may be something good even in that platform, even in that awful document so inimical to the real fiscal interests of this country. There was, I think, something good in it. I think that taxes on luxuries are right. But this French treaty absolutely forbids them. It is the one argument in its favour. Not only does it forbid it by making its reductions of ten or fifteen per cent off the low intermediate tariff, but it also goes further and provides for specific duties tying the hands of this country. I do not know whether his abhorrence to that platform had anything to do with my hon. friend's treaty or not, but it is really a very apparent argument in favour of the treaty from his standpoint.

My hon. friend opened up the discussion of this treaty I think very fairly. He said in opening that he did not know that it would amount to very much; I think those were his

exact words. He did not know if we would do very much business under it; he was not sure. He said at page 464 of Hansard:

> France will not make as generous a treaty to-day as she did in 1907.

So we have it from the lips of the real negotiator, because I have no doubt that my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe) had some other business to look after—for example, he was looking after all the cables dealing with that most important question the appointment of his friend Mr. Talbot as a director of the Canadian National Railways, and other large matters of state administration—

Mr. LAPOINTE: Where did you get that fine piece of information?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It was in the press. Of course, if my friend tells me he had nothing to do with that nomination, why, he knows; I do not.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The press stated in the month of February that the name of Mr. Talbot came as a surprise.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The press, I think, said that cables had been sent over to my friend about it, and that he cabled back that a representative of Quebec would be appointed.

Mr. LAPOINTE: That is different.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I quite admit to my hon. friend that he may not have thought then that he was going to so greatly advance one of the minor employees of the Quebec government. That was never publicly talked about then. I admit freely and frankly that everybody was amazed when the appointment was mentioned.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Hear, hear.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Mr. Speaker, here we have the statement of the chief negotiator that this treaty is not as good as the last treaty. Let us just look at the last treaty.

Mr. VIEN: The dead one.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend says the dead one. I do not know exactly why he says that. It may interest him to make use of the word "dead."

Mr. VIEN: Let us say dying.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Suppose we take that treaty of 1907, not the treaty of 1921, and if my hon. friend wants to call that treaty dead I do not know but what he is right; if he had gone still further and said it never should have been made, it would have been much better, and if it never had been made there would have been a great deal more money in Canada to-day. But let us look at that treaty of 1907. A fair way of looking at the effect of a treaty of that character is to examine its results after it has got into operation: I think my hon. friend will agree with me in that statement. It is also fair to deal with it for a term of years, and the usual term for purposes of comparison is five years; most statisticians use that term. I am going to give the House figures showing how well the old French treaty worked out, not for Canada, but for France, and I do not think I am fair to France in saying France in that way—not fair to Canada, but most advantageous to the most favoured nations. For the five years from 1909 to the year 1913 the total French imports into Canada were $56,991,000 odd. The total of Canadian exports to France as against that $56,991,000 of imports amounted to $11,883,000 odd. The yearly average for the period was $11,398,000 of imports and $2,376,000 of exports, resulting in an average yearly unfavourable trade balance against Canada of $9,000,000 odd, or an adverse trade balance against us for the five years under consideration of $45,107,000 odd. It paid, did it not? A wonderful contract got by my hon. friend, and the sad part of the thing is that instead of improving our sad position he comes back and admits that he has made a worse bargain.

Now let us go back to the year 1909 and take the imports from France for that year and those for the year 1913, and just see what happens. The imports in 1909 were $8,197,000 odd. The imports for 1913 were $15,375,000 odd, or an increase of $7,178,000 odd, or 87·56 per cent. That is what the treaty was doing for France. Now let us take the exports and see what the treaty was doing for Canada. The exports to France in 1909 were $2,341,000 odd, and in 1913 $2,357,000 odd, an increase of $15,647, or ·66 of one per cent. That is what my hon. friend's diplomacy does for Canada. On the one hand it gives an increase in the French business of 87.56 per cent and on the other hand an increase in the Canadian business of just .66 of one per cent. Take it in another way. Just look at the adverse trade balance that he manages to work up. In 1909 the adverse trade balance was $5,855,000 odd. In 1913 the adverse trade balance was $13,018,000 odd. There was an increase in the five-year period under my hon. friend's treaty of $7,162,000 odd in

Canada's adverse trade balance, or an increase of 122 per cent. And, Mr. Speaker, the minister says that this new agreement is not a good contract, that is not as good as the one entered into before. Of course, it is true that France's imports per capita are less than ours. Her duties are higher and that is one reason why we should have been granted more favourable terms. For example in the Book of Statistics of the United States for, I think it is, 1920, the last year for which the figures have been compiled, the imports per capita for France are given as $84.71, while Canada's are $131.88; and this condition is to be aggravated by this treaty. "What harm is it," asks my hon. friend. My hon. friend says the Americans are busier. I wonder if my hon. friend could not have hired an American to look after this treaty for him. He has only got just what the Americans have, and they have given nothing, no concession, and they have entered into no contract or no treaty. France just simply gave the United States favoured rates. When he says that he has put Canada in the same position as the United States is it true? Why, the United States gives nothing, but Canada ties her hand and says the duties shall be thus and thus—

Mr. VIEN: Does my hon. friend contend that better terms could have been obtained from the French government?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I have not the slightest doubt of it—not the slightest. I cannot imagine anything worse than we have in this arrangement of ours.

Mr. VIEN: On what does my hon. friend base that view?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: On the basis of common sense. On the interest France must have in maintaining this trade so advantageous to her, and the unnecessary and extraordinary concessions which France enjoys under this treaty. Does my hon. friend want any other reason?

Mr. VIEN: Why did you not get a better treaty in 1919?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: We had some reverence for the work that had been done before. I have always had tremendous regard for the Minister of Finance. I had no idea until I looked into this treaty how horribly the contract he has made works out for us. I do not think the hon. gentlemen opposite had any idea either. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries looks at me incredulously. I do not think he knew what the trade figures were when he went over to France or he would not have come back with such a contract as this.

Now, let us see what we are giving up? Of course, we are giving up our fiscal independence—that is independence in the matter of framing our own tariff. We grant specific duties which we cannot raise. France does nothing of the kind, absolutely nothing. We give a contract to the effect that the percentage between our intermediate and general tariffs shall be maintained. France does absolutely nothing of the kind. Canada is tied; France is free. My hon. friends opposite applaud a treaty of that kind. I wonder why? In addition to that let us see what we are giving up in connection with tariff rates in some instances; I do not pretend to have mastered all the items covered by this treaty. However, it is not necessary to deal with the whole of it; a few citations will be enough. First let us see what comes in from France below the British preferential rate. Item 156 covers cognac, brandy and armagnac brandy, something that will come into direct competition with Quebec in so far as their local production is concerned. Perhaps they think there should be no local production in Quebec. I do not know.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: If they do think there should be no local production in Quebec, my hon. friends opposite would be quite right in voting for these duties. The British duty is $10. The intermediate duty is $10, but under this tariff it is reduced to the most favoured nations to $9, a difference of 10 per cent. Take another item, champagne. There also the French rate is 10 per cent below the British rate. Now let us take castile soap.

Mr. VIEN: You need it more.

Mr. CANNON: You are blowing bubbles.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Here also France gets a reduction of 10 per cent. The British rate is 10 cents and French soap pays but 9 cents. I could take also item 81, trees, etc.; item 86, canned vegetables; item 169, novels or works of fiction; item 182, printed music and music for mechanical piano players; item 262, olive oil; item 264, essential oils; item 583, manufactures of silk; item 657a, moving picture films, all of which made as low as the British rate. We are indeed doing something; we are giving specific rates to France and entering into certain covenants advantageous to her and receiving nothing

in return. The whole effect of this treaty is to aid the commerce of the "most favoured nations." That is what my hon. friends have managed to do, and in addition, to increase the French rates against us and to curtail Canadian business.

Now let us see what we are really interested in in the export market. I would have thought my hon. friends opposite would at once have said "Agriculture" but all they have done for agriculture is to have the rates put up against it, nothing else. Where my hon. friends get the minimum rate for agricultural products it is only because the general rate of France is just the same, that is speaking generally. I will try to be a little more specific.

Let us run over our chief agricultural activities, and see how tremendously the ministers in the city life of Paris, had forgotten that there was such a thing as the Canadian farmer. In item 68 wheat (grain flour) there is no difference at all between the minimum and the general tariff. We get nothing there. Item 69, oats (grain, meal) is in the same position. Then we come to items 70, barley (grain, meal); 71, rye (grain, meal); 72, maize, (grain, meal); 73, buckwheat (grain, meal); 91, sugar; 93, syrup, and 95, preserves. In all these items we find no concessions, no reduction from the general tariff.

These other agricultural items that we are largely interested in, I think, perhaps, were pretty well covered yesterday by the hon. member for Lincoln. The others all go up. Now let us see what is going up. I think I can say to my hon. friends, without wearying the House that in the list—and he will correct me if I am wrong—there is not a single agricultural product of Canada that has not been increased. If I am wrong I hope my hon. friend or his expert will tell me, so that I may be corrected. I think the only agricultural items which are not increased are lambs and calves, which are not exported. The rates on all the items of agricultural export outside of the ones I have mentioned, which take the general rate, there being no difference between that rate and the minimum have been increased. In the absence of denial or challenge of that statement, I will not weary the House by reading the list. My hon. friend contends that apparently the idea of the hon. member for Lincoln was that what ought to be done in making this treaty was simply to have gone to the French ministers with a long list of the articles that we were exporting and not bothered about anything else. I would like to ask my hon. friend, would it not be better to get proper rates on the present business than to speculate on business in the future, which may never arise in 20 years? Is it not better to deal with real issues than possibilities? Is not my hon. friend interested in the trade balances of to-day, or is he looking forward to bringing in a budget 25 years hence, when by some extraordinary accident this treaty may be helpful?

But he is wrong, I think, when he says that the point made by the hon. member for Lincoln was that we are not now manufacturing these articles. His point was not based so much upon that Mr. Speaker, as upon the fact that in connection with the great majority of these items, Canada was importing. Canada got her supplies from the outside. We have one exception to that —bronze powder—but that is so infinitesimal that no one can find it. In so far as the rest of it is concerned, I think he will have difficulty in showing that this country is not importing. I would like the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) however, to write to his optimistic friend who got started so well after his former trade inquiry making bronze powder. I have discovered that there is something said about it in the return of the Department of Customs and Excise in connection with this article, and I would point out to him that while he may be getting on well, this is an article which is not very much used and there is not a tremendous volume of it. Although there is not a tremendous volume of it, this report for the year 1921-22 at pages 248 and 249, shows that we are importing $46,000 worth. I would point out to the House that we should not quarrel with these figures. They are figures laid on the Table of the House by the present minister of Customs and Excise (Mr. Bureau), and although laid on the Table by him, we have absolutely no quarrel with them. I might further point out to my hon. friend that he must know about this item, because that self-same minister collected a duty of something like $15,000 on it. There is just one further thing I should emphasize and bring to my hon. friend's attention. Notwithstanding that glowing letter, this return shows there are no exports at all. So much for that.

I have no doubt there are other things to be found which are just as unimportant.

Suppose my hon. friend had taken up Canada's real business, and had bothered himself about it. Take the figures for the year 1922, our chief article of export to France was canned salmon. The rate on canned salmon —and I hope the hon. member will correct me if I am wrong—was increased from 25 francs to 35 francs per 100 kilograms—35 as against 25. Wheat is just left where the hon. member found it, and there is no change

or help at all. Canned lobster remains where it was, with the general tariff 40 and the minimum tariff 25. The old tariff which my hon. friend had in his hand under the former arrangement was 25, and the present tariff is 25. The next largest is sugar, 2 cents, and of course nothing is done there. All the sugar rates are the same. France needs sugar. Her minimum tariff is just the same as her general tariff. Of course if it had not been so my hon. friend would have expected a higher rate there. Condensed milk is increased. I am just taking the things of importance and I may say that there is an increase of 50 per cent on condensed milk, the former tariff being 5 francs and the present tariff being 7½ francs. The next item in order of importance is wood pulp and in this there is no change.

In the next item, oats, (grain, meal), there is no difference in any of the tariffs. It is impossible for Canada to be charged more than anybody else there, and there is no change. The next item, asbestos, is just as it was. We sent over a lot of raw asbestos. The tariff under the treaty is the same as the tariff now in effect. Then I come to mowing machines. That was one of the things my hon. friend was talking about a good deal this afternoon. As regards the manufacture of agricultural implements, my hon. friend forgets that, under the temporary treaty, that wrong was largely righted. On mowing machines, the rate is just the same as he found. It was 24 per cent, and it is now 24 per cent. The same is the position in connection with wood pulp chemical. Harvesters and binders and also ploughs are in exactly the same position, the rate now being 24 francs. Coal tar and pitch are still free and always were free. Coal is also free; there is no change. Then we come to machinery with varying rates, and I think my hon. friend has got something here. This is the first item of any importance in which there is any change for the better. I think this item of machinery covers some of the articles in which our manufacturers are so largely interested. I have no doubt there is an improvement. The next item of importance is apples, and the rate on this is just as it was before. As regards pneumatic tires, the next item of importance, there is an increase of 50 per cent. The old rate was 150 francs per 100 kilos. That becomes 225 francs. The next is match splints, and there is again no change. Then we have butter, lard; but I am, perhaps, getting below an item which my hon. friend would think of immediate importance. I have gone down the list in order from exports of $1,774,316 to $68,182. If my hon. friend had concentrated on those really important matters and could have got some decreases instead of increases, that would have been a great thing for his treaty. A very different course of action was followed by the French. They have not a long list. They did not want anything in the treaty for political purposes. They were making a business treaty like business men, and every one of their items is a real item. If my hon. friends think there is any doubt about that, I invite their attention to a list prepared by the Bureau of Statistics showing the principal commodities imported for consumption in Canada from France during the year ended March 31, 1922, and my hon. friends will find that the French negotiators did exactly what the hon. member for Lincoln suggested that the Canadian negotiators could do, should do, and ought to do, namely, look after the real business of this country.

It is a great mistake to describe this treaty as a treaty with France. My hon. friend did a very good thing some years ago when he denounced the most favoured nation clause with Germany. That was a splendid bit of work, and I wish he had only gone on with his good work before he took up the question of this treaty. I suppose my hon. friend's answer will be: "Why did you not do this?" But let me say that I should have done it, and I would, had I had an opportunity. But supposing we forget the tu quoque argument for the moment—I consider that Canada is in an anomalous position at this time in that, while she wants to help France, as I think most of us do, on something like terms that we can stand, she cannot do so without giving the same terms to a number of other countries, and without getting any trade concessions from them whatever. I want to point out to the House a few of these instances, showing exactly how this works out, and suggesting that, as regards results, this contract might be better described as a contract for the benefit of Switzerland, Japan or some other country. It is not necessary to go through all the items, but let me take a few of them. Item 575, braids, cords, fringes, tassels, is one of those items as regards which my hon. friend has made the mistake of adopting that vicious principle of a fixed rate. The intermediate rate is 35½ per cent. He fixes a rate of 27½ per cent. In the year 1922—and I take that year because I can get complete returns for it—under this item of braids, cords, fringes and tassels, France sold us $46,847 worth of goods. Switzerland sold us $112,407 worth, and under this treaty she gets the benefit of that fixed

rate, for 2½ times the amount that France sold. As regards item 653, brushes, under my hon. friend's treaty he takes 10 per cent off the intermediate scale of 25½ per cent. In 1922, France sold $42,941 worth of brushes, and Japan sold us $114,415 worth, again considerably more than twice as much. Under tariff item 651, dealing with buttons, where the treaty clips ten per cent off the intermediate rate of 30 per cent, France sold us $11,332 worth of buttons and Japan sold $107,761 worth. Does this not seem perfectly ridiculous when one comes to examine it? For the purpose of assisting the trade of France, Canada makes a special rate on buttons for some real or imaginary—I think, imaginary—benefit to the country, when France is selling only $11,000 worth of them and Japan $107,000, and Japan gets the benefit of that rate.

Item 368 deals with clocks and watches, and the treaty takes 10 per cent off the intermediate rate, which is 27½ per cent. France sold $3,829 worth whereas Switzerland sold $75,586 worth. Yet there is no concession at all to Canada in connection with the sale of that $75,000 worth of goods in our market. In item 453, electrical apparatus, telephones, etc., 10 per cent is cut off the intermediate rate, which is 25 per cent. In this case France sold $1,231 worth; Japan, $18,180 worth, and Switzerland $12,915 worth. Yet they all get the same reduction.

Let us take embroideries, in connection with which we have a low rate. There is an omnibus section, 575, which embraces a lot of different embroideries, handkerchiefs, etc. Take embroideries, white or cream coloured, in connection with which my hon. friend fixes a specific rate of duty. France sold us in these embroideries $6,039, and Switzerland $423,092. So here is Canada violating all proper principles of her own fiscal policy in fixing a duty apparently at the behest of France, when France sells us $6,000 worth of these particular goods as against some $423,000 sold us by Switzerland. Of other embroideries France sold us in the same year, $17,700, while Switzerland sold us $100,598. In handkerchiefs France sold us $5,629, Japan sold us $77,050, and Switzerland $225,823. I would ask my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if he had any idea what he was doing when he was opening Canada's doors to that outside trade in that volume in luxuries, not only to France, who supplied only a fraction of the trade, but to other countries as well? Did he realize what he was doing? I am sure he did not. Let us take lace, white or cream coloured. France sold us of lace $68,474 worth; the Netherlands sold us $36,736; and Switzerland sent us $241,915. Next take lace nets and netting, not otherwise provided for. In this line France sold us $186,568 and Switzerland $72,879. So that under that item, 575, France sold to Canada in the year 1922, $284,480, while Switzerland sold us $1,064,307.

I wonder whether my hon. friends really realize what the treaty does, and what further excuses we are going to have for letting in this large amount of articles which can be described only as luxuries, under such circumstances as indicate that the contention that this treaty is for France is very largely absolutely wrong. France is not getting the benefit of it. The next item I would point out is 120, anchovies and sardines. In this case there is another of those precious fixed rates of duty. France sells us $36,639 worth of this article, while Norway sells us $246,613. Some people will say, of course, that anchovies are a good thing to have and are not luxuries, although some of us describe them as such. However, let us proceed; let us take item 581, silk fabrics. This is something that is pre-eminently in the class of luxuries and there is a fixed duty of 20 per cent against the intermediate tariff of 27½ per cent. France sold us $1,006,000 worth of this article as against $3,970,706 worth supplied by Japan. In other words, Japan gets this amount of silks in under a fixed duty, giving nothing in return for the advantage. Switzerland under the same item supplies, as against France's sale of $1,000,000, the sum of $4,093,000 again giving no concession for it. Take item 582, silk ribbons. The fixed duty is 25 per cent as against the intermediate duty of 32½ per cent. Under this item France sold us $248,656 worth and Switzerland $692,408. Item 624 refers to toys and dolls, 10 per cent off the intermediate duty of 27½ per cent. Of these articles France sold $23,173 worth as against Japan's sale of $187,150.

The next item is wearing apparel—but what is the use of going on with the list? What is the use of proceeding with these figures, Mr. Speaker? Here we have a treaty which of necessity, with matters as they are now, and as my hon. friend admits, extends automatically these great concessions granted to France by Canada to all these other countries, without the slightest advantage in return to this country. I am again sure that the hon. the Minister of Marine, in view of his studied declarations in this House, could never have had these figures before him or have known what he was doing. It is really very hard even to begin to cover the

objections that one may raise to this treaty. I am not going to try to do it. I have pointed out a few of them, but there are so many more that it would be entirely beyond my power to enumerate them. Let me, however, indicate something else. When the hon. member for Lincoln was speaking yesterday he was showing what the result would be calculating on the basis of 7 cents to the franc. We are not doing very much business, if any at all, in many instances, with this rate. But I wonder whether my hon. friends have really considered what will happen if the franc goes up. If the franc, which is to-day valued at 7 cents for purposes of the calculations made by the hon. member for Lincoln, should go up, you might just as well try to do business with the moon as with France. It would be just as reasonable. Take canned vegetables. I am going to ask my hon. friend to correct me if I am wrong. The Canadian rate on canned vegetables works out at a cent a pound; the French rate works out at 1¾ cents per pound, on the basis of 7 cents to the franc. The franc at par represents 20 cents. Supposing it never goes back to 20 cents but just rises even to 14 cents, which would still give a big discount, I should like to know from the Minister of Finance whether he honestly thinks he could do any business at all under these rates. My hon. friend says nothing. He knows he could not do any business under such conditions. No reasonable man in the world would suggest that business could be done on these precious rates. Of course, I am referring to the rates on the various articles that we have been considering. Take the agricultural rates, so far as the minimum and the general tariffs are concerned they are left as they were originally. But with the franc worth 14 cents, or a depreciation of 33-1/3 per cent of its real value, does my hon. friend honestly think any business can be done with France in canned goods? Why, we are not doing any business now except to a very small extent.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the whole effect of this treaty will be to make trading with France more difficult except as to articles in which the Canadian manufacturers are specifically interested. And I am not saying that our manufacturers ought not to be considered; they ought to be; but they should not have any exclusive consideration in a matter of this kind. Nobody is helped except our manufacturers. And the stand of the hon. member for Lincoln instead of being a matter of reprobation, I again submit, Sir, ought to be heartily approved. He stands against his self interest, recognizing what this treaty does to primary and other productions, recognizing what it does in reducing the duties on and the revenues from luxuries and the like, recognizing that such reduction must be made up at the expense of the rest of us, recognizing that every single cent taken off here—and there will be a lot—simply means a little more charged elsewhere on the necessities of everyone. I repeat Mr. Speaker, that instead of being disapproved the course of the hon. member ought to be very much approved.

Mr. JOSEPH ARCHAMBAULT (Chambly and Vercheres): Mr. Speaker, in my opinion we should praise the government for their recent activities in the development of our foreign trade. Everyone will admit that an increase in the volume of this trade will help to solve the important problems that are now confronting us—emigration, immigration, the reduction of our national debt and the lightening of the burden of taxation. An increase in our foreign trade implies the revival of our industries and the exploitation as well as the further development of our natural resources. In a word, Sir, if we create or enlarge new markets it will be a great incentive to further production, whether agricultural or industrial. This government has only been in power for a little over a year, and already trade agreements have been made with France and Italy, and similar agreements are in process of negotiation with Belgium and Australia.

International trade is based on the same principle as private trade, and cannot be promoted by inactivity. You may have the best of goods to sell, but if you do not approach the consumer you will find no market. The best way to create international trade and reach the foreign consumer is by the governments of the various countries of the world making treaties, advertising their goods and employing active trade commissioners. It must be admitted, Sir, that when the government assumed office the conditions surrounding our foreign trade were chaotic. Having no commercial treaties with other countries meant instability of commercial conditions, and manufacturers and merchants were chary about engaging in foreign trade. Our importers and exporters were similarly affected. There was always the menace of a sudden change in the tariffs of other countries and this uncertainty paralyzed our foreign trade. Therefore the results of the first year's efforts of this government to stabilize our foreign commerce are in striking contrast to the nonchalant and indifferent action—or shall I say, inaction?—of the late administration.

The former Minister of Trade and Commerce, Sir George Foster, who at the time had assumed a new and pleasant responsibility, and already had delectable visions of a comfortable seat in the Red Chamber, could not attend to the proper development of our trade with foreign countries. And probably his colleagues were too busy preparing for the magnificent electoral triumph of 1921. The only effort apparently of the last administration to revive our foreign trade manifested itself in the baneful loans to Greece and Roumania. These, it is true, meant a revival of trade for certain companies of which members of parliament and even ministers were directors; but they meant also a practical loss of nearly $35,000,000 to the Dominion.

Mr. MEIGHEN: How does the hon. gentleman make that out? Does the government not intend to collect or does it not expect to collect this money?

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: We intend to collect it, but we do not say that we are sure to collect it..

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman, then. is just counting the money as lost, which is a mere guess.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: It is not a guess. It is based on facts. We have been trying to collect the loans made by the late administration. My right hon. friend did not succeed in collecting one cent of interest from Roumania. It is true that now, through the wisely directed efforts of the government we are beginning to get some interest from Greece and Roumania.

5 p.m.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Hear, hear. You will get every dollar.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I was not surprised to hear the long and undigested protest of the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Chaplin), who was well satisfied when the late administration confined its efforts to promote our foreign trade, into buying goods from the inner circles and selling them to bankrupt countries at the expense of the people of Canada.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the hon. gentleman not tell us the value of the agricultural products which were financed by those loans?

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: From the reports that were made to the House I understand that out of some $27,000,000 a little over $3,000,000 was devoted to the purchase of wheat. Most of the money was lavished on axes and saws manufactured by companies of which the hon. member for Lincoln was a director, and upon roofing and other articles of merchandise manufactured by companies of which some members of the then administration were directors.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman has no right to make any such statement. It is absolutely contrary to the truth.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Does not my hon. friend remember that I based my accusations a year ago on a return which was made by the late administration, and which showed that quite a number of members of parliament supporting the late administration, and even a minister of the Crown, were directors of companies that sold to Greece and Roumania to an amount of something like $20,000,000? My hon. friend cannot deny that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is very different from what the hon. member said. He said that most of it was that. Only a small fraction of it was that, and what was obtained by such companies was obtained in open competition just as any other company got it. My hon. friend knows that. He knows as well that similar companies in which hon. members no doubt are interested, perhaps in which they are directors, will benefit under this treaty. It is exactly the same thing. The hon. member is only trying to create a prejudice upon what he knows is a false premise.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: I am not trying to create a prejudice. I only wish to show to the House that the hon. member for Lincoln is much more particular and exacting when we are trying to make a treaty with France than he was when we were selling goods to Roumania and Greece. The hon. member first objected to the tariff on French wines, and he submitted that it was unfair to allow French wines to come in under a tax of 15 cents a gallon while Canadian wine was paying a revenue of 30 cents a gallon to this country. Well, first of all, my hon. friend forgot when he made that statement that the Minister of Finance when introducing his bill stated that on account of the treaty, re-adjustments would have to be made that would be announced in the budget speech. But there is a second answer. Coming from a province where it is a misdemeanour even to think of wine except when it is made within the province and is unpalatable, is it not amusing to hear the hon. member protest against advantages given to the importation of French wines? If I am well informed French wines cannot be sold

legally in Ontario except for religious and medicinal purposes. True, intentional ailments are very numerous, but there is hardly any consumption of Ontario wines in the other provinces, unless one is willing to take a chance of getting permanent headache.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman has no ground for that statement. It is not the fact.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Is it not a fact that there is hardly any Ontario wine sold in the other provinces?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think I can show that over half of the sales of Ontario wines is in the province of Quebec and the province of British Columbia.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: How much does it amount to?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have not the figures but I can get them. But that is the percentage; something over half is sold in these two provinces, Quebec and British Columbia.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: My point is this, that the reduction of the tariff on French wines will not interfere with the sale of the native wines of Ontario. It is admitted by everybody that a person who has been in the habit of drinking French wine will not drink Ontario wine.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I cannot dispute that.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Perhaps, but judging by the remarks of my hon. friend for Lincoln he takes the ordinary, narrow stand that because some other provinces allow their people legally to consume imported wines, he should step in and impose upon them the narrow and illogical views of his own province. So much for the hon. member for Lincoln. I am not going to go through the whole schedules like he did.

The hon. member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton) who spoke in very dramatic tones, praising, unnecessarily I may say the well known unselfishness of the hon. member for Lincoln, did not answer the unassailable argument made by the Minister of Finance, and which is the gist of the question, that in making this treaty with France we get the best possible conditions under the circumstances. By this treaty we get trade conditions with France better than the United States has.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Better?

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Better than the United States, as I shall be able to show in a few moments. Suppose this treaty is not passed. Trade conditions between Canada and France as respects the tariff would be in a much worse condition. The hon. member for West York also indulged in some reproaches regarding the platform of the Liberal party in which it was stated that we would not make any reductions on luxuries. The hon. member must remember that we are dealing with France. He must remember that we are making a trade agreement with a country, and that the agreement must therefore deal with articles produced by that country; otherwise it is useless. Everyone knows also that France produces luxuries more than any other goods, such as wines, perfume, silk and many other articles. The hon. member for West York also stated that the old treaty was better than we have now. Suppose that is true; the old treaty is dead. As my hon. friend said, the old treaty of 1907 is dead.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, it just dies when this comes into effect. This kills it.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: The treaty of 1907?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh, I thought you meant the one that went into effect in 1921.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: The old treaty was buried three years ago. Perhaps my hon. friend has not waked up to that fact yet.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What the Minister of Finance said was that the temporary treaty was dead.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: I am speaking of the treaty of 1907, and there is good reason why the present treaty may not be as advantageous as the old treaty. In 1907 France was not the high tariff country that she is now. There was no such high protection in France then, and the reason why France is more protective to-day is because she has incurred such losses during the war that she wishes now to have an increased revenue in order to recuperate.

I may have been mistaken when I said that we have better trade conditions with France under this treaty than the United States has, but I refer to the particulars of the products under this convention. The first item is horses. If the new agreement goes into effect the rate on horses from Canada will be 150 francs and on horses from the United States 225 francs.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Then it was better with the United States before, because the duty on horses is not changed?

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: It is better now.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No it was better before.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: I repeat that it is better now. The figures speak for themselves. I do not know that I need say anything further in reply to the speech of the hon. member for West York, but I wish to place before the House another aspect of the question, and it seems to me that this point should have been brought forward by some hon. members opposite if we consider the speeches they used to make five or six years ago. I submit Sir, that out of sympathy and friendliness every facility should be given to France in her tremendous task of reconstruction. It is true that we should approach the consideration of this treaty from a business point of view but, under the circumstances, that consideration should not be absolutely freed from sentiment. Let us consider what the losses and sufferings of France have been. She lost a million and a half of men killed, 750,000 crippled, and 2,000,000 dangerously wounded. She spent a tremendous sum of money in resisting the invader; and what have her losses in property been? The Germans destroyed or devastated seven of her departments, 4,000 cities and villages, 550,000 houses, a territory of 6,300 square miles whose population in 1914 was 4,700,000, 94 per cent of her woollen industries, 90 per cent of her steel works, 55 per cent of her electrical industries, 70 per cent of her sugar refineries, 35 per cent of her coal mines, 2,500 miles of her railroads, 670 miles of canals, and 450 bridges. When we consider the suffering she has undergone and the martyrdom that she has endured we should have every sympathy for her. She is the nation which has suffered most gravely during the war. She has set herself heroically to the work of rebuilding her devastated areas. When one considers all these things and also remembers that we are dealing with an ally and a friendly nation it seems to me that an element of helpfulness and of sympathy should be added to our strict sense of business in endeavouring to arrive at a proper conclusion. Moreover, this fact, also, should not be forgotten: In dealing with Canada France is dealing with a nation comprising over two and a half millions of citizens in whose veins her own blood flows, and who have sacredly preserved for her a love born of the ties of kinship, a love that will never die.

Mr. ROBERT FORKE (Brandon): Mr. Speaker, while listening to the speech of the hon. memer for Lincoln (Mr. Chaplin) yesterday afternoon, without having had an opportunity of looking into the French treaty, it seemed to me that he made out a rather serious case against the convention as it now stands. However, since then I have had some little time and opportunity to examine more carefully into the details of the treaty and to form some conclusion as to what the arrangement means. As a consequence I have altered my opinion to some extent. While article after article was mentioned that we never exported to France it really seemed as if the treaty did not amount to very much after all.

Listening to the speeches this afternoon it strikes me as very peculiar that so much effort should be made to enter into treaties and build up international trade, while all the nations of the world are devoting themselves assiduously to the erection of tariff walls to exclude that very trade. I think, perhaps, a period will come in the world's history when the inhabitants will look back to the present era and wonder how much wisdom was displayed at this time in the promotion of treaties for developing international trade.

The hon. member who has just resumed his seat remarked that international trade was just like private trade. I cannot see the question in that light. I never saw people who wanted to do private trade endeavouring to construct obstacles for the purpose of hindering it. The same may be said of international agreements for the promotion of commerce. Seemingly nations are engaged in building tariff walls with the object of hampering trade with other nations as much as they possibly can.

The ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) made what I call a high protection speech. He came out very plainly and disclosed where he himself stands at the present time in regard to tariff matters. One of his main arguments was that if we had a policy of really high protection then we would have a weapon in our hands which would be of value to us when we came to bargain in trade matters with other nations. I do not place very much reliance on that sort of argument. If that is the only reason why we should have a high protective tariff then I think we might just as well leave the matter alone.

The argument has been made that the present treaty is not as good as the one previously arranged. I do not think that is a very strong argument to put forward at the present time. The two ministers of the present government who negotiated the present treaty may have found obstacles in their way which prevented them from concluding an arrangement as favourable as the one it replaces. The French government, in

its wisdom, has seen fit to increase its tariff, and has acted within its rights in so doing. Of course, Canada had to make the very best bargain possible under the circumstances. The French general tariff is not very much higher than the one which will be operative under this treaty, but it seems to me that it is advisable for us to have a treaty with France.

Looking over the list of articles that we have exported for some time past, I find that the chief items have been lard, lobsters, wheat and wheat products, oats and oatmeal, table fruits, sugar, wood and manufactures of wood, and smelts. On all these articles there is practically no change in the tariff. Another product that we export is canned salmon. We export a large amount of canned salmon and there has been some increase in the duty. However, there is not much change in the duties on the main articles that we export to France, and it is quite possible that in the future there may be some increase in our exports.

On the whole I do not believe that this treaty is one of supreme importance to Canada. However I take the ground that it is well that we should have a treaty, and that it should be just as favourable a treaty with France as it is possible to get. But we know the circumstances. I do not believe the Dominion of Canada and France are ever likely to have what may be called a treaty that will be of tremendous advantage to Canada, because the articles we are likely to import from France are largely articles of luxury, which, perhaps, I would be in favour of taxing pretty highly before allowing them to come into our daily consumption. I think perhaps the most important part in the whole treaty is the fact that Canada is placed on an equality with the United States in regard to her imports into the republic of France. It seems to me, in looking over the list of the old treaty, that on a great many articles the United States had a more favourable rate than Canada. That feature has been entirely removed and to-day we occupy just as favourable a position in that respect as the United States. This matter is intricate in many of its details, and yet, in looking over the treaty carefully, I do not believe it is of very great importance after all, other than that it is desirable that Canada should have friendly relations with France as far as possible, that we ought to have a treaty to understand just in what position we are placed, and that we should be placed in the most favourable position we can possibly occupy in our relations with that country. I have no doubt the minister made the best possible bargain. I do not say it is a splendid bargain. I do not think it is. I really do not think we have got very much that will prove to be of any great benefit to us as a dominion. However, I intend to support and vote for the treaty.

Before concluding I would like to compliment the Minister of Finance on his virility and the way in which he has presented this matter. I am sure we are all pleased to see him able to take care of himself and to defend what he has been doing in so able a manner.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): I join gladly in the last words of the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Forke). I am not certain that I will be able to agree with him in any other sentence he uttered. The minister's defence did not fail in vigour or in point of ingenuity. The minister was at his best in selecting the unimportant and magnifying it into great consequence, particularly when he had something at hand that reflected upon it, and then proceeding to its destruction with animation, with some threatenings of attitude, but with meagre success. The minister's favourite habit of argument is to state his opponent's case not only in language but in substance to suit himself, very often wholly at variance with the realities of the case, but in such form that his powers of abuse and of ridicule may be exercised against his opponent.

Mr. FIELDING: Abuse?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, abuse. If I may depart from the subject in hand, I could give an illustration very recent indeed, and I can produce the absolute proof for what I say. The minister went into the constituency of North Essex and proceeded to reply to certain arguments that he stated I had used in an address in the town of Walkerville. He stated that I had made an attack upon a reduction of $3,000,000 in the estimates of the Department of Soldiers Civil Re-establishment, that I had declared that this was done at the expense of the widows and orphans, and he held me up to ridicule as one who could not be relied upon at all, because as he stated, he knew I was intelligent enough to understand that the Department of Soldiers Civil Re-establishment did not deal with widows and orphans. I knew he added that reduction was merely due to contraction of responsibilities consequent on getting further away from the war. But he portrayed me before his audience as a misrepresenter of the truth, willing to take an advantage not based on facts. His work of destruction was well done. Give him a

wind-mill to his liking and he is able to tilt against it with wonderful display. The fact was that I had stated exactly the opposite of what the hon. minister said. He took his account in that case from a Globe report, written by some one who never was at the meeting at all. What I stated was reported verbatim, and there was no variation in the matter of the reports of the press representatives. I had stated in answer to a question from the audience that there was a reduction of $3,000,000, and that I would do full justice to the government. I stated there was probably reason for the reduction, because we were getting further from the war and the responsibilities were less and I made no criticism of it whatever. This is all reported in the paper that is published in the city of Windsor in the clearest language and was at the disposal of the minister. But the correct report would not have suited his powers of destructive argument. He went further. He stated that I had attacked the administration of pensions and the Pensions Board. This he drew from his own imagination. I did not criticize the administration of pensions and never mentioned the Pensions Board. I give these instances as illustrations of the habit the minister has, which I do not think he wholly got away from in his address this afternoon. They have nothing to do with the case.

Mr. FIELDING: Hear, hear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes and the minister is glad to get rid of this exposure, but he was very glad to use that style of argument in the county of Essex and again to-day. I do not think it befitted the minister, or the post he fills.

Now as respects the French treaty, I do not at all dispute the sincerity of the position taken by the hon. member for Brandon. I think though he has come to his decision a little hurriedly, If I am to regard myself only as the leader of a party opposed to his, I would not want anything better than that his party should support this treaty. He seems to think it does not make very much difference about the treaty anyway. It is not a matter he says of very great consequence, and we should support it, because, the minister did the very best he could. Now let us inquire into that position. In the first place, the treaty means a loss of $500,000 a year to the revenue of Canada and that is $500,000 collected off the users of luxuries. Let us not forget that. I think $500,000 is a minimum figure, and that time will show that it is much too low, but using the figure, and placing the loss of revenue paid by those who consume conspicuous and undoubted luxuries at $500,000, is it of no consequence to Canada? That $500,000, now has to be paid out of the pockets of the great mass of the people of Canada using the necessaries of life. There is the loss on the consumption of luxuries imported not only from France, but imported in far greater quantities in many important instances, from Switzerland, Japan, from Sweden, the Netherlands, and from, I think, in all, eleven favoured nation countries.

Switzerland, Japan, Belgium and the Netherlands, are some of the countries which now have the right to come with their goods into this country under a tax the same as in the French treaty. Wait until all this works out, and we shall see our $500,000 loss in all probability much magnified. That will inevitably be an added tax or a failure to reduce taxes on the consumers of necessities in this Dominion. I submit in the first place, in no strong language, this suggestion: It is surely incumbent upon us, before we make that sacrifice, to see that we are getting something worth while.

I want to examine the member's second argument. He says, "Well, the minister did the best he could, and we had better take it at that or France will do something still worse to us if we do not submit to her terms in respect of this treaty now, pay what we are paying and impose the tax we are imposing on the consumers of necessities of life in Canada." Why should Canada be in this position? Is it necessary that Canada should be in the position where she has to go over to any country, go over to France, and make a treaty admittedly worse than were conditions that obtained before, just for fear France would raise her tariff? Have we reflected on why it is we are in such a position? Is Canada going to be always in such a position? I suppose, a year or so from now, if France gives notice that this treaty does not suit her, the minister will go over again and France will say, "Now look here, if you do not make a treaty and raise duties on meat exports again, on vegetable exports again, on stock and farm products again—if you do not come across and submit to these terms, we will put the duties on those goods far higher still." The minister will go over and do this, and he will come back and say: "This is the best I can do. If I had not done it, you would have a worse duty still." Is Canada to be continually in that humiliating and helpless position? Let us reflect why she is in it to-day and see where the blame lies. I do not think hon. members of any branch of this House want this country to be in such a

position continuously. Assuming that we do not, what is the reason that the minister was in it? The minister was in it just because of his own fault, just because of his own election commitments in this Dominion, just because of his own professions and just because of his own failure in office. Those are the only reasons. He was not in it because of any natural conditions of trade. Trade conditions were quite the reverse. French trade with Canada is of more value to France than Canadian trade to France is of value to Canada. Their exports to us are about $13,000,000, while our exports to them are about $8,000,000. In that fact, a natural condition of trade, the minister had an advantage. Where he was at a disadvantage was his own fault. He left this country in such shape that he was handicapped in negotiations. Why was he? He was handicapped because he had gone up and down this Dominion for months making pledges of tariff reductions here, there and everywhere, a general reduction all round, and the French statesmen knew that. Certainly they knew in France that he had been a party, although he denies this now, to tariff commitments at a convention, commitments which, if they were carried out, would be of great advantage to France, and that, whatever else might be said about the party to which he belongs, there at least was a general commitment of the majority of them for tariff revision downwards. Thus the French people knew that no matter what they threatened, the hands of this government were tied; they could not do anything. Their hands were tied by engagements which they made in order to lure the people of Canada into voting for them, commitments made to get alliances and to get into power. These commitments no one knows better than the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) as he sits in front of me, were against the interests of this country. We should not be tied to general, sweeping commitments of that sort. I do not favour any high tariff and I never did. The minister does not contradict me now. Why? A year and a half ago he was calling me a high protectionist; he was crying out to get into office to reduce the "high protectionist" tariff of the late government; but he comes here now to make out a case on this treaty and he says: "We have been a low protectionist or a low tariff country all along." Under those circumstances he never should have made the commitments he did to revise our tariff lower still and in so doing he stripped from his hand every weapon that he could have had to negotiate with the statesmen of France.

But his fault does not end there. He knew last session that negotiations with France were going to be necessary and that France under this treaty was entitled to negotiate. She was not entitled to any treaty with us if she was not prepared to give us a fair tariff as regards articles that we export. Under those circumstances we were not bound to make a treaty with her; we were only in honour bound to negotiate for a treaty, and we were to be the judges whether or not the offer was fair. The minister knowing that and knowing the general inclination of the French tariff upward should, before he went over to France, have placed, not the general tariff of Canada, but our tariff on luxuries, higher than it was. If he had done so, he would then have been in a position where he would not have had to bring back this abject surrender of our fiscal position to France. Our tariff on luxuries was then a comparatively low tariff for luxuries. He left it where it was. They had raised their general tariff, and he went over in that position and he did so, not because he did not think it would be in our interest to raise our tariff on luxuries under those conditions; he did it, because he had not the courage to come to this House last session in the face of his commitments, and propose any addition at all to the tariff. That is why we are in the position we are in to-day. Those are the two principal factors, the two principal faults that placed the minister in the position in which he was. I ask again: Do hon. members really think this country must continuously be in the position that France or any other nation can hold the big stick over our heads and say: "Here, though we sell you $13,000,000 worth of goods now and we buy only $8,000,000 from you, if you do not join with us to raise our tariff on stock, meats, poultry, vegetables, butter and various things which really count, chiefly agricultural products, and if you will not at the same time agree to lower yours on what we sell you, all right, we will do worse still. We will raise our tariff four times as high and you will have to stand for it all." I want to put the situation before hon. members and to ask those who have thought out this tariff subject; if you admit that we are in that position, do you think this country ought to be continuously there?. Do hon. members opposite think we should be? There is surely a tariff lesson to be learned from reflection on the experience of the Minister of Finance in France. I do not think the treaty is in our interests at all.

I said last night that the minister had now negotiated and obtained a higher tariff against us on the goods we sell, or can sell,

than existed when he went over. He managed to come back with a higher French tariff against us and a much lower Canadian tariff against France. I do not think the minister is an unintelligent man by any means so far as tariff matters are concerned. It was not his will that such a folly as this be perpetrated; it was simply through his fault that he had to do it. It was because of the campaign he had conducted and the commitments he had made, and because of his failure last session to have the courage to do what was in the interests of the Dominion. I do not think the minister would refuse to admit right now that under this tariff we are not in as good a condition to trade with France as we were under the temporary tariff that he has put out of effect. Where the items are lower they are trifling; they relate merely to fanciful exports from Canada in almost every case, and in those cases where they are not such, the export is so small and the possibility so negligible that it does not weigh at all as against the price which the minister has paid in relation not only to the revenue of this Dominion but to the interests of the agricultural producers of this country.

I shall now make a short reference to the minister's reply to the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Chaplin). I do not think that I have ever seen the minister more heated in the House than he was in his reply to the hon. member. Why was he so heated? The hon. member for Lincoln had certainly made no provocative speech. His speech was merely a statement of figures from beginning to end, a statement of the conditions of our trade and the exact operation of the treaty upon those conditions. I think, however, what stirred the minister was the revelation which the hon. member made of the inherent weakness of his performance. The minister seized upon one alleged error in regard to which the hon. member for Lincoln was not in the least to blame at all, even if he was wrong; and I doubt to this moment that he was wrong. The member for Lincoln said that, among other things,—and this is only one, out of over a hundred cases he brought forward, this government had got the admission of bronze powders into France at a lower rate than before; and the hon. member pointed out that we did not export this article but on the contrary imported it. He said that he had bought it himself for forty years and had always had to import it; while the trade returns published by this government, over the signature of a minister of the same government, indicated that we exported no bronze powders. The article appears in the trade returns. The trade returns at page 248 show that we imported $46,000 worth last year of this article, while there are no bronze powders in the export list at all. It may be this statement is an error, although I do not think that I have ever found the trade returns in error before. But if there is an error, well, I am not so trivial as to attribute it to the Minister of Customs (Mr. Bureau), whose signature appears as authority for these trade returns. But such was the kind of argument the minister indulged in; he snapped back to the member for Lincoln the retort that if it did not appear in the trade returns it was the fault of the government which that hon. member supported. What does the minister mean by an answer of that kind? The trade returns are prepared by the officials.

Mr. FIELDING: The hon. member was saying that the matter was not to be found in the trade returns, to which I correctly replied that these trade returns were prepared by our predecessors. I found no fault with the returns, but when the hon. gentleman stated as a fact that something was not to be found in them I had the right to inform him that we had not prepared the returns.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Well, for that matter, the present government did prepare the returns. They could not have been prepared until the year was out, and the year did not expire until the 31st of March, 1922, when they had been in office three months. The trade returns would be prepared on the year's results and besides they are signed by the present Minister of Customs. I know that the first part of the work would be for a period before the minister took office, but the compilation would nevertheless be under the direction of the present Minister of Customs, who had been in office three months before the year expired. But if there was an error it would obviously be childishness for me to attribute it to the Minister of Customs or to any other member of the government; the fault would not be any minister's, no matter what government was in office. Now, here are these official returns showing no exports of this article, while they show imports amounting to $46,000; and the minister triumphantly presents a telegram, contradicting the trade returns of his government.

Mr. FIELDING: The point was this. It was alleged that this article was not made in Canada, whereas the telegram which I read

to-day, and for which I am no more responsible than anyone else, simply stated that it was made here.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I quite agree; but—

Mr. ROBB: I wonder if the leader of the Opposition would take my word for it. I live in Valleyfield and I know the Canadian bronze powder industry carried on there. I was mayor of Valleyfield when it was established there and I know that that industry exported millions of dollars' worth of bronze powder to the British Admiralty during the war.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not know whether the article is exported or not, but every member of this House has a right to rely on the trade returns; and it would have come with better grace from the minister, if he found a telegram which contradicted the trade returns, simply to have stated the fact. The hon. member for Lincoln was quite justified in using the returns. It is just possible that the bronze powders which the minister referred to are known as something else in our trade returns, and may not indeed come in under this treaty at all. I fancy that if that is not likely it is at least possible; and I venture to suggest that it is not unlikely. But of bronze powders, as known in the trade returns, we have no exports shown; we have imports. I should think that in relation to an article which we have to buy from outside to the amount of $46,000 a year, it would not be necessary for an operator in Canada to look for it in a market across the ocean if he could get it in his own country. It may be that it is the same article, and it may be, on the other hand, that it is a different article. But in any event, whatever it is, it is one selected out of a hundred or two hundred and presented by the hon. member for Lincoln, who was absolutely right in his facts based upon the trade returns of Canada. I do not see therefore that there was much excuse for applause and noisy ecstasies as of victory won because somebody sent a telegram conflicting with the trade returns. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think it is with the consent of the whips that I move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. FIELDING: With a view to resuming this evening?

Mr. MEIGHEN: That was not the understanding; but I do not wish to adjourn the debate unless the whips agree.

Mr. FIELDING: I did not think there was any arrangement with the whips.

Mr. BOYS: I think my right hon. friend must have misunderstood me. No doubt that arrangement was made, but I went and told him that it had to be changed. My hon. friend must have overlooked what I said.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is right; the whip so informed me, but I understood that he was going back to discuss the matter further.

Mr. FIELDING: Would my hon. friend prefer to adjourn the debate, to resume some other time?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, but I do not wish to do so if there is any objection.

Mr. FIELDING: If the hon. gentleman desires it I offer no objection.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

SUPPLY

SOLDIERS' LAND SETTLEMENT

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Marcil in the chair.

Soldiers' Land Settlement—advances to soldiers settling upon the land, and cost of administering the Soldier Settlement Act, including salaries, $8,400,000.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): What are the salaries paid to the members of the board administering the act?

Hon. CHARLES A. STEWART (Argenteuil), (Minister of the Interior): With the exception of field supervision, which is a separate item, the amount required to pay the salaries of the staff is $500,000.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): What does the chairman of the board receive?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The chairman receives $7,000 and the other members of the board $5,000.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Is the position of chairman of the board more important than that of deputy minister? What reason can the minister give for his salary being $7,000?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): These were the salaries when I took charge. I have not changed them at all. The work is pretty much the same, although perhaps not so much is being done, but no changes have been made in these salaries since I took charge.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Owing to the natural contraction of the work, because there are really very, very few being placed now, if any, cer-

tainly very few as compared with those before, is the minister effecting a corresponding reduction in the expenditure?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): There is a reduction in the expenditure.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is it corresponding?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): For purposes of comparison it might be well for me to give the figures for the last three years. The general office expense, including travelling expenses of inspectors and appraisers for 1921-1922 was $285,777.23; 1922-23, $200,700; for 1923-1924 estimated $180,000, Salaries exclusive of agricultural supervision for 1921-1922, $823,189.26; 1922-23, $711,600; 1923-1924, estimated $500,000. Legal expenses and disbursements, 1921-1922, $37,220.23; 1922-1923, $28,000; 1923-1924, estimated $20,000. Printing and stationery, 1921-1922, $32,022.88; 1922-1923, $27,300; 1923-1924, estimated $20,000. Advertising, 1921-1922, $5,190.39; 1922-1923, $3,600; 1923-1924, estimated $3,000. Miscellaneous, 1921-1922, $2,418.55; 1922-1923, $7,600; 1923-1924, estimated $5,000; making totals of expenditure for the three years respectively $1,185,818.54, $978,800, and $728,000. The figures for agricultural expenditure—will the totals satisfy my hon. friend?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think so now.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Agricultural expenditure including salaries, travelling expenses, motor car accessories, and home branch courses, for 1921-1922, $869,525.45; for 1922-1923, $695,900; for 1923-1924, estimated $672,-000. Now I will give the totals of all these items; 1921-1922, $2,055,343.99; 1922-1923, $1,674,700; and for 1923-1924, estimated $1,400,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The reduction is far from a corresponding reduction. The number of soldiers now being placed on the land is relatively negligible, but the cost is keeping up pretty well. Of course, I admit that in respect to the supervision work that would not be expected to contract very much. The minister's figures show a very small diminution from last year and the year before, but I would not criticize that. I would think that only a small diminution could be made, but I really think that as to the rest, the amount of machinery and the expenditure of the organization is away beyond the actual work being performed. It would seem to me that way. Could I get these particulars, for example? The minister gave the figures for legal costs. They seem to be keeping up magnificently. Could the minister tell us how many loans were made on land in 1922-1923, and the cost per loan, also how many were made on land, say, in the year 1919-1920, and the cost per loan? I was in charge at that time, and I know we made very stringent rules as to legal costs.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The explanation that I get for the legal fees is that this seems to be a sort of continuing business; that is it is not cleaned up in the years in which the men are established but goes on from year to year. I am informed that some of the legal business even of 1919 is still unfinished in that respect.

In answer to my right hon. friend's criticism as to reductions in the staff I may say that one could expect that there would be a reasonable reduction in the inside staff. In so far as the outside inspection is concerned, however, I am rather of the opinion that until these settlers are firmly established they will require supervision. It would not be good business because of the mere fact that you are not settling very many men to reduce the field inspectors or the officers who are supervising the work of these men.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I admit that.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I think that is the strongest feature of the whole scheme. Indeed, I would go as far as to say that if these men were withdrawn we would perhaps have a great many more salvage cases than we otherwise would have. On the other hand, in making inquiry from the board with respect to the probable cost of carrying on the soldier settlement work—that is provided we could reduce the field staff, the agricultural staff, or the inspectional staff almost to a minimum—I am informed that the cost of collections and of the general work of the staff necessary to carry on the salvage work, and of their salaries, will amount to a very considerable sum. In all probability it will take more than half a million dollars annually to carry it along. That may seem to be rather a large figure for that kind of work, but there is not any doubt that a very large amount of salvage work is required in connection with carrying out this scheme. That is very evident now, although an adjustment last year has had the effect of reducing it very materially. I think I have the figures in that connection. I do not think, however, it will be possible to make a success of this work by making a very serious reduction in the inspectional staff, or a reduction beyond a reasonable number for the carrying out of the scheme in its entirety until such times, at least, as these men have more than half

paid up the loans they received from the government.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In what I said before I admitted what the minister had said that the supervisory work—which, as he well remarks is one of the best features of the whole plan—cannot be contracted proportionately at all to the contraction of the placing of men. Indeed, I do not think it can be done very rapidly at all. I fancy that it would be bad policy to look for a rapid reduction in the staff of professors, collectors, and instructors, but what I had reference to were other expenses. For example, I could not understand why now—as against two or three years ago when we were placing at the rate of 10,000 men a year on the land and the legal expenses were under some $30,000—when we are placing almost none those expenses still keep up to about $20,000. That did not seem reasonable to me. The minister is informed that the legal fees drag on. Well, they will if they are allowed to. For the life of me I do not know why they should.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is the bad feature of the legal business.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, and there is need for control by a strong hand. As to the loans that were made in 1919-20 there would not be a loan made until the title was passed. It is true that the matter might drag until this year but it would not be in the 1919-20 loans; it would be in the loans this year. The loans would not be made until the title was passed. There might be cause why the title could not be passed and it might drag on to this year, but that would not be counted in the loans for 1919-20. I think we had a comparison of the cost per loan in 1919-20. We had it figured out and it was all, I think, given to the House; it was very low indeed. I would like to see if it is the same for last year, when probably another class of lawyers got in and handled the soldier settlement work.

While I am on my feet I wish to express gratification at the results considering all the conditions under which this work has been conducted. The whole soldier settlement scheme encountered just about as heavy obstacles as any plan ever launched by the administration encountered. No one, who was not through it, can realize fully the pressure that was brought upon the government after the return of those hundreds of thousands of men—pressure for one form of enterprise one day, another form of enterprise the next; very heavy pressure for entering upon a scheme of land purchase and loans for the purpose of colonizing the returned soldiers. It was indeed a dangerous enterprise; there was risk at every corner. I do not think any government launched anything in which it was more difficult to select sound and true lines in order to avoid error—I had almost said at a thousand points—in entering upon that work. It encountered a diminution in land values. That is, perhaps, the biggest obstacle the work has faced. Well, it has gone through that. Concessions had to be made because of that—concessions made a year ago which I think were right. They were very simple; they merely meant a grant out of the treasury, that was all; it was not a very great one. But when we consider that obstacle, when we consider as well, and associated with it, the lowering of farm prices not accompanied by any lowering of farm costs proportionately—when we consider that while the soldier settlement scheme, a new scheme, has to be made to go while farming, in general becomes more and more a matter of standing still, of loss rather than of gain, and that through it all this scheme survives to a very satisfactory degree of success, I think it indeed reflects credit on those who worked it out; and I am not saying this without mentioning the man who chiefly did it. The loans were mainly devised by Dr. Black, now the minister's deputy for the Department of Immigration; and the soundness of the policies adopted, the various safeguards instituted, and the strong features that have saved it through these very difficult years, are attributable to the good judgment of Dr. Black. Now, I merely say that had the years been even years—that is to say had conditions been normal; when we put in the work we could not wait, we had to do it then, there was no option on our part—had they remained the same in the matter of land value, in the matter of farm sale prices, and farm purchase prices, then unquestionably the whole soldier settlement organization to-day, and the men who have been placed on land under it, would be a very pronounced success. At the present time I think it can be said that the soldier farmer, taking all things into consideration, is in a better position relative to that in which he was when he started than the other farmer relative to the position he was in at the same time. I do not think there is any dispute about that. Consequently the scheme has been a success, and if we have an improvement in time, which I look for myself, then the whole advantage that this country has any right to expect will be harvested. I only hope I can get the figures of the cost, because I would like to be sure that it is being run on the same economic

principle and being watched as carefully as it was some years ago.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): With regard to the legal part, I think perhaps my hon. friend is expecting too much of a reduction in the legal costs, owing to the fact that we were not establishing as many men as we were in the years he speaks of. The legal officers are on salary. This applies to Ontario, Quebec and the eastern provinces, but not to the West, and there is a considerable amount of salvage. True there is perhaps not a great amount of legal fees involved in the matter, still there are bound to be more or less legal costs, and the board must protect themselves against any action that might be taken against them for various causes. I can only assure my hon. friend that we will exercise the utmost caution in connection with these fees that are paid to solicitors. The chairman informs me that exactly the same fees are being paid as were paid formerly.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The same scale?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes, same scale.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have every confidence in the chairman. He has been a lawyer himself, and could not be imposed on unless he comes under the malign influences of party favoritism.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Having had considerable experience in farming, I am not unmindful of the fact that in establishing a soldier upon the land, making the loans that have been made and will no doubt be made in the future, considerable care will have to be exercised to keep out of difficulty, and I am of the opinion that due care should be exercised in connection with every loan made, as well as due care exercised when salvage cases occur, and they are occurring to a considerable extent. But I will tell my hon. friend that I do not want to be criticized by him, and I am willing to give him and the Conservative party full credit for instituting the establishment of the soldiers upon the land. I do not want to interfere in any way with the scheme, and I wish to assure him that I think the board to a man would be prepared to say that in no way have I myself interfered, or permitted anyone else to interfere, with the settlement of a single man or made any suggestion in regard to it. I have not interfered in any way. I have simply allowed the board to carry on as they have been doing in the past. In other words, I have left it entirely to the discretion of the board in dealing with these cases.

Mr. HANSON: Who selects the legal men in the various provinces?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The Justice department I am told have made those appointments and that has been the rule, but the fees that are paid are taxed by the members of the Soldiers' Settlement Board, and adjustments made if necesary.

Mr. HANSON: Then the patronage system is still in force in this department, as in other departments?

Mr. GRAHAM: Being continued.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I have no knowledge of any change, if it was patronage. I wish to assure my hon. friend that I did not know there was any change, and I do not know of any change in the method of selection.

Mr. MANION: I was very pleased to hear the minister state the policy has not been changed in any shape or form. That is a compliment to my right hon. leader who really originated the scheme, or, at least, as minister put it into effect. I should like to have the minister make some statement as to the general condition of the soldiers now on the land. When the question was before the House last year we discussed the conditions at some length. I well remember that the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Speakman) described the very serious condition of men in the prairie provinces who were put on the land, and I think it might be well for the minister to give us some idea of the number of men now on the land, as compared with, say, a couple of years ago, and as to their general conditions of prosperity or the reverse, because I am sure not only the House but the country generally is interested in the question of the soldier settlement scheme as a whole.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I, perhaps, cannot answer my hon. friend any better than to give him the comparative statement of the financial condition as it appears by our returns. I will be unable to give my hon. friend a statement as to the actual conditions on the land in comparison with a year ago or two years ago.

Mr. MANION: The minister can tell the condition by the number who wish to get out of the contract which they made. In that way we will be able to get a very good idea as to how they are doing.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I will give my hon. friend the report of salvages but I wanted first to give the collections because they are a pretty fair indication of how the

men are progressing. The date of last year's report is April 14th, 1922, and this statement I have before me is from October to April in both years. I am quoting this year's report as against that of last year. Last year the collection was $1,537,158.88 or 37.7 per cent of the amount due. This year, 1923, for the same period, the total is $1,662,778.99, or 55.6 per cent of the amount due. Therefore we have an increase of 37.7 per cent to 55.6 per cent for the same period, which is the heavy collection period.

Mr. MANION: I would take it that, from the financial statement the minister would probably say that conditions of men on the land are improving. Is that not correct?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes. Still, if you take certain areas in Canada, for instance the northern portion of Alberta, while that was fairly prosperous last year, their returns do not show up as well. But the totals, taking Canada as a whole, show that conditions are improving. This is a statement of the totals. No doubt hon. gentlemen will say that the statement does not show up as well as the statement of last year; but as a matter of fact, that is the complete statement.

Mr. BANCROFT: Will the reductions in payments this year make some difference in those percentages?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes, that is true.

Mr. MILLAR: It must be remembered that, as was to be expected, some returned soldiers were placed on land where they could not succeed, but not through any fault of their own. Take those soldiers and others who had a better chance and who still did not succeed, that is all the class of salvaged soldiers. After they have left their land, what is the policy of the government as regards the debt? I find some of these returned soldiers, after they have been salvaged, are in fear and trembling lest when they start to work elsewhere, their salaries or wages will be garnisheed. I find it is in the contract that they are liable; but in talking with some of the officials of the department, I have heard them say that this debt could not be collected. If it cannot be collected, would it not be wise to cancel the debt entirely and thus free those men from that fear?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The chairman assures me that no man has been pressed for the deficit that may in some cases accrue. In most of the cases upon which I pass, or where salvage has taken place and the resale of the property has been completed, there is sufficient to cover all the advances made by the board. But there are, of course, and will be a large number of instances in which that will not be the case, in which even after salvage has taken place, the individual will still be a debtor to the government. I would not like to say that in cases where fraud has taken place, we would not pursue; but speaking personally, I would not want to pursue a man who had done his best, but who had made a failure. I do not think that would be a proper thing to do.

Mr. MILLAR: Could the minister say positively that in no case any of this debt had been repaid by such returned soldiers? I am not positive; but I think I have heard of at least one case where some part of this debt has been repaid. Again, can we take it from the minister that in every case where a returned soldier has tried to do his best, it will be the policy from now on that he will not be pursued for a return of that debt?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I presume, as long as a man is liable, the act would make it possible to endeavour to collect, if he were able to pay and if it were wise to endeavour to collect. I am simply making the statement personally that unless a man deliberately committed a fraud, if he had made an honest effort and had made a failure, I think it would be very unwise to pursue him for a debt he might owe in that connection.

Mr. LEWIS: I should like to ask the minister a question regarding the authority of the supervisors in certain connections. What are the instructions as regards possessing or repossessing a crop? The reason I am asking this question is because certain supervisors have been in my district, for instance, and they have been dictating to these men what debts they shall contract in regard to living. Moreover, I find that on certain farms, they actually possess practically the whole of the crop, with the direct result that these men are not able to pay any store bills. In my particular district, there are three or four returned soldiers who have incurred debts to the local stores, and when they have gone to pay them, they have found that the Soldiers' Settlement Board have taken all the crop and that they cannot pay these debts. The result is that these men are simply getting off the land, not because they feel that they cannot make it pay, but because it is impossible for them to get any more goods at the local stores.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I had the same opinion as my hon. friend that, perhaps, there was over-supervision; but one must remember that pretty generous loans were made to these men. I will say very frankly, I think too generous loans were made. That, however, was the judgment of the people who were in charge at that time. I am not criticizing that; but I am saying that this increases the responsibilities and it naturally must increase the supervision, because if a man is lent, say, $5,000 or in that vicinity, I mean his total loan, on a quarter section of land, I think a farmer would call that a rather risky loan. Therefore, supervision must play a very important part. That is why I say I think it is important that supervision should continue; and if it appears at times to be of a character that is burdensome, interfering too much even in the home life of the settler, perhaps, after all, in many cases this is for his good. Instructions, however, are given to the inspectors to use their best judgment. The board inform me that they have had a good many men pass through their hands, and they have now after their experience chosen the men who have shown the better judgment and discretion in dealing with matters of this kind. I have heard the statement made that a settler could not sell a pig; that he could do nothing without the consent of the inspector. We must bear in mind that where a considerable amount of risk is involved in a loan, fairly rigid supervision is necessary.

Mr. LEWIS: I am not objecting to the fairly rigid supervision; but if the supervisor comes and takes all a settler has, you simply force the man out of existence, so that he cannot remain on the land. I can give two instances in my district where they took everything, when a man had incurred a debt of three or four hundred dollars. I am informed this year from home that the man has removed from the land simply because he cannot live.

Mr. STEWART: (Argenteuil): It must be remembered that there are 22,000 loans. I do not wish it to be understood that I hold any brief for the inspectors. I would rather encourage reasonable judgment being exercised in connection with all these matters; but undoubtedly there will still be men whom it will be impossible to continue who perhaps are disregarding every advice given by the inspectors, and who find themselves in a serious condition which jeopardizes the loan as well.

Mr. LEWIS: Of course I would say that the crop in that district was not a heavy one, and the total crop would possibly not more than pay the interest.

Miss MACPHAIL: I think I have heard from possibly 400 or 450 of the soldier land settlers in Ontario. Of that vast number I do not think there were more than half a dozen who had any criticism at all to offer concerning the Soldiers' Settlement Board or the work of supervision. It has indeed been very pleasing and encouraging to hear the very hearty approval of the supervisors which the soldiers and their wives in many cases have expressed. While some did say that they rather chafed under the supervision, they felt that the government were only doing what they must do in view of the large amount of money that has been put up, sometimes without any very great security.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I should like to know whether the conditions portrayed by the member for Swift Current (Mr. Lewis) prevail to any extent now in regard to the settlers who are unable to pay their store bills. We know that this condition prevailed very largely two years ago, but that was precisely one of the disadvantges which we had hoped to meet by the amendments passed last session when we took the accrued interest and subsidiary loans and consolidated them afresh in a new loan, thus relieving the men of immediate payments. I do not think that the condition the hon. member refers to can be widespread at the present time, because there is practically nothing new save the small first payments. This condition must be considerably relieved since last year.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Soldiers are only human, like other people in Canada, and there will always be individuals among them who will be improvident, get into debt and run up heavy bills, always of course against the advice of the supervisors. There can be no question about that, and that is one of the things which the supervisors endeavour to keep the settlers from doing. Perhaps they persist in doing it, however, and when adjustment day comes it is quite likely that they feel they are being hardly used. I can quite understand that; but in answer to my hon. friend I would say that so far as I know the condition mentioned has been reduced to the minimum.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is the minister doing any advertising now for the board?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): We have almost ceased to advertise; I believe we are advertising in the veteran papers only.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have no particular objection to advertising, but I might observe that we did cease it altogether some years ago, because there seemed no need for it; the facts and all the features of the policy were known. What was done years ago was to put in the Veteran and other papers—very few—a mere succinct statement of what the law provided in order that fit men might apply to come in and benefit thereby. But we stopped advertising. The minister, however, revived it, and the reason I became a little doubtful as to what influences were at work was the character of the advertising that he had adopted. It was indeed a remarkable advertisement I saw in one of the papers in which he advertises; this particular advertisement was not of the nature of those inserted when the work was first started, namely, a mere statement of the facts. This was the character of it. In the middle of the page was a letter from a veteran telling how much better things were now; he did not have as much to pay this year on account of the legislation of last session, which he used special language to describe; consequently, he was thoroughly well satisfied. Then an explanation was given, at the bottom, of what had brought all this about; it was all due to last session's legislation of the present government. In a word, the minister was spending public money to insert a political advertisement, for it was nothing more, because it had nothing whatever to do with the work of the Soldiers' Settlement Board. The advertisement was in a veteran paper which I have filed. There is no question about it; I remember it distinctly, for I was astonished at the character of the advertisement the minister was sending out. It was merely a method of using public money to give political éclat to the government.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Let me assure my hon. friend that this is the first intimation I have had of the letter in question: I did not see it. There has been no increase in advertising in the veteran newspapers or elsewhere. The advertising never ceased; it is just the same as when my right hon. friend had charge of the organization.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): That is the information I get from the chairman of the board. However, suffice it to say that I have never interfered with the advertising. I want my hon. friend to understand that it is my desire to have this work carried on just as he started it; I want to carry it out in every detail just as the hon. gentleman originated it. I want to carry it on as economically as I can, and when the time comes that we should curtail expenditure with respect to it I shall be glad to do so. I do not, however, want to be criticized for having interjected into the scheme anything that might interfere with its success; and I have never done so. I have every confidence in the board and I never suggested any advertisement to them. I never knew of this particular advertisement, never solicited it and will not do anything of the kind at any time. I want to give the scheme every chance to succeed, and I can assure my hon. friend that I have no desire to take any political kudos out of it. The hon. gentleman is welcome to it all.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I was not seeking any credit whatever in the matter. I accept the minister's word that he did not father the advertisement, but I am curious to know who did. There must be someone who is attending to that phase of the operations. The minister is wrong, though, when he says that he is merely continuing what we did in respect of advertising. I cannot say what took place after I left office, but I am quite sure from memory that we ceased advertising. That, however, is not what I object to, if the minister feels that some good can be done by merely letting the returned soldier know what is available for him. If he thinks that advertising of that character should be revived, very good; and the veteran papers would be the ones to use. But I certainly do know that to utilise advertising space at the public expense for the character of advertisement I saw is wrong, no matter who is responsible for it. I take the minister's word that he is not.

Mr. KNOX: I rise to add my word of commendation to what was said by the hon. member for Southeast Grey (Miss Macphail). I have been keeping close watch on the operations of the soldier land settlement scheme ever since its inception and I can heartily commend the working out of the operations of the board so far as I have observed them. I do not view this matter from the political standpoint at all, nor from the standpoint of those who originated the scheme; nor am I looking at it from the point of view of those who are at present carrying it on. I am speaking entirely from the standpoint of the observer who has been watching it closely, and I can speak particularly of the work done in my own district of Prince Albert in Saskatchewan. I have visited these men in

their homes, and have been in all corners of that district where they are established. I might give a few figures I have compiled in reference to the men who have been established there and also show the extent to which salvages have occurred. In that district 2,338 applications were made to the qualification board. Of this number 1,800 were passed as qualified, or practically 77 per cent. Some of those disqualified have gone into training; that is to say, they are working for farmers in the district with the intention, which will no doubt be afterwards carried out, of again coming under the qualification board and being passed and established on the land. There have been established some 1,509 soldier settlers, of which number 136 or 8 per cent have since been salvaged. That percentage is very small indeed as compared with the number of failures which may have occurred with the original homesteaders, men who went on the land and tried to establish themselves independently, and long before the organization of the Soldiers' Settlement Board. On the first of October last there were 1,281 with payments due. Of these 624 have since met their payments in full. I think that is a very good showing. Three hundred have made them in part. In spite of the fact that last year not very much money was made on the farms, indeed a great many farmers who were thoroughly established previously went behind, we find that these men under proper supervision have done particularly well. The applications in hand for the present year show that at least 150 new settlers will be established in this district. I would point out that this is entirely independent of the number who may be brought over from the British Isles by Major Ashton. These one hundred and fifty men made application on the spot and are likely to be established. The payments this year stand at 55.1 per cent of the amounts due; but there have also been pre-payments made that is to say payments not yet due, sufficient to bring that percentage up to 61.8 per cent. Considering these figures, and remembering what I have seen of the supervision exercised by the inspectors, as I said before, I wish to add my word of commendation. The project is working out particularly satisfactory, and I think it should get every assistance that we can give it.

Mr. GARDINER: I should like to call the minister's attention to one point in regard to the soldier land settlement scheme. Many of the soldiers when they returned already possessed land, but in order to get re-established they made application to the Soldiers' Settlement Board for loans to buy stock and implements. I understand that the board took security for these loans on practically everything the soldiers had, irrespective of the amount advanced. In many cases this has placed the borrowers in the unfortunate position of not being able to do business with their local stores, implement dealers and banks. I have come across a few cases where the amount of security is out of all proportion to the amount loaned. I agree that the board should get adequate security for repayment of the loans made, but thus protected I think the board should be content and should release the balance of the security in order that the soldier settlers concerned can do business along the ordinary lines usual in farming communities. Having all their security tied up with the board these men cannot function as they should.

Mr. KELLNER: I am frank to say, Mr. Chairman, that in my district this scheme is not the great success that it seems to be in some of the other districts about which we have heard. I think the comparatively marvellous success which has attended the scheme in certain districts is largely attributable to the fact that a good many of these soldier settlers are receiving a pension and were granted certain concessions by the government last year. Had they been operating entirely on their own resources it is questionable whether they would have made a success of their operations. However, I do not wish to say anything very detrimental, because coming from the province of Alberta it would be dangerous for me to suggest that there is anything the matter with western Canada—I might be considered a degenerate, and I should not like to take such a chance. But I should like to hear the right hon. leader of the Opposition and the minister deliver the speeches we have listened to in this House to returned soldier settlers in some of the districts in Alberta; I think the reception they would get would be wholly different from that which was accorded them here.

In regard to the supervision exercised over these soldier settlers, it is all we could wish. I believe the inspectors almost go around to watch the settlers gather their eggs! It is my opinion that almost the entire inspection might be eliminated. I think the municipal councils could look after the interests of the government a whole lot cheaper and more satisfactorily than the inspectors are doing. We hope that eventually the loans will be paid back to the government, and these soldier settlers are the ones who will have to discharge them. I wonder if the collections at present are sufficient to pay the administration costs.

There are many districts to-day in which the school authorities find themselves in a serious condition because of the heavy arrears of taxes. I took the matter up with the minister some time ago, but I have not heard as yet from him as to whether the government intends to do anything. In the province of Alberta there has been I think 14.6 per cent of abandonments. That only tells part of the tale. We have a large number of farms on which there are arrears of taxes, and as these farms are mortgaged to the government it is impossible for the local authorities to collect their taxes. I do think the government should guarantee payment of taxes on such land so that the district schools may function; otherwise many of them will have to be closed.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The reason for the delay in replying to the hon. gentleman's question in respect to taxation is that I wanted to be sure of my ground with regard not only to municipalities in his province but elsewhere. The Justice department has advised me to the effect that where lands are held by the Crown parliament has no authority to pay or guarantee taxes to the municipalities, crown lands being immune from taxation. So the matter would require readjustment and I am so informing the municipal authorities who have written me in connection with it. This government has no control over the collection of taxes from the man who is on the land, and can do nothing towards assisting him in their payment. I am speaking more particularly of lands salvaged and returned to the control of the Dominion government. I admit frankly that it is a hardship, and I sought for some way to assist the municipalities, but that is the answer I have received, and I am giving it to the committee in order that hon. members may convey it to the parties interested.

10 p.m.

With respect to my hon. friend's suggestion that we might abandon inspection, I must say that I do not agree with him, and I so stated at the beginning of my remarks this evening. I believe the success of this undertaking depends largely upon the inspection that is exercised over our soldier settlers. I do not mean to say that it should be of a kind that would be arduous upon the settler, but I do think that this inspection and advice that is given to the settler when the inspector visits him is a feature that can be commended. I did not know until informed by my hon. friend that they were there every morning when the hens laid. That is news to me. However, if such is the case, it only speaks more highly of the very efficient manner in which these men are doing their duty.

Mr. GRAHAM: It speaks well for the hens too.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I would like to say just a word about the way in which the soldier settlement scheme is working out in my part of the country and in some other parts with which I am perhaps somewhat familiar. For some time I have taken a good deal of interest in the working of this board, and I have had an opportunity of meeting a good many returned men who are working under the provisions of the act. I know, and no one who comes from our part of the country but must know, that conditions among the soldier settlers are very hard in those parts, but I am not attributing that to the regulations of the Soldiers' Settlement Board or to the act under which they are working, or to the method under which the act is carried out. The condition of the soldier settler to my mind reflects the condition of agriculture as a whole in that part of the country, and if the conditions of agriculture as a whole are bad, as they are, the condition of the soldier settler will be bad also. But that can hardly be laid at the door of the board or of the scheme itself. I think that differentiation ought to be made. My own impression is that on the whole the soldier settlers are doing remarkably well considering all the circumstances. We have to remember this, even when we compare them with other farmers who are in debt, that the soldier settler is more heavily indebted than the average civilian farmer. He has the advantage of better terms, lower rates of interest, but on the other hand he owes practically 100 per cent, and in some cases over, of the value of his property. So he has a larger percentage of debt as a rule.

I was gratified to some extent to see that the percentage of collections had risen during the past year. I expected that of course due to the fact as has been stated that the total amount called for was much smaller, but what was much more significant was the fact that the actual amount realized was greater than last year. To my mind that carries far more significance than the percentage itself. How was that done? I do not believe it was done because the men themselves were making more money, because I do not believe they were. They could not make any more money than the farmers around them made during the last year. But I do believe this. It was due in part at least to the greater heart and the better spirit with which a great many of these men went at their work after some of the amendments that were made to the act last year. I am not speaking for political purposes at all. As a matter of fact, I have

read a number of letters similar to the one mentioned by the right hon. leader of the Opposition, which did not attribute the entire credit to the Liberal government, but the fact remains that the effect of these amendments was somewhat belittled, I think, in saying that it was just a slight grant from the Treasury Board. It did not really take the form of a grant at all. What was done as far as the relinquishment of money was concerned was the cancellation of some $12,000,000 of interest due in the next four years. It was not money paid out by the Treasury Board as a grant, but money coming to the board by way of interest which was cancelled. That is something different from a grant. But more than that, I believe that a different principle was established in the loaning of money. We found, and I think any hon. member who followed the work last year and from his own experience at home knows that the principle of having the heavier payments come due during the first years of a man's settlement, due to the short term for live stock and the long term for the land, was not a safe principle, and in my opinion not a right principle, because it is in the first years that a man finds it most difficult to make his payments. Parliament therefore tried to establish the principle of making the easy payments come first and the harder ones towards the end, when the settler would be more properly settled on the land.

I simply rose to mention these two points. One was to explain a little more closely what had been done, and the second was to draw that distinction between the conditions under which all agriculture was suffering and the conditions which were due to the Soldiers' Settlement Board itself. I can say in all fairness, as a somewhat disinterested though not uninterested observer, that I believed the act is working out fairly well, that the work is carried on fairly efficiently by the men employed, and that on the whole a very fair spirit exists among the returned soldier settlers towards the board under which they work and the officials with whom they come in contact.

Miss MACPHAIL: I do not want to be misunderstood. Like the hon. member who has just taken his seat, it was the working of the board of which I was speaking, and not of the wisdom of the act itself. I believe it is much too soon to say whether the land settlement scheme for soldiers has proved to be a success or not. It may prove to be; it may not. This is true. It came at a time when it was exceedingly hard for people going on the land. I notice in many of the letters I have received that the men who have made the fewest payments are the most optimistic about the scheme and those who have paid the most are the most pessimistic. That struck as being an odd thing. But we should give praise where praise is due, and I think that the Soldiers' Settlement Board, taking them in the large, have been very kind and considerate, and those who went to visit the soldiers on the land must have done so in a humane and kindly way since the expression of opinion regarding them is so unanimous.

I rise to ask the minister if it would be possible to have the settlers in Ontario, for instance, make their payments in the spring instead of in the fall. In grain growing provinces, such as in the middle West, to pay all debts in the fall when the grain is to be sold works out very nicely, but not in Ontario where in the fall there is very little to sell. Besides that, there are debts coming due which would take what little the soldier settlers have to sell. Possibly a couple of hundred who answered me asked for that change to be made; at least, they said it would mean a great deal to them if they could pay their debts in the spring instead of in the fall, because under the present method they were forced to sell their grain which they wanted to feed. I do not know whether it would be possible for the minister to make the change. I know it is difficult to have one method apply in one province and another in another province, but they do ask me to express that wish for them.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I may say in reply to the hon. member that in cases where the settler is desirous of feeding his grain to stock it has been the custom to defer the payment. The question of a general setting back of payments has always been more or less a contentious one. I know that it has been a contentious matter even in the West because it has been felt that the farmers have been forced to sell their produce at a time when it was perhaps inconvenient, and that it would be better to defer payments, but unfortunately no one has taken the lead in the matter particularly, and until all are agreed to delay payments there is always the fear of the first creditor getting away with the bulk of the crop and leaving all the others in the lurch. Therefore, payments are usually all set for one period. I might say, however, that where the soldier desires to feed his grain to stock rather than market it in order to pay his

debts, we will be very glad to extend the time in cases of that kind whenever application is made.

Mr. KELLNER: The minister answered my question in regard to the gathering of eggs but he missed the other one. He did not tell me whether the receipts were sufficient to pay the administration costs of the board, and I suppose that would include capital expenditure and depreciation. I would like to make another remark as to the payment of these taxes. The minister tells us that according to the information which the Department of Justice has given him the government cannot make the payment. In that case I would like to submit that possibly they could make a grant to the school district. The only alternative to the government not pursuing either course would be to close the schools. I do not think this government would regard that with favour, at least I hope not.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I can answer one of my hon. friend's questions. He asked whether we were getting any money in to pay the cost of administration. The cost of administration is estimated to be $1,400,000 and we have collected already over $1,600,000. I am informed that the collections are coming in at the rate of $40,000 each two weeks.

Mr. FORKE: It seems to me it is rather a strange statement the minister made, that it is not within the power of this parliament to pay taxes on land that was patented before it came into the hands of the soldier settler and then was abandoned. Does the minister say that parliament has no power to make any provision of that sort?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): That is the opinion of the Department of Justice with respect to any land. No difference is made once the land becomes the property of the Crown.

Mr. FORKE: It would require an amendment of the British North America Act to make such provision?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Apparently; that is the answer I get.

Mr. FORKE: It seems a funny thing.

Mr. LEWIS: Did I understand the minister to say the cost of administration and supervision was $1,400,000?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): That is for this year.

Mr. LEWIS: And the amount collected was $1,600,000?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): That is what we have collected already this year.

Mr. LEWIS: It would seem that the cost of administration and supervision was almost equal to the amount collected, taking the salvage cases into consideration. It would seem to me to be far better to cancel the whole debt altogether than to spend money that way and take it out of the soldier on the land.

Mr. KELLNER: In view of the minister's statement as to the cost of administration, and keeping in mind the interest charges, if I am right in supposing that the loans amounted to somewhere in the neighbourhood of $100,000,000, there must be some depreciation in capital expenditure in view of the large number of farms that have been abandoned.

Mr. MANION: I would like to get a little more information from the minister; I do not think he quite understood one of my questions. Could he give the number of soldier settlers in the different provinces, and also, if possible, the number that have had to be salvaged? I would like the figures for this year and also for the past year.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The figures are as follows:

Province—	Adjustments
British Columbia	490
Alberta	944
Saskatchewan	549
Manitoba	575
Ontario	234
Quebec	135
New Brunswick	101
Nova Scotia	53
Prince Edward Island	53
	3,134

The number of cases completed is 906, and the number pending 2,228.

Mr. MANION: I do not quite follow the minister. I take it that "adjustments" are salvage cases, are they?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Mr. MANION: Would the minister give the total number of soldier settlers in each of the provinces so as to distinguish between those men and the number who have been "adjusted," as the minister expresses it, or salvaged, for the past year? I would also like the figures for the previous year, just as a matter of comparison in order to ascertain how the men are doing on the land.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I can give my hon. friend the number settled in each province.

Mr. MANION: That will do.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The total number settled under the act—

Mr. MANION: May I suggest to the minister that if he would first give the total number settled under the act in each province, and immediately follow that with the number of salvaged cases, it would be a little more convenient for us.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): There are two kinds of settlers. There are a few without loans. I will give my hon. friend the number of settlers who have received loans in each province, and follow it with the number of salvage cases in each case.

Province—	Settlers granted loans	Salvaged
British Columbia	3,211	490
Alberta	6,623	944
Saskatchewan	5,631	549
Manitoba	3,508	575
Ontario	1,759	234
Quebec	459	135
New Brunswick	630	101
Nova Scotia	429	53
Prince Edward Island	355	53

Mr. LEWIS: Is that the number of salvage cases from the time they were first settled?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Mr. LEWIS: As a rule do the salvage cases pay back the expense of salvage and the original loan, or not?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I mentioned a short time ago that out of the total number about one-third of them have been completed and they do not in all cases cover the entire loan.

Mr. LEWIS: Can you tell me the total indebtedness of the soldiers to the board, taking the whole range, outstanding at the present time?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The total amount loaned was $94,993,421.38.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): In the case of lands that have come into the possession of the board, through salvage or otherwise, what steps have been taken to dispose of them? In any case are they being held for a rise in price?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No; they are open for sale from the moment they come into the hands of the board. Of course, in every case an endeavour is made to secure, at least, the amount against the property. Sometimes the proceedings are delayed on that account. In some cases we have accepted less than the amount owing against the particular property in question.

Mr. KNOX: Is any effort made to have returned men placed on these lands?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes, wherever it is possible to do so an endeavour is made to get returned men on this land. In a few cases where men were liable to get into difficulty, others stepped into their shoes and prevented salvage cases occurring; indeed where salvages had already taken place this occurred.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): How many settlers were placed on the land during 1922.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): 1,359 new settlers.

Mr. MANION: How much longer is permission to be given to the returned soldiers to settle on the land? I presume there is some specified plan, and that it is not for an indefinite time.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I have discussed that matter with the board. It was rather a difficult thing to decide when we ought to cease receiving applications and settling men upon the land. I may say frankly I have a feeling that perhaps all the men who wish to avail themselves of this settlement scheme have pretty well made application. I think those figures will give the committee an idea. The total number of returned soldiers who have been qualified by the board up to January 1923, is 46,692. These men passed the board and were qualified to get loans, if they were desirous of accepting them. The loans granted to January 31st were 22,222, so that there were 24,000 who really qualified who did not avail themselves of the opportunity. There are at present in training 532 ex-Imperials, Those who completed training and have not taken up land number 774. So that, aside from the men who drifted out after qualifying and did not settle on the land, we still have 1,276. One would expect a fair number of them, at least, to apply for settlement.

Mr. MANION: Out of the 22,000, would the minister tell us how many took up land in each of the years since the beginning I would like to know how they are diminishing at the present time.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I have not the number of settlers, but the actual amount expended will give a fair indication. I have

not the number of men established opposite the amount of money. The amount of money expended in loans was:

*Year	Loans
1918-19	$ 1,383,391 82
1919-20	42,715,374 34
1920-21	22,833,186 29
1921-22	11,501,160 09

That would give my hon. friend a fair indication of it.

Mr. ANDERSON: Is the office in Toronto supervising the whole of Ontario? Are there other offices besides the Toronto one for the enforcement of the land settlement scheme?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No, Toronto is the only general office for this work in Ontario. They do not report directly to Toronto, but the office is in Toronto.

Mr. GARDINER: When the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) had his estimates before the House he told us about the fine condition of agriculture in the province of Quebec. I noticed by the report of the minister to-night that, out of 459 grants made in Quebec, there have been 135 cases of salvage which is over one-third of the number of loans made in the province of Quebec. Can the minister tell this committee, in view of the splendid conditions obtaining in Quebec, according to the Minister of Agriculture, why there are so many salvages in that province?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I am afraid I cannot answer the double-barrelled question.

Mr. GARDINER: Try and answer the single-barrelled one.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No, I could not give that information. I have no knowledge as to just what brought about the salvage cases in Quebec, or indeed in any of the other provinces.

Mr. GARDINER: Would there be any possibility of getting that information from the Minister of Agriculture?

Mr. ANDERSON: What was the cost of the Toronto office for 1921-22?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I can give my hon. friend the total cost in Ontario, which would include the field supervisors and the whole staff of the Toronto office. This is taken from the salary list so that it would include all costs at Toronto. The amount is $70,940.

Mr. ANDERSON: How many officials does that include?

*For corrected statement see page 2207.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Forty-six all told.

Mr. ANDERSON: How many supervisors are in that number?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Fourteen supervisors in Ontario. That was the situation on the first of January, and there are still fourteen.

Mr. ANDERSON: Has the minister the figures for the year before as well? I want to make a comparison. Is the figure the same for the year before?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): We have not last year's figures here.

Mr. MANION: Has there been a decrease or a marked decrease in the expenses?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The decrease in cost of field supervision this year will be $14,700, so that we are reducing expenditure. I may say frankly, I do not think we should reduce materially the inspection work of the board, because that, after all, is the important work if we are to do our best by the soldiers on the land.

Mr. MANION: I quite agree with the minister in that regard. But as regards office staff, legal expenses and that sort of thing, since the expenditures of the department are going down and as this probably means a considerable decrease in a number of applications for settlement on the land, the general expenses, aside from the inspection work, should also decrease. I was wondering if there was any decrease at the present time.

Mr. ANDERSON: I notice that out of 1,759 soldier settlers in Ontario, 234 gave up their holdings. What was the amount of the holdings, and what was the loss in Ontario, if any, to the government?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): It would be almost impossible to give that, because many of these cases are not completed, and it would be difficult to ascertain the estimated loss or actual cost while cases are still pending completion. My hon. friend will remember that taking the whole of Canada, we have completely salvaged only a little over one-third of the cases, and there are still two-thirds to be completed. The figures I gave some moments ago would indicate that.

Mr. ANDERSON: How much were the loans and how much had the soldiers paid on their holdings?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I shall be glad to have that statement prepared, but

that will take some little time. In answer to my hon. friend (Mr. Manion) as regards a reduction in staff, in July, 1920, the staff was 1,580, all told. At the moment the staff is 690, all told.

Mr. MANION: The minister means the whole staff in the Dominion?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): In addition to salaries paid to members of the board, what extra amounts were paid and for what?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Nothing except their travelling expenses.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): What amounts?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I have not a statement of the actual travelling expenses of each member of the board.

Mr. COOTE: I should like to draw the attention of the minister to the fact that the percentage of salvaged cases in Alberta appears to be 14 per cent, and in Manitoba, 16 per cent. Can the minister explain why the percentage of cases in Manitoba is greater than in Alberta?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I could not explain that; I frankly say so. I could not attempt to explain why the numbers should be greater in one province than in another. All we know is that when it becomes necessary to salvage, action must be taken. I would not attempt to analyze the cause of this.

Mr. CALDWELL: Of the salvaged cases which have been completed, how many have reimbursed the government in full, and refunded to the soldier the payments that he has made?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The number is very small. Perhaps one influence that contributes to that is that land and stock were at a very high point when the soldier was established. Now deflation has set in, and while he might have had a considerable amount of value represented by his investment, owing to that deflation and to the fact that he is being salvaged just when deflation is at its height, in many cases there is not much salvage to repay the man who made the investment.

Mr. CALDWELL: I realize the condition that brought that about, and I am not blaming the Soldiers' Settlement Board for that condition; but it would be interesting to know in how many of those cases there was salvage enough to pay the soldier back in full, or in part, or even anything?

[Mr. C. A. Stewart.]

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The chairman of the board informs me that there are a considerable number of cases in which money has been paid. I have not that information here, but I shall be glad to get it for my hon. friend.

Mr. LEWIS: I should like to share the optimism of the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Speakman); but after listening to the figures given regarding the total indebtedness, the amount of money received and the number of cases that have been salvaged, I do not think the outlook is very bright either for the soldier settlers themselves or for the government. If the figures given by the minister are correct, approximately $94,900,000, and in view of the fact, of course, that interest has been cancelled at the present time, the fact remains that interest is to be charged on over $94,000,000. This would mean that $4,745,000 would have to be paid yearly to meet the interest, without taking into account any of the capital investment; and when we consider that last year only $1,600,000 was collected and it took $1,400,000 to get it, it does not seem to me that this is very good book-keeping. I am just wondering what the end is going to be.

Item agreed to.

Grant to H. H. Moss, to cover expenses in connectior with his illegal arrest, $595.58.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Will the minister explain what this amount is for?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I have here a written explanation of the matter. There was one Harold Moss, whom the department were seeking to prosecute. He went to the United States and an arrest was made, but unfortunately we arrested the wrong man, with the result that there was a protest from Washington from the Secretary of State, who suggested that the government of Canada make a compensation to one Moss, an American citizen who was arrested instead of the man we were after:

A letter was received by His Majesty's Embassy at Washington from the United States Secretary of State, suggesting that the government of Canada make compensation to one Harry Moss, an employee of the National Board of Fire Underwriters of New York City, who was wrongfully arrested in Chicago on the 3rd November, 1921, at the direction of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, on being erroneously identified with Harold H. Moss, who was wanted on charges of false pretences and fraud in connection with transactions with the Soldier Settlement Board.

From the board's records, it is clear that one Harry Moss of Chicago was improperly arrested on an infomation laid and warants secured by the board for the arrest of Harold H. Moss, formerly of Winnipeg. The Board is not in a position to say what injury Harry Moss suffered by reason of the improper arrest.

nor if injury was suffered, is it in a position to say what compensation should be paid, or how the matter should be disposed of. It would appear to the board that the entire matter is one involving the administration of justice, and must be determined by the opinion and recommendation of the Justice department.

Should it be determined by the Justice department that compensation should be paid by the Canadian authorities, it will be necessary to determine on which department the responsibility rests for the improper arrest, and the board on that ground does not accept the responsibility.

In order that full information may be available for the proper consideration of the legal and international questions involved, a brief history of the case as it appears in the board's records, is given herewith.

As a result of certain information placed before the parliamentary committee on Re-establishment, the board instituted an enquiry under Section 55 of the Soldier Settlement Act, into certain land purchases in the province of Manitoba. At this enquiry, taken under oath, it transpired that in 1919 one H. H. Moss of Winnipeg had sold to the board certain farms, and the evidence thus taken established, in the opinion of C. H. Locke, legal counsel employed, a prima facie case against the said H. H. Moss of perjury, obtaining money by false pretences, and other criminal wrongdoing. Moss was a witness in the early stages of the enquiry. On the advice of counsel the board placed the facts before the Attorney General's department of Manitoba, and in consultation with the Deputy Attorney General of Manitoba, laid certain informations against H. H. Moss and had warrants for his arrest issued. The Royal Canadian Mounted Police had been employed to assist in gathering evidence for the enquiry, and the warrant for arrest was placed in their hands. On attempting to execute same, it was ascertained that H. H. Moss had fled from justice, and was somewhere in the United States.

The Royal Canadian Mounted Police pursued their attempts to locate H. H. Moss in the United States, and their agents finally reported that he had been located in Chicago, and they asked the board to undertake to defray the expense of their sending a police constable to Chicago to verify the reports of the police agents. The board agreed to do this, and constable Downey was sent from Winnipeg to Chicago by the R.C.M.P. authorities. The board supplied the R.C. M.P. with a good photograph of the accused and with a full description and other means of identification. Constable Downey reported that he had definitely located the accused in the offices of the National Board of Fire Underwriters in Chicago; that he had personally seen the accused; and that there was no doubt of his identity. On the advice of counsel, the board submitted the facts to the Department of Justice, and obtained authority to commence extradition proceedings, and the R.C.M.P. were therefore authorized to make the arrest. This was done and Mr. Locke having acted as counsel at the board's enquiry and being conversant with all the facts, was sent to Chicago to direct the proceedings. On his arrival he immediately discovered that the man arrested was not H. H. Moss, the accused, and consequently ordered his release. The whereabouts of Harold H. Moss, the accused, have not since been discovered.

We are asking for this sum because we believe we shall be liable for the wrongful arrest of the American citizen Moss, who was not the man we were after.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Is it proposed to give this amount to him?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The matter is entirely in the hands of the Justice department.

Mr. GUTHRIE: What is to be done with the money?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): We are assuming that we shall have to make some restitution for the wrongful arrest of this man, and as he is an American citizen the matter is more or less of an international character.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The amount is odd; it must have been decided upon in some way.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The man has agreed to accept that amount as restitution.

Mr. GUTHRIE: And in the meantime the minister says his department has not been found liable in any way by any tribunal, so that it is a matter of negotiation between the man, Moss, and the department.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Well, that is partly right, and perhaps my explanation is only partly right. The man has agreed to accept this amount and we have practically agreed to pay it in settlement of the case. The money has not yet been paid, but undoubtedly it will be.

Item agreed to.

TRADE AND COMMERCE

Trade and Commerce—salaries and contingencies, $498,490.

Mr. MANION: Perhaps the minister will explain the cause of the increase of some $50,000 in this item.

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Trade and Commerce): This is accounted for partly by requisitions and partly by transfers and some increases of the staff. There have been transferred to the permanent those who were on the temporary list. Under the act of 1918 the statistical work of all the various departments of government was transferred to the Bureau of Statistics. So we have transferred some of these employees from other departments, and to carry on the work it is necessary to make these employees permanent in accordance with the requirements of the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. GUTHRIE: What strikes one at first glance is the very substantial increase in the number of employees in this department. An increase in a single year from 300 to 345 employees is rather staggering, while the increase in the cost of administration as a result of this increase in staff is from $425,000 to $476,000. What was the necessity for this enormous increase in the staff?

Mr. ROBB: As I have just explained, it does not necessarily mean that there is this enormous increase in the staff nor in the

cost of administration. Under the system of book-keeping, to meet the requirements of the auditor general moneys must be voted either for temporary or for permanent employees. The Civil Service Commission refuses any longer to grant certificates for the temporary employees who have been in this department for a number of years, and this necessitates their being made permanent. As a matter of fact I think the increase in staff is warranted in view of the statistical information demanded. My hon. friend will observe that 37 of these 45 additional employees are in the Bureau of Statistics. There are only two additional employees in the administration branch of the department, and under readjustment during the year these will disappear. The other six are in the commercial intelligence bureau.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Were they not all in the department last year?

Mr. ROBB: Some have been transferred from the Department of Labour, some from the Interior department, and some were on the temporary list and had been there for a number of years. If we had a system of book-keeping whereby we could have a lump sum to run each department during the year it would not be necessary to vote so much, but when we have to provide for those who are now temporary employees and will be transferred and made permanent after this vote is passed, my hon. friend can see the necessity for putting through these different votes.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Turning to page 66 of the Main Estimates, where the various activities of the Department of Trade and Commerce are set out, it will be found that for the carrying on of that department last year we voted $3,252,000. This year all the minister asks is $3,029,000. He proposes a reduction of $222,000 in round figures. No new services are enumerated on page 66, apparently no greater activities are contemplated over last year, if anything the work of the department will be decreased this year because about a quarter of a million dollars less is asked for in the Main Estimates. Notwithstanding that, on turning to civil government we find this increase of 45 in the number of employees and something like $50,000 in salaries. You can go over all the details of civil government and though we are year by year getting farther from war activities, when so large a Civil Service was necessary, it is strange that the cost of civil government seems to increase. This year there is an increase of $252,000. This is one of the departments of civil government. If we may judge by the Main Estimates its activities will be less even than they were last year. But whatever we may provide in the estimates, for some reason or other the cost of the staff of the department goes up, and as a result we are asked to provide by taxation a quarter of a million dollars more than we did last year. It is all very well for my hon. friend to say that these clerks have been transferred from some other departments, but those other departments do not show a decrease, and the Main Estimates show that the amount in excess of last year for civil government is just a shade over a quarter of a million dollars.

Mr. BELAND: Mr. Chairman, as my hon. friend has referred to all departments of civil government, and he has confined himself to a study of the civil government estimates, I think you will agree with me that it is not the proper manner in which to examine the expenditure for administration so far as salaries are concerned. Take the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, almost all the employees are temporary and do not figure at all in the civil government list. There is this year in the estimates for salaries for the Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment department a reduction of $1,000,000. Now, my hon. friend I know wants to be fair. He says there is an increase in the civil government expenditure of a quarter of a million dollars. I grant that it may be so, but even if it is, if there is a reduction of salaries in my department of $1,000,000, there will be a saving of three-quarters of a million dollars this year in salaries. My hon. friend will admit that—yes, he has to admit that.

Mr. GUTHRIE: That is as to temporary employees. I am talking of those on the permanent list.

Mr. BELAND: My hon. friend says these are temporary employees. What did he mean when he referred to the war? He said the farther we get away from the war the more we pay in salaries. The Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment department is a war department if it is anything at all. There was a reduction last year of $1,000,000 in salaries. This year there is a similar reduction. My hon. friend fails to take that into account, but he should do so if he wants to be fair.

Mr. GUTHRIE: That is a different proposition.

Mr. BELAND: No, it is not a different proposition at all. My hon. friend intimates that there is an increase in the amount for salaries for administration while there should

be a decrease because we are getting farther away from the war. I agree with him. But when he confines his remarks to civil government he becomes—unwittingly I am sure—unfair and states the position wrongly, and I think he will admit it because he wants to be fair. This is for the Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment department—a reduction of $1,000,000. What about the Defence department? I think 1,600 temporary employees have been dispensed with there. That does not appear in the civil government estimates. There is also probably over a million dollars of reduction in salaries paid. My hon. friend says it seems that the expenditure is increasing all the time. No, it is decreasing every year, and by large amounts. The cost of civil government, no doubt, remains much about the same in almost every department, and it will remain about the same no matter what government is in power. I rose mainly for the purpose of pointing out that it is very unfair to confine one's observations to the civil government estimates; it is absolutely unfair because really there is a decrease of over $2,000,000 in salaries paid by this government this year for employees all over the country.

10 p.m.

Mr. GUTHRIE: This item that we are discussing now is the civil government vote. It has nothing to do with the temporary employees which the various departments of the government employ and have employed since the war. It was not only in the war departments, such as the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment and the Department of Militia and Defence, that temporary clerks were taken on. Why, they were almost innumerable in the Finance department and in every other department of the government owing to the war. But this vote we are discussing now, and in regard to which I charge there is an increase when there should be no increase, is a permanent vote. There is no cutting down in this vote. These men are simply appointed to the permanent staff and there will be more of them there again next year and the year after that again. Instead of decreasing the cost of civil government this government is increasing it. I am aware that there is a vanishing expenditure, or should be, in my hon. friend's Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment. I know that in one year or a year and a half we let out from the Militia department 8,000 temporary employees. I should think we are within reasonable distance now of closing up the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment altogether; but the fact that we have let many hundreds of war employees go who are no longer necessary, is that a justification for increasing the permanent staff that governs this country? That is my point, and the only point I wish to make. Instead of retrenchment we have increase. The times do not justify increase; the activities of the government do not justify increase; the business of the country being done to-day does not justify this increase. The fact is the civil service of Canada is being loaded up in this way with permanent employees, and you cannot dispense with them as you can with temporary employees by simply telling them to go. They obtain a fixed place in the service of Canada. Next year I am willing to predict there will be no decrease in this particular vote, but that the cost of civil government in Canada will be more than it is this year.

Mr. ROBB: My hon. friend knows that under civil government we have employees classed as temporary as well as those on the permanent list. There are in all departments many employees who have been on the temporary list for years, and the Civil Service Commission have ruled that they should be put on the permanent list. I think it is only reasonable when a man has been in a department five, ten or fifteen years and it is evident that his services are required that he should be put on the permanent list. You have to pay him anyway.

My hon. friend, on the other hand, referred to a reduction of $222,000, and he takes that as an indication that we propose less activity during the year. That is not true. We anticipate greater activity during the year. I can show my hon. friend where these reductions were made. In the first place there is the census staff, which my hon. friend knows is taken on every ten years. Those are temporary employees. There is a reduction of $115,000 there.

Mr. GUTHRIE: That will not appear in this vote, will it?

Mr. ROBB: No, but it was in connection with this vote that my hon. friend anticipated less activity during the year. Then $85,000 was spent for improvements to the elevator at Vancouver. The department had nothing whatever to do with that. It was all handled by the Board of Grain Commissioners. We are also making a reduction of $10,000 in the Commercial Intelligence department, travelling and miscellaneous expenses in connection with the junior trade commissioners. There is a reduction of $15,000 for exhibitions and publicity; a reduction of $5,900 in the Weights

and Measures branch; $6,330 in the Gas and Electricity branch; and $50,000 through printing now being done elsewhere. This does not in any way affect civil government, and no person knows it better than my hon friend, who has been in charge of a department himself and has had considerable experience in parliament.

Mr. GUTHRIE: It strikes me that the reductions in all the services my hon. friend has just enumerated must mean less work than there was to do formerly with a larger expenditure. When the expenditure was greater and there was more work to do, more clerical assistance would of necessity be required—more men to do the work. I think it is quite clear from these estimates that there is going to be a considerable reduction in the work of the department. Then why add forty or fifty to the staff of a department to do less work? Let me put to my hon. friend the case of a business man doing a business this year entailing an expenditure of $3,000,000. He has his staff and does the work satisfactorily with the number he has. Next year he is going to do a business of $2,500,000. Do you think he is going to add fifty clerks to his staff to do a less amount of business? It strikes me as too obvious for argument that with a smaller expenditure and less departmental activity, the department should get along at least with the same staff it had last year. Does not that seem reasonable? Instead of that the minister proposes a large increase in the staff and an additional expenditure of $50,000 to pay for it. It may be that he has been loaded down in his department with other services he did not have last year, but I doubt very much if there is any saving shown in these other departments from which his additional staff has come. I have not looked into the estimates and I cannot say as to that, but my experience of nearly thirty years in this House has been that the cost of civil government has gone up under every government. I do not believe there ever was a time when the need for retrenchment was as great as it is to-day, and surely it is not a matter for censure that one should point out this substantial increase which the government proposes for the coming year when we cannot afford the money, when every dollar of the increase has to be met by taxation of the people. What I protest against not only in the Department of Trade and Commerce but in all the departments of the government is that the temporary staffs are being carried on. The war staffs are certainly being reduced from year to year, but the temporary staffs of the department still exist and they are paid out of special votes in the case of almost every department. They have them there and year by year they get them wedged in as permanents, whether by the aid of the Civil Service Commission or in defiance of that body I cannot say, but the result is seen in the estimates brought down to the House. There is an aggregate increase of—I said $250,000—but it is an increase of $265,000, in the cost of the clerical work, practically, of the government of Canada.

Mr. MANION: Would the minister tell us how many temporary employees in the department have been placed on the permanent staff?

Mr. ROBB: They have not been put in yet. We cannot put them in until this vote goes through.

Mr. MANION: What are the details?

Mr. ROBB: The statutory increases amount to $16,000, and there are 45 to be transferred.

Mr. MANION: From temporary to permanent positions?

Mr. ROBB: Yes; some of them are transferred from other departments.

Mr. MANION: I notice that the minister mentioned the Department of Labour. I looked up the appropriations for that department and I found there had been a decrease in the staff of about 27; that is about 20 less than the increase in the department. I should like to say just one word about the Statistical branch. It is now, and has been for some years—two or three years I think—entirely in the Department of Trade and Commerce.

Mr. ROBB: Since 1918—no, prior to that. In 1918 there was an act passed transferring the statistics of every department to the Dominion bureau.

Mr. MANION: I do not recollect the exact date but I knew it was back about that time. I simply wish to say this: The Bureau of Statistics, since that unity has been brought about, is a department which is of great use, not only to the members of this House but to the people of the country in general. I remember that when I came into this House first, about 1917, if you wished to obtain any statistics regarding minerals, for example, or grain, or any other department of government, you would ring up the department, perhaps the Department of the Interior, the Department of Agriculture, or some other department. You would probably be referred from the one to the other and from the other back

to the one. I remember on one occasion being referred by telephone to seven or eight different offices when I tried to get certain details. At the present time one can ring up or write to the Bureau of Statistics and get—on most occasions, and on most subjects concerned with government—the figures or statistics which one desires, and I have yet to see them pointed out as given in a mistaken way. I just wished to put myself on record as expressing on my own behalf alone, but I am sure it is the opinion of many in this House, an appreciation of the work that is being done by the Bureau of Statistics under Mr. Coats. I believe that once in a while—in the Civil Service as in other branches of life—a few words of commendation where they are well deserved, as they certainly are in the case of the Bureau of Statistics, are decidely in place.

Mr. ANDERSON: I would like to ask the minister how many of the forty-five employees referred to have been transferred from the Department of Labour?

Mr. ROBB: Nine.

Mr. ANDERSON: From what departments were they transferred?

Mr. ROBB: I could not give that information. I should say that nine is the total number that were transferred. I think most of them came from the Labour department, but some of them may have been transferred from the Forestry branch.

Mr. ANDERSON: I notice a reference to "office appliance operators". What work do these employees do?

Mr. ROBB: They are the men who run the multigraph machines in the Statistical department and other branches.

Item agreed to.

Mr. MANION: May I ask the minister what other items in the Department of Trade and Commerce remain to be dealt with? Has he nearly finished the estimates of that department?

Mr. ROBB: No, there are some steamship subsidies yet to be dealt with.

Mr. MANION: I would like to point out that the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens), as the minister knows, having been formerly Minister of Trade and Commerce, usually looks after those estimates in the interest of hon. members on this side. The hon. gentleman is not in the chamber to-night, unfortunately he is engaged elsewhere, and I would like to have these items held over. I would prefer if the minister would do that until the hon. member is able to be present I do not know that there is any special matter that he wishes to take up, but I should like the minister to hold these votes over for the time being.

Mr. ROBB: I would like to get them cleaned up but I will say this: I did defer other estimates to suit the former Minister of Trade and Commerce, my immediate predecessor, and it is quite likely there will be some small items in the supplementaries. I will allow the hon. member for Vancouver Centre wide discussion on those.

Mr. MANION: If the minister agrees that on some other item we may come back to these particular appropriations, if we wish for further details, I think as far as we are concerned we will be satisfied.

Mr. ROBB: Anything you wish.

Patent and Copyright—salaries, $175,865; contingencies, $35,000.

Mr. ROBB: There is no change in the number of employees, but there is a slight increase in the amount for salaries owing entirely to reclassification.

Item agreed to.

Canada Grain Act—additional amount required, $200,000.

Mr. MANION: I should like to suggest to the minister that this is a large item to be taken at this late hour, and that as there is likely to be some discussion it had better be left over.

Mr. ROBB: I do not object strenuously to letting it stand but I will explain this: The Board of Grain Commissioners estimated the amount required last year at $1,342,869. It was reduced in the department some $42,000. There were some accrued payments for the previous year, 1921-22, amounting to $50,000 and there were certain increases of salary endorsed by the commissioners. Furthermore we had an additional expenditure owing to having to handle last year almost the largest crop in our history. That explains the increased amount required. The elevators administered by the Board of Grain Commissioners are a paying and not a losing proposition, and this is the estimate which has been prepared by the board and sent down to us.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): What effect would the possible establishment of a wheat board have on this matter?

Mr. ROBB: None whatever. We would administer this act just the same.

Mr. MANION: There have been some changes in the personnel of the grain commission. Would the minister tell the House what changes have been made and what appointments have been made since last year?

Mr. ROBB: The Board of Grain Commissioners are appointed for a period of ten years. The term of Mr. Staples, one of the commissioners, expired last year, and the government appointed in his place Mr. Mat Snow, a well-known western gentleman. Then Mr. Jones resigned voluntarily. His time was up this year, and, incidentally, I want to pay a tribute to Mr. Jones whom I regarded as a man who thoroughly understood the grain business, but he voluntarily retired and the government appointed to replace him Mr. Robinson, who had been associated for a number of years with the Saskatchewan Co-Operative Elevator Company. Mr. Hetherington is now replacing Mr. Jones as general manager. Previous to that one of the commissioners, Mr. Jones, was manager of the system. Mr. Hetherington, who had been for many years secretary, is now general manager. I am not sure who succeeded Mr. Hetherington as secretary. It was on the recommendation of the commissioners, and Mr. Leslie Boyd still remains the chairman.

Mr. MANION: Any present indication of making any more changes?

Mr. ROBB: Not the least whatever.

Mr. MANION: I am very well acquainted with Mr. Jones, and I agree with the minister that his retirement is a great loss to the board because he is a very able man. I wish to ask the minister a question in regard to the different elevators that the Board of Grain Commissioners are handling for his department. There is one at Port Arthur and one, I think, at Saskatoon. Will he give us the details as to where they are and the business done at the present time?

M. ROBB: I have not the records before me as to the details of the business they are doing. In addition to those mentioned by my hon. friend, there is an internal terminal elevator at Moose Jaw, one in Saskatoon, and there are also elevators at Vancouver and at Calgary. The elevator at Vancouver has been putting through a lot of grain this season. Indeed, last year we put more grain through that elevator in Vancouver than during all the years since its construction, and this year I think we will put through more than twice as much as we put through last year. We were operating it and using the Calgary elevator as a reservoir, so that when the superintendent at Vancouver was able to see by the ships coming in, that he was going to empty his elevator in Vancouver, word would be sent down to Calgary to send on the reserves that were there, and in that way we have been able to handle the crop with satisfaction.

Mr. MANION: Has the minister any information as to the amount of grain going through the government elevators at Port Arthur, Saskatoon and Vancouver?

Mr. ROBB: I have it here:

	1920-21	1921-22
Port Arthur..	13,439,586	14,018,826
Moose Jaw..	4,161,870	1,527,367
Saskatoon..	5,360,152	5,254,197
Calgary..	4,317,795	3,138,319
Vancouver..	1,082,438	6,621,474

We have not the figures for the crop of the year we are in now.

Mr. MANION: In most of the elevators except the Vancouver elevator, and I think the Port Arthur elevator, there has been a decrease.

Mr. ROBB: Yes, last year.

Mr. MANION: With the large crop from the prairie provinces, why was there a decrease?

Mr. ROBB: These figures are for the crop of the previous year.

Mr. CHAPLIN: The minister informed the House that this propostiion was self-sustaining. Can he tell us the revenue and to what account the money went?

Mr. ROBB: Would the hon. member like to go back several years?

Mr. CHAPLIN: No, just two years.

Mr. ROBB: In 1921-22 the revenue was $1,937,325.02 and the expenditure $1,235,000, leaving a surplus of $702,325.02. In 1922-23, up to February 28th—that is part of this year's crop, the revenue was $2,080,348.75 and the expenditure $1,231,667.80 leaving a surplus $1,848,680.95.

Mr. CHAPLIN: That goes into the consolidated revenue fund?

Mr. ROBB: Yes.

Mr. MILLAR: From a rumour circulating some few years ago, which seemed to me to be very well founded, it appeared to me the department might suffer a loss in regard to a carload of grain shipped to the United States, passing out of the mixing elevator. The purchaser in the United States refused to receive

the grain on the ground that it was not up to grade. The department had it inspected at Buffalo, and I believe by the order of the grain commissioners it was stored at Buffalo, and the new sample being graded by the inspector, he found the grade No. 3 and 4 tough, where the cargo was in fact graded out at No. 3. I understood the ground taken by the mixing elevator was that they had received from the government a regular certificate, and that they were therefore, not liable for any loss because the grain was not up to the mark. The purchaser took the stand that he would not accept it, and I understood there was some good reason to believe the loss might possibly fall on the department. Could the minister give us any information as to whether that matter is settled or how it stands?

Mr. ROBB: No, there has been no record of any claim coming in to the government. My recollection is that the matter was adjusted. I am glad my hon. friend has mentioned that, because it did not occur to me when I was answering some other questions. This complaint of a shipment of grain going out from Fort William to Buffalo was brought to my attention some time last summer. I ordered an investigation, and as a result of that, I instructed the commissioners to fire two of the employees who were grain inspectors and who, we had reason to believe, had, to say the least, neglected their duties. This had a wholesome effect on the others. I have heard of no complaint since then.

Mr. MILLAR: I am glad to hear that. I do not know whether the minister will have this information or not. Some years ago there was a heavy loss owing to the difference in weights between the elevator at Fort William and the transfer elevators at Owen Sound, Collingwood and other places, of about 50,000 bushels a year. Changes were put into effect in 1908 which remedied that matter, and for a year or two conditions were all right. I was wondering whether that remedy has been effective up to the present time or not. Can the minister state whether there is any discrepancy or not in the weights of grain shipments as they arrive at Owen Sound, Collingwood, Port Elgin and, in fact, Buffalo as well?

Mr. ROBB: There are very few complaints coming to the department now as regards either inspection or weight. We recently had some complaints from overseas regarding the weight of a cargo of grain shipped out of Montreal. We are going to send a couple of men over there. We will send one man from the inspection department, and I think the Montreal Harbour Commissioners are going to send a man to look into this. We want to satisfy our customers on the other side that we in Canada have every desire to see that business is done right, upon a fair basis. As my hon. friend knows, the grain is weighed out in this country in large draughts; on the other side it is weighed in smaller draughts. Then there is a question as to what may have happened to some of this cargo in transit. The boat may have sprung a leak. There may have been some wet grain in the bottom, dumped over. We are going to look into this matter in an endeavour to satisfy the claim on the other side.

Mr. ANDERSON: Are there any elevators in Ontario under the control of the department?

Mr. ROBB: No. The grain commissioners have a certain supervision over these elevators; but we do not own any in Ontario.

Mr. ANDERSON: There is one at Port Colborne.

Mr. ROBB: That is under the Railway department.

Mr. ANDERSON: Has the department not been requested by some interests in Ontario to establish an elevator?

Mr. ROBB: We have from time to time such requests from all parts of the country, where people imagine an elevator would be a very nice proposition.

Mr. ANDERSON: Within the last year?

Mr. ROBB: Yes, we had a request from Ontario.

Mr. RYCKMAN: What is the total value, roughly, of these elevators, including plant and equipment?

Mr. ROBB: In my judgment, these elevators could not be built to-day for their original cost. The capital cost of the Port Arthur house is $1,415,336.31; of the Saskatchewan elevator, $1,134,745.73; of the Moose Jaw elevator $1,322,725.50. Of the three houses I have cited, the capacity is 3,250,000 bushels, 3,500,000 bushels, and 3,500,000 bushels respectively. There is at Calgary a smaller house with a capacity of 2,500,000 bushels and costing $884,564.35. The house at Vancouver, with a capacity of 1,250,000 bushels, cost $837,351.71. The total capital investment is $5,594,723.60, for a capacity of 14,000,000 bushels.

Mr. RYCKMAN: The minister, I think, said that there was no write-off for depreciation for buildings or plant.

Mr. ROBB: No.

Mr. RYCKMAN: If a proper depreciation were set up against this capital invested, and if the profits were only as stated by the minister, namely, as I recall, $700,000 one year, and $800,000 last year, this would mean that this business is not being very profitably carried on.

Mr. ROBB: The accountant at Fort William has prepared a statement which has been sent here; but I cannot find any statement of interest, although he has an item of $294,000 under profit and loss, which might be attributed to interest. That shows a percentage of profit on the capital investment in plant in the Port Arthur house of almost 5·32 per cent.

Mr. CHURCH: As this is an elevator appropriation, the minister might tell the committee what has been done since last session regarding the promise made then by the minister in answer to a question asked on this side of the House as to a terminal elevator for central and western Ontario. A few years ago there waited upon the government a deputation consisting of representatives of, I might say, all the farming and business interests of central and western Ontario. I understand the policy in relation to elevators is that there shall be equality of treatment; that where a government elevator is erected in the West, an elevator shall be erected in Ontario. A memorandum was presented by a deputation of 200 people including the United Farmers of Ontario, the Grain Growers of the province, the late Lieutenant Governor Clarke of Ontario, Mr. Manning Doherty, the harbour commissioners of five or six very important harbours, representing that Ontario had been discriminated against as regards a terminal elevator to serve the farmers of that province. Ontario is suffering under a handicap in the matter of transportation. There are many flag stations where there are no elevators, and the United Farmers of Ontario and the harbour commissioners of Toronto in a very elaborate memorial which I read last session, pointed out to the government the necessity of such a terminal elevator in central Ontario. This is very much needed from the farmer's standpoint, because he has no place to take his grain crop, and he loses a good deal of the price, his time and so forth. The need of such an elevator is, indeed, apparent to everybody. Years ago, in my city there were a number of elevators on the water front, but now we have none. There is an elevator at Port Colborne and one at Fort William, and I agree with the minister that there is no need for another elevator for through-going crop. But this elevator is not for through crops going to the Old Country via Buffalo. The need in Ontario is a local one; the farmer needs some elevator where he can put his crop in the winter and leave it until such time as water-going traffic can take it to its proper destination. A return brought down to the House some time ago showed that there are a great many elevators in the West. Well, the people are not objecting to that. Rather, they are encouraging the government to put up these elevators; and the minister since taking office has been active in many branches of his department. I commend him as far as this goes. But so far as Ontario is concerned I want to urge upon him the great necessity that exists for terminal elevators for the farmers of this province. The deputation that waited upon a former government was drawn from Peterborough, Stratford and from the whole northern division of the Grand Trunk, as well as from central and western Ontario. This large deputation waited upon Sir Thomas White, but the government of that day could not see its way, owing to the war, to take practical action in the matter. They admitted the necessity there was for an elevator of this description but they attributed their inability to do anything to the financial stress of the time. A hundred and twenty farmers' organizations petitioned the government, and I shall not read the memo to-night, because the minister has a copy of it. The hon. member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton) asked the minister last session to give this matter his consideration and the minister promised that during the recess he would look into it. The question was discussed the other day in the Ontario legislature, but it was found that that body could do nothing in the premises, because the matter was a federal one. Now, I may say that while the United Farmers of Ontario have no particular love for the city I come from, nevertheless they recommend that the elevator be established in Toronto. I am not asking at this moment that this recommendation be acted upon; all I ask is that an elevator be established somewhere in the province to meet the economic and transportation necessities of the farmers of Ontario. It is not so much the site of the elevator that matters; what is important is that one be established. We want a terminal elevator for the small farmer so that

he may have somewhere to take his crop for the winter months, because as things stand at present he has no such facilities. I know that the minister is sympathetically disposed to this question and while I do not want to delay the committee on this item to-night, I hope that the minister will give us an assurance that he will take steps to meet the representations that have been made by the farmers of Ontario. I believe he will be waited upon by another deputation and I trust that he will give them a chance to put their case plainly before him. I think it is in the interests of the country that he should make a declaration of policy with regard to the desirability of establishing this terminal elevator on lake Ontario or lake Erie for central and western Ontario. This is an important matter and I sincerely trust that the minister will give it his most careful consideration.

Mr. ROBB: While I am always glad to meet a deputation from Ontario and Toronto particularly, I think I would rather go up to Toronto and look into the matter there. I have been promising my hon. friend a long time to go there, and I think I can assure him now that before next session I will go to that city and look the thing over. I might point out that the way freights are arranged in this country, working west to east, there is considerable elevator capacity at Depot Harbour, Owen Sound, Midland, Goderich, Port Huron, Port Credit and Port Colborne. I am inclined to think there is need of more capacity at Port Colborne. I would point out to my hon. friend, however, that while there is considerable elevator capacity up there, perhaps not enough for their requirements, there are at Kingston two very large houses in addition to one at Prescott, which were practically idle during the last few years. However, I renew my promise to the hon. member to visit Toronto.

Mr. MILLAR: The minister, having had a conference with the Grain Commissioners in the last few weeks, said that some complaints were made during the year with regard to screenings. Possibly the point may have been raised in the course of the conference, and the minister may be able to give us information. The point I refer to is this. The farmers were in many cases paid very small amounts, sometimes even so low as 50 cents or $1 a ton for screenings of excellent quality. I am not referring to screenings that are so cheap to-day that they are thrown into the lake. I know there is a quantity of that class of screenings. I am referring, however, to valuable screenings; what I have in mind particularly is white cleaned oats. This should have been worth $12 or $15 a ton, but the farmer received only $1 a ton for it. If that point arose during the conference perhaps the minister can give us some information in reference to it.

Mr. ROBB: We discussed that, and the Board of Grain Commissioners are now preparing for me a complete statement. I intend that that shall be one of the questions to be inquired into during the summer.

Mr. MANION: I was going to mention something about screenings myself when my hon. friend (Mr. Millar) brought up the point. I was pleased to hear him refer to it because there has been a good deal of dissussion at the head of the lakes with reference to that question. As the minister knows, both the ex-Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Stevens) and myself have asked questions regarding the disposal of screenings because charges have been made that the screenings have not been turned back in the condition in which they should be. In the old days before the amendment to the Grain Act, the overages were mixed up with the question of screenings, and they are yet to a certain extent. But the main charge seems to be that instead of people getting back the screenings as they should really get them, in their original condition, they receive, as a matter of fact, refuse screenings. I am not making a positive statement of fact, but this charge appears in the press occasionally, and one hears it on the street too; and sometimes as a member of the constituency I get letters in reference to the question. It is stated that when anyone asks for screenings he simply gets refuse screenings, instead of the original screenings which are worth a great deal more. The matter is very much as the hon. member has stated. I asked some questions of the minister, by correspondence and on the order paper, regarding this matter with a view to obtaining further information. At present the question seems to be in a rather hazy state. I do not say that as a criticism of the Board of Grain Commissioners, because I believe they are an able body who are trying to carry out their duties as well as they can. But in the past the question of screenings and dockage has been allowed to drift along, and now there seems to be coming from the prairie provinces, as well as from some dealers at the head of the lakes, who wish to buy screenings, the charge that they cannot get what they are entitled to receive. I would suggest to the minister therefore that it would be a good idea to have the whole question thoroughly investigated. I might mention a concrete

circumstance in reference to this matter. A man named Harvey from one of the prairie provinces came to the head of the lakes about a year and a half ago bringing in unfinished sheep which he fed there on screenings. He brought them in very ordinary selling condition and he fed them during the winter on screenings he obtained almost for nothing, because the refuse screenings at that time were really used for fuel in a number of the business blocks of the city. I have forgotten how many sheep he had, but I think the number was around 10,000; and he fed them on the refuse screenings which he got practically for a song. He sold those sheep in the spring very much fattened and in excellent shape for market, and he made a very profitable deal in the transaction. This winter he has increased the number of the sheep he is feeding there, and although I cannot give the exact figure, I think it is around 20,000. This winter, although he has had to pay a higher price for these refuse screenings, he is fattening a large number of sheep in the same way as he did last winter. So it shows the possibilities for the future from the live stock standpoint, which is probably one of the most important branches of agriculture not only in my section of the country—in which naturally I am interested—but throughout the whole Dominion. Formerly these refuse screenings were of no value to the elevator people and were taken out and dumped into the lake. According to replies given by the minister to questions placed on the order paper, and to letters written by myself, the Board of Grain Commissioners claim that the elevator companies have been losing money in handling these screenings. Then it is claimed in rebuttal by one of the dealers at the head of the lakes in letters to me and to other members in this House—at least I assume so from some of the questions put on the order paper—that if he could get these screenings at a fair price he could make a very fine stock feed out of them. And the fact that last winter so many sheep were fattened simply on the refuse screenings shows that they contain very good feed for stock.

Mr. MILLAR: Could the hon. gentleman tell us whether the owners of those sheep sustained any loss by reason of some of their stock being attacked by disease, said to be due to their being fed on these screenings?

Mr. MANION: No. I know the gentleman quite well and his first lot were a great success. I believe this winter—I have only a hazy recollection of it—some disease did develop, but it had nothing to do with the feeding. The first winter he fattened ten thousand sheep very successfully with very little shelter—only an old plant which had been built for another purpose; but this winter I am not sure that he has any shelter at all for his sheep, and the last I heard they promised to be as successful a lot as he fattened the previous winter. It was a very unexpected result, and if my hon. friends on my left do not know about it I imagine they will be more interested in the success of the experiment than any other hon. members. Mr. Harvey is the gentleman who has made such a success in the use of these screenings for the fattening of sheep. Therefore, this whole question of screenings might very well be thoroughly looked into not only from the standpoint of the fattening of sheep, but in relation to stock feeding generally. I might add that I have been told someone is going to bring in a number of cattle next winter to fatten on these refuse screenings and counts on having the same success as Mr. Harvey has had with sheep. But there is also the phase of the question which my hon. friends to the left have brought up on several occasions this session, namely, that the grain trade was not treating the wheat growers fairly. The remarks of my hon. friend who has just sat down (Mr. Millar) show that he at least is thinking of that phase. From what I have read in the press many farmers feel that they have not been able to get back, even from the government elevators at Saskatoon and other points, the screenings to which they are entitled. I read an article recently in a newspaper in which a farmer stated that he had shipped a car of wheat from one of the prairie provinces to Vancouver, and that by the time the car reached Vancouver he had lost money on the shipment owing to the freight he had to pay on the dockage. He claimed—and he is supported by others—that if he had got back what was coming to him—I do not say this positively for I am not a grain man, but I have heard it said at different times by experienced grain men—that if he had got back the broken wheat and various other grains and seeds in the screenings of value as feed he would have been in a position to gain very markedly on his shipment. I only refer to that in passing. My hon. friends to my left probably are very much more familiar with the question than I am and will be able to judge as to the correctness of the claim, but I know it has been very much discussed among grain men at the head of the lakes.

I repeat, I think the minister would do well to have the whole question investigated, because I do not think it is the policy of those

in charge of the government elevators to treat the farmers of the West unfairly. Certainly those elevators were not only built for the convenience of the western farmers, but also for another purpose—that of acting as a check upon the privately owned elevators. In the past at least there have been vast amounts of overages which were very, very valuable in nearly all the elevators, including those operated by the government. So the minister has within his power an opportunity, through the Board of Grain Commissioners—and I am sure he will be glad to take advantage of it—to look into this whole question and see that justice is done. That is all I am asking. I have no interest whatever in any shape, manner or form in the grain business except as a citizen of this country, but I am slightly familiar with it as a resident at the head of the lakes where we have such immense elevator capacity.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Mr. STEVENS: Pardon me, Mr. Chairman, no. The minister was to give us an answer.

Mr. ROBB: May I repeat again that it will be a subject for inquiry. Already the Board of Grain Commissioners have suggested to Mr. Clark of the Department of Agriculture, who has charge of the administration of the Stock Feeds Act, that he should go up to Fort William and ascertain the real value of these screenings.

Mr. STEVENS: I wish the minister would be good enough to refer the observations made by my hon. friend for Fort William (Mr. Manion) and those I am about to make now to whatever body is going to consider this matter. The crux of the screenings problem was I think brought up in a question asked a few weeks ago by one of the members from Manitoba—I have forgotten his riding. It is so difficult sometimes to approach a question of this kind without appearing to be more or less viciously attacking the elevator interests, and therefore I should like to make it perfectly clear that that is not my object at the moment. There is a statement of fact, however, which I desire to make, and I am sure it cannot be gainsaid. It is this, that when a car of wheat is first cleaned dockage is made because of the presence of a certain percentage of dirt—chaff, seeds and so forth. In that first dockage there is a large proportion of broken wheat, oats, buckwheat, flaxseed and purposes. That belongs rightly to the other grains that are very valuable for feed farmer, and he should get full value for it.

11 p.m.

That fact, I think, is admitted, and this is what I want my hon. friends to my left to get as well: That it is not the screenings that are sold at $1.50 a ton that was referred to the other day. The screenings sold for $1.50 a ton is the residue after this first screenings has been put through a second process and all the valuable wheat, oats, buckwheat, flaxseed and other grains taken out. Then the residue, weed seeds, chaff and stuff of that character is sold for $1.50 a ton. The point I want to make is this: There is no justification for any company doing that, retaining the full value of the broken wheat and such like grains taken out of the first screenings. That is the justifiable complaint that my hon. friends to my left and the farmers they represent in the West have. I pointed out in 1919 and in 1920 in the House, as well as on other occasions, that it was an injustice to the farmer. It was a loss of valuable grains which belonged to him, and he had a right to complain. I think that we ought to find some way, and we had this in mind a little over a year ago when the other commission was working upon this, of so adjusting the regulations and controlling the terminal elevators that the farmer would get the full value of these screenings.

There is another feature. According to the law, when a dockage is made the shipper or farmer gets the value or warehouse receipt for the wheat less the dockage. When the dockage is ascertained the shipper is supposed to get credit for that. Now through ignorance very frequently, and when I say ignorance I mean simply ignorance of his rights, the shipper does not claim that credit, and it has not been made obligatory upon the elevator actually to make the entry and advise him of it. In other words, a great many elevators take the stand; It is there, if they like to claim it, well and good. But if they do not know enough to claim it they do not get it. That is one complaint the farmers have which should be corrected by regulation.

Then next is this, and it is even more important. I have already cited the process of a second cleaning. What the shipper or the farmer is entitled to from the elevator is the full value of the screenings from the first cleaning, less, of course, the charges for cleaning, which charges are fixed by the schedule. He is entitled to the full value, but he does not get it. That is the point I want to make, and I would suggest that these references of mine, perhaps imperfectly made to-night, should be brought to the attention of whoever is going to investigate the matter and a serious effort be made to adjust that problem.

Mr. ROBB: Does the complaint apply only to the government elevators? Does it not apply also to the Saskatchewan Elevator Company?

Mr. STEVENS: To all elevators. I will speak with absolute positiveness up to 1919. It included all elevators at the head of the lakes up to that time. I cannot speak with the same positiveness since, because since 1920 I have not personally checked up the figures, but I know that the conditions are the same; there has been no change. I asked some questions in the House the other day. I am not in a position nor do I wish to weary the House with any detailed analysis of these questions and answers—

Mr. MILLAR: The remarks my hon. friend has just made do not apply to the mixing elevators, do they?

Mr. STEVENS: No, because the mixing elevator must own its grain. It purchases it outright. I am referring to the public terminal elevators. I could name them. I have a list, but my hon. friend knows them. It is practically all the elevators at the head of the lakes, those known as public terminal elevators operating under license from the Grain Commission. The mixing or private elevator purchases its grain outright, and of course once in full possession of it, it can do what it likes with it. I do not want my hon. friend to think for a moment I am discussing now the question of whether it is advisable to permit mixing. I know the problem and would be prepared to discuss it, but I do not think it is germane to this question.

I asked certain questions which will be found on Hansard on page 1661. One was this:

> What is the information as applied to public terminal elevators and the government elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur:—(a) Total amount of wheat scalpings shipped from same: (b) total amount of oats scalpings shipped from same.

The answer to that is this, and I want to submit to the minister that I am not particularly complaining about the answer other than to say that I feel that more accurate information ought to be in the possession of the commission or the department:

> The board is unable to furnish the amount of wheat or oat scalpings shipped or received as they are included in the records of the board as elevator scalpings. In consequence no separate record is available showing the composition or quantities of either wheat or oat scalpings handled by terminal elevators.

Frankly I question the correctness of the answer. If it is correct, I would suggest that some record be kept of these important matters? I also asked this question:

> (c) Total amount of second recleaned scalpings shipped from same.

To which the answer was:

> From public terminal elevators, 3,705 tons; from government elevators, 633 tons.

From further answers it will be noted that there were 7,000 tons and 44,000 tons, showing that there is a very large quantity of these screenings and scalpings dealt with by the elevators.

What I am going to say now is not assertive; I am not in a position to assert, and yet I am fully satisfied in my own mind that it is the case. The cream or the valuable grain seeds in these screenings is appropriated by the elevator companies, and pooled by them and shipped to Minneapolis. I wish the minister would note what I say in that regard. I want just simply to assert that as in my opinion correct, without having under my hand proof. The minister will find if he will request his commission to make an investigation that what I say is true. If it is true, then it is not a square deal to the shipper; that is all there is to it.

Let me turn to another phase of this elevator question, and again I do not advance what I am going to say in the way of an attack on the elevator companies so much as an argument on the question of system. Under the Grain Act the grain commissioners fix a charge for the use of the elevators—for the elevating of the grain, for fifteen days storage, and so forth. Now, under the figures that I gave this House, over a period of years, it was shown that the elevators got a return on capital invested of about 8 per cent without taking into consideration either overages or screenings. Plus screenings, and leaving out overages, their return amounted to about 13 per cent. Taking an average through, including overages, their return ran into enormous sums which varied and went as high as 75 or 80 per cent—very high earnings. Now, what I am getting at is this: Those screenings did not properly, in equity, belong to the elevators. They may by the distortion of the law, perhaps, establish an ownership; but I want to say that in the spirit and intent of the law, and in equity, they did not properly belong to them. That being the case, I am perfectly sure of my ground in that regard, what I am getting at is this: If the elevator companies can show that if they are deprived of the revenue from screenings they cannot earn what is a reasonable return, then it is the duty of the Grain Commissioners to fix their fees so that they can earn a reasonable return. But I know this, that if you add the

overages to the returns by fees their earnings are not only sufficient but very very large. I argued in 1919 and 1920, and I argue to-night, that the duty of the grain board is to fix the elevator fees at a figure that will give to the elevators a proper return for the services they render, whatever that may be decided upon; but in so far as the overages and the screenings are concerned, they should not be permitted to become a part of the revenue of the elevator companies.

Mr. BROWN: If I understand rightly there was an amendment to the Grain Act that allowed the government to appropriate all over a certain percentage of the overages. Is that being carried out?

Mr. STEVENS: As far as I know it is.

Mr. BROWN: Then, of course, the overages cannot now be anything like they were in former days.

Mr. STEVENS: I am glad my hon. friend—

Mr. ROBB: Before my hon. friend deals with that, I should like to mention that the government owns but a very limited percentage of the storage at Fort William and Port Arthur; there is a large part of it owned by the men who ship grain there from co-operative companies.

Mr. STEVENS: I want the minister to realize that I am not directing this as against government operation at all but against the system.

Mr. ROBB: The elevator system?

Mr. STEVENS: Against the whole elevator system, the control and handling of grain at the head of the lakes. In answer to my hon. friend for Lisgar (Mr. Brown) I may say that in 1919 I brought to the attention of the House this frightful abuse of privilege, and I showed by figures definitely how these overages were made up and the enormous quantity. I showed, I think, beyond contradiction—in fact the figures were never questioned—that something over $15,000,000 worth of grain in the preceding few years had been appropriated at that time contrary to the act. I took the stand at that time that I take to-night—

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Is that in overages?

Mr. STEVENS: In overages. I took the stand then, and I take it to-night, that we as a parliament should never have allowed the elevators to retain those overages. I am aware the elevators will say, "Oh, we are making a shortage and we require overages to make up the shortages." But the figures I gave were the net figures, after allowing them to cover their shortage. As a matter of fact, the amount of shortage returned is only a modicum of the amount of overage that yearly accrues, and if the House, or any member interested, will take the two, from 1912 down to the present time, the last 11 years, I venture to say the shortage will not amount to two per cent of the overages so that it is a negligible quantity. Well, I argued that those overages should not be allowed to be retained by the elevator companies, and I showed at that time that the permission to retain them was in itself an inducement to create the overages—

Mr. ROBB: Hear, hear.

Mr. STEVENS: That was the crux of the whole business, and that was why I sought to have the law, as it was then, observed, because according to the law they were not permitted to have them. However, in 1919 the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar), Mr. Maharg, then member for Maple Creek, Mr. Reid, then member for Mackenzie, and some other hon. gentlemen questioned the advisability of the stand I took and they attacked me. Well, I am of rather a forgiving and merciful nature; I desire to forget those things. Anyway, they took exception to my stand and they made this declaration: They said that speaking for the farmers of the prairies they felt there was no particular abuse in that regard, and they suggested that one-half of one per cent should be permitted to the elevator companies. Well, that did not seem very much and when one says it quickly, without giving it any thought, one-half of one per cent sounds a pretty small quantity. But now what do we find? We find this: Not only do they retain one-half of one per cent, but there is an impression that they do something else. The one-half of one per cent has no basis in law or in equity; it is simply an arbitrary figure fixed; there was no logic in fixing it and no reason; there were no previous figures on which it could be based; there were no lack of earnings on which it could be based—there was absolutely no basis for it at all but an arbitrary basis. Well, they not only take their one-half of one per cent, but there is a grave suspicion that some at least—I will not say all by any means—that some at least treat the excess, or much of the excess above the one-half of one per cent in other ways more devious and dark than visible, and the practice of dockage is going on to almost as great an extent, I think, as ever. Therefore, when this commission sits

I believe the main question for it to consider is the making of such regulations, and the providing of such fees, as will remove this abuse and remove the temptation—shall I say?—the inducement to extract from the grain at the head of the lakes this illegal tribute—or inequitable tribute because it is made legal by the amendment I referred to.

But that is not all. You have got to go further back than that. You have got to go back to the country elevator and you have also got to meet a similar situation there because, as anybody knows, the grain is frequently either bought outright there or, if it is not, a dockage is made on the country elevators. So that the commission has a very important duty to perform, and I believe this: It will be found, without very much trouble, that a substantial increase of the return can be given to the shipper; and after all when you take into consideration this great problem—and I think that most of us realize that it is one of the most gigantic problems we have facing the commercial life of this country—after all there is no short cut to the increase of value to the farmers of the plains; there is no mystic wand that you can wave to get them a higher price for their wheat. You are going to get a higher price for the farm products of the prairies by lowering the cost of moving the goods to the seaboard, more perhaps than in any other way, and it does not matter so much whether that is in the way of lowering freight rates, or lowering of handling charges, or what not, but what I do say is this: we have got to check every detail of the process, and it is quite an expensive process.

You take your grain from your threshing machine, you haul it to the country elevator, and there is a certain amount of leakage, shrinkage, and such like, and fees charged for. It is shipped then to the terminal, and there is a certain amount of dockage, transfer fees and so on. It comes down the lakes and is retransferred at Port Colborne or some other point, and there you have another charge. It goes to Montreal, and must be loaded from the ship, transferred to the elevator there, and after that, if you follow the thing through, and you have charges for warehouse receipts, bank interest discount and insurance, it will soon mount up to a measurable margin between what it brings in the ultimate market and what is received by the farmer. So that the duty of the department, and what we were trying to get at two years ago through the commission which was appointed, and what I hope we will accomplish by the next commission, is to so check over the process so that the actual cost will be reduced to a minimum, safeguarding the legitimate rights of those doing the business, but that every measure of waste that is now going on, every shrinkage, every dockage that is not absolutely essential shall be eliminated, and where any dockage is made that every pound that belongs to the farmer shall go back to him.

Take a carload of wheat of, say, 1,000 bushels; there is a 5 per cent dockage which means 50 bushels. Fifty bushels in comparison with 1,000 bushels is very small, but there is no reason why it should be ignored. Or, we will take it another way. Suppose that out of that 50 bushels there are 30 bushels of good grain—and I believe I am about right in suggesting that that is the case in most intsances—that 30 bushels of good grain may be cracked or it may be this, that and the other, it may not be No. 1, but it will be, at least available for first class feed. That is of value to the farmer. It might only represent a few dollars and may not seem a very serious matter, but when you add to that, as I have already pointed out, a little shrinkage here and a little overcharge there, it means a big thing in the long run and in the aggregate to the farming community.

Mr. LUCAS: In the hon. member's opinion are the elevators entitled to any dockage whatever?

Mr. STEVENS: The hour is getting late and I really do not want to pursue the subject. I will say no. In making that categorical answer, I am quite aware that I am opening up quite a field of discussion, but the point I have been endeavouring to make—and I think it ought to be the objective of any inquiry—is that the elevators are entitled to a fair remuneration for the services rendered. That remuneration ought to be fixed for them under the Grain Act. It is always a dangerous thing, I do not care what business it is, to permit any person to have the privilege of extracting a portion of a commodity handled as a part of his fees for handling it, whether it is wheat or any other commodity. It is not done in any other line. You do not let the railway company take part of the goods as a fee for transportation. We fix a rate for them to charge. We do not let a railway company take part of a carload of wheat to pay for possible losses on the trip. We say to them "You deliver that cargo at the head of the lakes, and deliver it at so much a hundred pounds." That is all they will get. I do not see why an elevator company, which is a common carrier, should have any different method of remuneration than a railway company, because both are common carriers.

Mr. FORKE: There is this difference, that there is a loss in weight in handling grain that must be provided for.

Mr. STEVENS: There is a loss in weight in transportation.

Mr. BROWN: You would not approve of the regulation of the grain commission whereby, in the case of a car carrying 3 per cent dockage, the elevator remunerates itself by taking the 3 per cent.

Mr. STEVENS: I do not think it is fair to the shipper at all.

Mr. BROWN: It is a question of toll or money charge.

Mr. STEVENS: Let me put it in this way: if you ship a car load of goods to a man, it may be boots or shoes or anything else—let us forget wheat for a minute—and he has the privilege of dealing with those goods, and of retaining for himself a certain quantity, say 3 per cent, he is going to see that he gets the 3 per cent, if he can. If there is any possibility of him getting it, he is going to get it. If you eliminate that feature you eliminate the temptation to him of extracting anything.

Mr. ROBB: I shall direct the attention of the commission to the remarks of my hon. friend.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): What is the status of the Manitoba litigation in regard to the Grain Act?

Mr. ROBB: It is before the court.

Item agreed to.

Mr. ROBB: There are some steamship subventions not yet voted, but perhaps we might adjourn now.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King, the House adjourned at 11.35 p.m.

INDEX

SECOND SESSION—FOURTEENTH PARLIAMENT, 1923

Abbreviations:—1r., 2r., 3r.,=First, second, third reading. Admn.=Administration. Amdt.=Amendment. Com.=Committee. Dept.=Department. Div.=Division. Govt.=Government. M.=Motion. Neg.=Negatived. Qu.=Question. Ref.=Reference. Rep.=Report. Res.=Resolution. Sec.=Section.

Abattoirs. *See* Cold Storage Act Amdt.; Live Stock Acts Amdt.

Abbott's Harbour, N.S., breakwater, 4563

Abitibi Region
Colonization and settlement, 1401
Transcontinental railway, 2833

Abolition of Capital Punishment. *See* Capital Punishment

Abolition of Grand Jury system. *See* Grand Jury

Academy of Arts. *See* Royal Academy of Arts

Accidents
Automobile, 3958
Canadian National Safety League, 3954
Industrial and other, 3957
Insurance, 3978

Accounts. See Board of Audit Act; Finance

Accredited Herds. *See* Animal Contagious Diseases; Live Stock, Health of Animals

Acland, Mr. F. A. *See* King's Printer; Printing Bureau

Acoustics. *See* House of Commons

Actions. *See* Bankruptcy Act Amdt.

Active Militia. *See* National Defence.

Actuarial Computations. *See* Labour, Annuities

Adams, Dr. Frank, the coal situation, 1265

Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 9, 34, 54, 75, 99, 122
Mover (Mr. Putnam) 9
Seconder (Mr. Rheaume) 16
Amendment (Mr. Hoey) 65; neg. 178
Amdt. to (Mr. Shaw) 72; neg. 177
Motion agreed to, 179

Address—*Con.*
Speakers, Messrs: Bancroft, 99; Baxter, 132; Black (Yukon) 85; Brown, 47; Carroll, 80; Drayton, 153; Duff, 108; Evans, 145; Fielding, 89; Forke, 34; Graham, 54; Hoey, 63; amdt. 65; Hughes, 123; Kellner, 106; King, Mackenzie, 27; Lewis, 117; Lucas, 75; McConica, 166; McMaster, 172; Martell, 101; Meighen, 17; Millar, 50; Neill, 174; Raymond, 160; Robinson, 72; Shaw, 66; amdt. to amdt., 72; Stewart (Leeds), 169; Stork, 149; Woodsworth, 41

Acknowledgment of by Governor General, 1256

Legislation referred to in, qu. 2612

Adjournments. *See* House of Commons

Adjustment of War Claims. *See* War Claims

Administration. *See* Government

Administration of Justice. *See* Justice

Admiralty Act Amdt. Bill (Deputy Local Judges and Deputy Registrars) Res., 1080, 2051; 1r., 2r., com., 2052; com., 3r., 2204

Adulteration of Grain. *See* Grain

Adulteration of Mill Feeds. *See* Feeding Stuffs Act

Advertising. *See* Immigration; Labour; Magazines and Periodicals; Press; Publicity

Advisory Council. *See* Research

Advisory Fuel Committee. *See* Fuel Supply.

Advisory Tariff Commission. *See* Tariff

Advocate, N.S., wharf, 4560

Aeronautics, etc. *See* Air.

Aeroplanes. *See* Air; National Defence, Canadian Air Force

After War Conditions, 1231. *See also* War

Agassiz experimental farm. *See* Agriculture

Age of Consent. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.

Agricultural Conditions. *See* Agriculture

Agricultural Fairs. *See* Exhibitions

Agricultural Implements. *See also* speeches on Budget; Reciprocity with United States; Treaties, French Treaty
Comparative prices, 1912 and 1922, 1407
Duties, 2756, 2815, 2848, 2974, 2990, 3033
See also Budget; Customs Tariff
Complaint of, 2863
Increased by increased price, 2848, 2975
Reduction of, 2743
Free admission to United States, 3017, 3062, 3499
French Treaty, 2001, 2246
Georgia pine, importation for, 3411
Imports, qu. 617
Live stock, required to purchase, 1408
Manufacturing of, 2247
Meighen, Right Hon. Mr., speech in 1911, 2848, 2974
Prices, 2836, 2991, 3070. *See also that title*
Comparison with United States, 2739
Standardization, 789, 805
Stumping machines, duty, 2653, 2749, 2955, 3486
Taxation of, 1850
Wheat, bushels required to purchase, 1912 and 1922, 1408

Agricultural Institute. *See* Agriculture

Agricultural Instruction Act. *See* Agriculture

Agricultural Labourers. *See* Farmers; Immigration; Labour

Agriculture. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget; Grain and Grain Trade; Immigration
Accredited herds. *See* Animal Contagious Diseases; Live Stock, Health of Animals
Agricultural conditions, 641, 1165, 1189, 1190, 1192, 1196, 1201, 1231, 1357, 1398, 1402, 1407, 1423, 1438, 1841-47, 1880, 2797, 2810, 2815, 2829, 2830, 2861, 2872, 2928, 2961, 3002, 4038. *See also* Western Provinces
Aird, Sir John, 1407
"Calamity howlers", 2928, 2977

Agriculture—*Con.*
Agricultural Conditions—*Con.*
Canada generally, 2763
Farmers' profits, 2873
Financing. *See* Bank Act Amdt. bill; Credits
Great Britain in. *See that title*
Interest rates 2962
Larcombe, Mr. Samuel, statement, 2873
Parliament difficult to convince, 2730
Past and present price comparison, 2978
Pioneering, 2870
Prince Edward Island, 2972
Production costs and prices, 2835
Special Committee
Appointed, 706
Bradshaw Mr. Thomas, statement, 2829
Evidence, 2972
Inquiry as to, 667
Leave to report, 911
Leitch Prof., dairying industry, 1843, 1845, 1851, 1858
Oleomargarine, 3271
Railway and shipping combine, 1395
Reports qu. 2612
First, 911
Second, 986
Third, 1136
M. (Mr. McMaster) for concurrence, 1209
Fourth, 2127. *See also* Combines; Freight Rates
Interim, printing, 2181
Fourth, Fifth, Sixth and Seventh
M. (Mr. McMaster) for concurrence, 4295, 4363
Fifth, 4007
Sixth and Seventh 4075
Tariff Commmission evidence, 2296
United States. *See that title*
Western provinces 1885, 2845. *See also that title*
Agricultural Credits. *See* Credits
Agricultural education 2869
Agricultural exports, 1904. *See also* Imports and Exports
Agricultural fairs. *See also* Exhibitions
Horse-racing, 726, 750
Agricultural Instruction Act, 3315. *See also* Marshall, Mr. Duncan
Grant 607
Renewal of, qu. 490
Agricultural lands, 1344. *See also* Immigration; Lands
Agricultural loans. *See* Credits
Agricultural products 1857, 2716
Beans, 2981
Distribution, 1852, 2868

Agriculture—*Con.*
Agricultural Products—*Con.*
Duties on, qu. 1992
Comparison with United States, 2958
Reduction by order in council 2650
United States tariff against 2649, 2650
Exports, 1390, 1838, 3061. *See also* Imports and Exports
Freight rates, 3195. *See also that title*
French treaty, 1978, 2006, 2247. *See also,* Treaties, French Treaty
Imports, 445, qu. 617, 2708, 2917, 2958, *See also* Imports and Exports; United States
United States from, 1249
Markets, 1410, 1414, 2869, 3066, 4027. *See also* Markets; Treaties, French Treaty
Competitive, 1804
Disorganized, 2861
France, 2235
Great Britain, 1905, 2714
Marketing agent in, 4675
Home market fallacy, 2849
Marketing and quality, live stock, 2862 *See also* Live Stock.
Prices, 1168, 2731, 2748, 2861, 2928, 3018, 3069. *See also* Prices
Europe in, 1052
Manufactured products and, 1083, 1407, 1851, 1885, 1907
Production cost, 1858
United States, 2810, 2910. *See also that title*
Agricultural representative in Great Britain, 3291
Agriculture and Colonization Committee
Changes in personnel, 2926, 3261
Oleomargarine, discussion, 3266
Reports
First, 666, 858
Second, 911
Third, 986
Fourth, 1441
Fifth, 2204
Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill, 1441
Assistance to, 2947, 3237. *See also* Bounties
Bacon production. *See* Bacon
Bacteriology, 462
Bad farming, 1887, 2809, 2810, 2812
Banking system and, 4014. *See also* Bank Act Amdt. Bill; Banks and Banking; Credits; speeches on Budget
Bee-keeping, suppression of foul brood, 4675
Biological laboratories, 580
Bonus, 3239
Bovine tuberculosis. *See* Live Stock, Health of Animals

Agriculture—*Con.*
British Columbia, increased production, 1432
Butter. *See* Dairying Industry
Canadian Council of. *See that title*
Cereals, milling and baking test, 463
Cheese. *See* Dairying Industry
Combines and, 2786, 2787. *See also* Combines
Commissioner. *See* Marshall, Mr. Duncan
Committee on. *See under this title,* Agriculture and Colonization
Conditions. *See under this title,* Agricultural Conditions
Co-operation, 1400, 1852, 2869. *See also* Co-operation; Markets
Dairying Industry. *See that title*
Dehydration of fruits and vegetables, 4674
Department
Commissioner of. *See* Marshall, Mr. Duncan
Cook, Mr. Leonard, qu. 2179
Deputy Minister, 2065
Salary, 611, 4669
Deduction for rent of house, 4669
Dryden, Mr. W. A., qu. 384
Trip to South America, qu. 1031, 3294, qu. 3704, 3705
Employees, 815
Estimates, 456, 575, 3283, 3303, 3988, 4074
Marshall, Mr. Duncan. *See that title.*
Officials attending fairs, 285
Salaries and contingencies 610, 3303
Seed branch, 4621
Staff, 2756
Stuart, Mr. John Cameron, qu. 2179
Depression in, 1083, 1889. *See also* Immigration, and *under this title,* Agricultural Conditions
Destructive Insect and Pest Act
Administration, 595, 3988. *See also,* Insect Pests
Diseases of Animals. *See* Live Stock, Health of Animals
Economic organization, 1857, 1858, 1863
Eggs. *See that title*
Entomological branch 3988
Forest destruction by insects, qu. 2178. *See also* Forests and Forestry
Experimental and illustration farms, 456, 3237
Agassiz, 457
Botany, division, forest destruction, 2178. *See also* Forests and Forestry
Brandon, 457, 459
British Columbia, 458

Agriculture—*Con.*
Experimental Farms—*Con.*
Buildings, 4629
Cap Rouge, 459
Central, Ottawa, 456, 465, 485, 2869
Buildings, 4631
Charlottetown, 460, 470
Fredericton, 460, 471
Grain, new varieties, 483
Harrow, 466
Indian Head, 459, 472
Irrigation, Brooks demonstration farm, 3429
Kapuskasing, 459
Kentville, 460
Lacombe, 458, 471
La Ferme, Quebec, 471
Lennoxville, 460
Lethbridge, 458
Livestock, 460-485. *See also that title*
Nappan, 457, 460
Dairy herd, experiment with, 2863
Morden, 459
M. (Mr. Leader) to reduce appropriation, neg. 486
Overlapping, 4633
Publicity, 463, 470
Rosthern, 460
Ste. Anne de la Pocatiere, 460, qu. 1028
Scott, 458
Summerland, 464
Swift Current, 458
Farm credits, 1088, 2869, *See also* Bank Act; Credits
Farm homes, 1215. *See also* Housing
Farm labour, 1166 ,1174, 1424, 1427, 1475, 2876. *See also* Immigration; Labour
Competition with protected industries, 2731
Demand for, 1168
Immigration of, 1100
Farm loans and mortgages, 170-1, 2763, 2962, 4041. *See also* Bank Act; Credits
Farm products. *See under this title* Agricultural Products
Farm women, 1844
Farmers. *See also that title*
City man and, 2869
Earnings, 2813, 3023
In parliament, 2787. *See also* Progressive party
National policy, 2917
Feeding Stuffs, adulteration. *See* Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill
Fertilizers. *See that title*
Field crops, 1889, 2861
Competitions, 600, 602
Production of, 2846
Value, 2845, 2934

Agriculture—*Con.*
Forage plants, 463
Free land available for settlement, 1087
French treaty, 2006. *See also* Treaties, French Treaty
Fruit. *See that title*
Grain-growing. *See* Grain and Grain Trade
Grants to provinces, qu. 490
Grasshoppers, 2774. *See also under this title*, Destructive Insects; Insect pests
Health of Animals. *See* Animal Contagious Diseases; Live Stock
Hudson Bay region, possibilities of, 1065
Immigration and, 1186, 1228. *See also* Immigration
Income tax. *See also* Taxation
Agricultural forms, 4498
Payments by farmers, qu. 1259
Insect pests and fungus diseases, 2774. *See also* Forests and Forestry; Insect Pests
Interest rates in western Canada, 1088. *See also* Bank Act; Budget speeches; Credits
International Institute of Agriculture, 599
Land. *See also* Dominion Lands; Lands
Along national railways, price, 1087
Sale of in western provinces. *See* Immigration, Canada Colonization Association
Live stock. *See that title*
Maritime provinces, conditions in, 1132
Markets. *See under this title* Agricultural Products; *also* Markets
Methods, 3071
Mixed farming, 2747, 2772, 2862, 2953
National policy and, 2786
Needs of, 3065
Noble Foundation farm, 2813
Noxious weeds, 1887, 1888, 2305. *See also* Seed
Organizations, 2976
Plant pathology, 463
"Plutocrats and profiteers," burden of, 1417-18
Poor farming, allegation of. *See under this title* Bad farming
Potatoes. *See* Vegetables
Production, cost of, 640, 1190, 1410
Profitable lines of, 2862
Publications. *See* Government Publications
Review of. *See under this title* Experimental Farms
Sacrifices, 3065
Seed. *See that title*
Seed testing. *See* Seed
Single-crop farming, 2862
Specialized, 2763
Stability, 3068

Agriculture—*Con.*
Tariff and, 1355. *See also* Budget; Tariff
Two ministers of, 3313
Votes for, 3237
Wages of farm labourers. *See* Labour
Weed menace, 1887, 1888, 2305
Wheat-growing. *See* Grain and Grain Trade

Air Board, annual report, 4510

Air Force. *See* National Defence

Air Service. *See also* Canadian Air Force, under National Defence
Destructive insects and pests, control of, 597
Forest patrol. *See* Forests and Forestry

Aird, Sir John
Agricultural conditions, 1407
Prices, agricultural implements and farm products, 1409

Alaskan, steamship, wreck of, 1212, 1659, qu. 1763, 3160, 3330

Alberta. *See also* Western Provinces
Agricultural conditions, 1435, 1438, 2766. *See also* Agriculture; Freight Rates; Immigration
Alberta Drainage Company, 3144
Bank Act revision, 4016, 4041, 4045, 4048
Bituminous sands, 3198
Butter shipments to China, 1840
Change of government, 2799, 2810
Coal, 790, 1262, 1265, 1275, 1281, 1282, 4692. *See also* Coal; Freight Rates; Fuel Supply
Canadian National Railways, qu. 1363, qu. 4437, qu. 4752
Consumption in Ontario, 1276
Freight rates on, 1280, 2781, 2828
Mines, 3424
Crown lands, revenue from, qu. 2515
Dairying industry, 1839, 1851, 2766
Production 1921, 2774
Destitution, 1440
Dominion forest reserves, 1256, 2061
Dredging, 1012
Farms, abandoned, 67
Freight rates, 1957, 1958. *See also that title*
Grain production, 1435
Harbours and rivers, 1001, 4589
Hemp production, 2780. *See also* Hemp Bounty bill
Highways. *See* Canada Highways bill; Immigration, 1476. *See also that title*
Indians, 2145
Insolvent farmers, 1202
Iron ore, 2512
Irrigation, 1436, 3428
Liberal Convention, 2995

Alberta—*Con.*
Mixed farming, 2772
Natural resources, revenue, qu. 2515
Oil, 2802
Bounty, 2510
Oil-drilling, 2508
Prospecting and developing, 780
Political patronage, 522
Privy Council decision, 2559
Public buildings, 1023
Sales tax collections, qu. 2417
Sessional indemnity, reduction, 1155
Settlers' relief, 3447
Tax sales, 4062
Telegraph and telephone lines, 2683
Tourist traffic, 3438
United Farmers of Alberta
Economic group organization, 3003
Freight rates, 3190
Immigration, 1440
Vermilion, town lots, qu. 489, 1307, 2417

Alcohol, denatured. *See* Inland Revenue

Alderson Claim. *See* Live Stock

Alfred peat plant. *See* Fuel Supply.

Aliens. *See also* Immigration; Labour; Naturalization Act Amdt.
Convicted, deportation of, 2123
Enemies.
Citizenship, 1380
Immigration, restriction of, 1128. *See also* Immigration Act Amdt. bill
Property, 2499. *See also* War Claims
Claim of Canada against United States, 2496, 3823
Custodian of, qu. 1486
Pugsley, Hon. William, appointed as Commissioner. *See* Pugsley
Securities held by United States custodian, 2496

Alliances, Political. *See also* speeches on Budget; Political Parties
Liberals and Conservatives on Bank Act, 4019, 4048, 4125, 4126, 4142, 4245

Alpine Club grant, 3414, 3444, 3954

Alternative Vote. *See* Proportional Representation

Aluminium Company of America, Massena plant, 659

Ambassador, British, at Washington. *See* British Ambassador; Treaties, Halibut Fishery

Ambassador to United States. *See* Canadian Representation

Amendments. *See* House of Commons

American Bank Note Company, postage stamps, printing, 1818

Americanization. *See* Magazines and Periodicals

Amery, Colonel L. C., 1328
Economic conditions in Great Britain, 1205
West Indies steamship service, 3392

Ammunition. *See* National Defence

Ampthill, Lord, unemployment in Great Britain, 1205

Analyst, certificate of. *See* Inland Revenue Act Amdt. bill

Anchor-Donaldson Line
Immigration, 1193
Ocean freight rates, 2127

Anderson, Captain, report on Hudson bay, 1042

Anderson, Mr. G. C., 1823

Anderson, Mr. R. K. (Halton)
Brant hospital, closing of, 1995
Budget, 2837. Colourless budget drafted for political effect, 2837; Right Hon. Mr. Fielding; reciprocity; free trader in opposition, protectionist in power; tariff record of Liberal party; the tariff; average rate of duty; National policy, adoption by minister, 2838; Minister of Agriculture convert to protection; revenue tariff and incidental protection; excise and customs duty; cost of living; Minister of Interior convert to protection; tariff a tax; who pays? excise taxation, 2839; sales tax and cost of living; collection of tax on domestic and foreign goods; sales tax increase in and revenue; question as to origin of finished articles, 2740; turnover tax; automobile industry; customs duty and sales tax 52 per cent; Liberal platform of 1919, repudiation of; reported statement of Minister of Finance on North Essex election; tariff stability, 2841; economy; balanced budget; public debt; cost of government; expenditure, rapid increase of; reciprocity; Treaty of 1854, 2842; depression following abrogation; Fordney-McCumber tariff; time inopportune for negotiations; lines of transportation; interprovincial and world trade; trade with British Empire; imports and exports; trade lines running East and West; wheat, market for, 2843; immigration, reported statement of Sir Henry Thornton; Bishop Lloyd, 2844; amendment; a political gesture; Progressive platform; attitude of opposition towards budget; western provinces, conditions in; rural income tax-payers, bank stock shareholder; field crops, value by provinces, 2845

Anderson, Mr. R. K.—*Con.*
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 534
Customs officials, Halton county, 914
Dundas street highway, qu. 708
Duties on farm and animal products, qu. 1992
Elevators, Ontario, 2037
French treaty, 455
Highways, grant to Ontario, qu. 620
North Oakville post office, 914
Pensions
Disability entitling to, 679
European war and active militia, 3726
Private abattoirs, 185-6
Proportional representation, M. (Mr Good) 394, 429
Return, inquiry for, 2008
Sales tax on automobiles, qu. 1993, 2841
Soldier Settlement, 2029
Trade and Commerce dept. staff, 2035

Anglo-Canadian commerce. *See* British Preference; Trade

Anglo-Japanese treaty, 1449. *See also* Japan.
Restriction of provincial rights 1453

Anglo-Saxons, a colonizing race, 1426

Angouleme, Que., postmaster, qu. 3139

Animal Contagious Diseases. *See* Dairying Industry; Live Stock, Health of Animals

Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt. Bill. *See also* Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill
(Compensation for slaughter, reduction of)
Res., 666, 2647; 1r., 2r., com., 2048; com., 2131; 3r., 2138
Sections and subjects discussed:
Abortion infective, 2867
Glanders, 2868
Hog cholera, 2867

Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt. Bill—*Con.*
Sections and subjects discussed—*Con.*
Internal parasites, 2867
Research work, 2867
Tuberculin test 2867
Tuberculosis, 2867
Immunization from, 2866
Watson Dr., chief bacteriologist, 2866

Animals. *See also* Live Stock
Inspection of. *See* Live Stock Act Amdt.
Products, duties on, qu. 1992
Wild. *See* National Parks and Reservations
Wolves, destruction of live stock by, 597

Annapolis Royal, wharf, 941

Annual Drill. *See* National Defence

Annuities, Old age. *See* Labour; Pensions

Anti-Combines bill. *See* Combines bill

Anti-Dumping. *See* Customs and Excise

Appeal Boards. *See* Pension Act Amdt bill; Pensions; Soldiers Civil Re-establishment

Appeals
Attorney-General of Ontario vs. Wholesale Grocers, 2051, 2521
Canada Grain Act 781, 2045
From convictions, inquiry, 4250
Narcotic Drugs Act, 1136
Right of. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.; Yukon Act Amdt.

Apples. *See* Fruit

Appointments. See Civil Service

Appropriation Acts
1. Bill No. 103 (Interim Supply—for $44,725,058.25 for 1923-24) Res. 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 1539
2. Bill No. 202 (Interim Supply—for $46,558,391.58 for 1923-24) Res. 3705; 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 3706
3. Bill No. 252 (for $18,202,105.66 for 1922-23 and $196,870,229.79 for 1923-24) Res. 4735; 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 4736

Appropriations set forth in Estimates. *See* Canadian National Railway bills; Estimates

Arbitrators. *See* Judges

Archambault, Mr. Joseph (Chambly and Verchères)
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4099
Bankruptcy Act, M. (Mr. Casgrain) 1503
Belgian Exposition, 496
Bolte, Mr. Camille, 1032, qu. 1138
Budget, 2879. Income tax, 2879; proposed changes; exemption on account of children; community of property; earned and unearned incomes, 2880; income derived from (a) inheritance, (b) accumulated capital, (c) profession or trade; revenue; dividends, 2881
Business of the House
Questions, as orders for returns, 939
Inquiry for, 3507
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Disposal of scrap material, etc., qu. 1138
Tank cars, transportation, qu. 1361
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 528, 567
Civil Service, temporary employees made permanent, qu. 814, 1385
Code Napoleon, 1526, 1558
Contrecœur, wharf, 952
France, reconstruction, 2012
French treaty, 445, 2009, 2262
Grand Trunk, list of shareholders, 940
Greece, loan to, 2010
Imperial conference, 4653
Income tax, exemption for children, M. 1382, 2128, 2880, 4502
Income War Tax Act 1917 Amdt. bill, 4502
Levis dry dock, 1261
Liberal platform, taxation of luxuries, 2011
Montreal-Longeuil bridge, 2086, 2640
Return, inquiry for, 3507
Montreal post office
Appointments, qu. 1361
Bolte, Mr. Camille, 1032, qu. 1138
Political patronage, 528
Public Works Act, tender and contract, 952
Rhineland occupation, qu. 2696
Roumania, loan to, 2010
Trade commissioners, 856

Archibald, Mr. E. S., purchase of thoroughbred stock, 3290

Architects. *See* Parliament Buildings; Public Buildings

Archives. *See* Public Archives

Arctic Expeditions, 4012
Correspondence, 814
New ship, purchase of, 4702
Publication of reports, 3360
Wireless stations. *See* Yukon

Argentine Republic, Senate, 1373

Arichat, wharf, qu. 2180

Armouries. *See* National Defence

Army. *See* National Defence

Army and Navy Veterans, petition, 4536

Army Officers, settlement in Canada, 1432

Aronovici, Mr. A. *See* Canadian National Railways, Paris offices

Arsenals. *See* National Defence

Arsenault, Mr. H. P. *See* House of Commons, Staff

Arthur Young Company. *See* Civil Service

Arthurs, Mr. James (Parry Sound)
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4509
Budget, 3033. Congratulations to Finance Minister; tariff platform of 1921; failure to implement; agricultural implement duty; boots and shoes; tariff changes offset by increased sales tax, 3033; cheque and receipt taxes inconvenient and discriminatory; net increase in duties under budget of 1922; budget of 1923 disappointing; British preference; direct importation through Canadian ports; hardship to the woollen industry; sugar duty; raisins and dried currants; scrap iron; paint ingredients, 3034; potato duty; Fordney-McCumber tariff; crude petroleum bounty; cost of living; French treaty; reductions of duties on luxuries, wines and spirits; favoured nation; prohibitionists and wine duty; 3035; sales tax; pyramiding; freight rates; Crowsnest pass agreement; railway receipts reduced by $20,000,000; reduction made at expense of shipper; rates on lumber, pulpwood and ties; immigration policy; Canada Colonization Association; differences of opinion amongst Liberal and Progressive members, 3036; "blue ruin" speeches; immigrants from Stornoway; northern Ontario and Quebec; agricultural and business conditions, 3037
Canadian Expeditionary Force, enlistments, qu. 1031
Civil Service, salaries and bonus, qu. 2179
Depot Harbour roadway, 4691
Deputy Minister of Agriculture, salary, 4673
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 329
Government workshops, Ottawa, 4617
Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia, 4560
Housing Act, administration, 2171

Arthurs, Mr. James—*Con.*
Immigration Act Amdt. bill, 2429
Mail carriage by subsidized steamships, 2172
Military hospitals, neurological cases, 696
Murray Stewart, vessel, purchase, 3355
Muskoka harbour improvements, 4612
O'Connor, Mr. P. J., qu. 2085
Pensions commission, report, 2128
Petawawa camp and Ontario elections, 3976
Public buildings, new, 4614
Sales tax, 3033-36, 4181
Soldier Settlement Board, loans, qu. 2207
Steamship services, 2171, 2172
Terrebonne public building, 4614
Unemployment relief, 690
Vetcraft shops, 696
Vocational loans, 687
Wireless equipment for vessels, 3355

Artificial Silk. *See* Customs Tariff Items; Textiles, Silk

Artillery. *See* National Defence

Artisans. *See* Immigration; Labour

Arts
Academy of. *See* Royal Academy of Arts
Recognition. *See* Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner)

Ascension Day, adjournment. *See* House of Commons

Ash Wednesday, adjournment. *See* House of Commons

Asiatics. *See* British Columbia, Fisheries; Immigration

Assassination. *See* Immigration Act Amdt.

Assay Office. *See* Mines and Minerals

Assessors. *See* Judges

Assignments. *See* Bankruptcy Act

Assiniboine River
Encroachments of, 999
Expenditure on dyking, etc., qu. 3264
Floods, 993, 998, 3041

Assisted Passages. *See* Immigration

Astrophysical Observatory, Victoria, 3242

Athabasca, Lake, discovery of iron ore, 2512

Athletics. *See* National Defence, Cadet training; Olympic Games

Atlanta Exhibition. *See* Exhibitions

Atlantic Fisheries. *See* Fish and Fisheries

Atlantic Ports. *See* Canadian National Railways; Halifax; Ports; St. John

Attendance of Members. *See* Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill

Attorney General vs. Wholesale Grocers, decision, 2051, 2521

Audibility of Debates. *See* House of Commons

Audit, Board of. *See* Board of Audit Act

Auditing. *See* Bank Act; Canadian National Railways

Auditor General. *See also* Board of Audit
Appointment, qu. 2298, 2710, 3307, 3987, 4355, 4512
Payments to temporary postmasters, 1823
Report
Referred to Public Accounts Committee, 434
Tabled, 8
Salaries and contingencies, 3987, 4674
Unprovided items, 4003
Vacancy. *See under this title,* Appointment

Australia
Australian Commonwealth Bank, 4067, 4075, 4092
British immigration, preference for, 2932
Budget, 2984
Chinese immigration, 2313
Dairying industry, 3297
Empire settlement scheme, 1473
Hughes, Premier, statement at Imperial Conference of 1921, 4663
Immigration policy, 1882
Land settlement, 1389
Participation in Eastern Crisis. *See* Near East Crisis
Pearce, Hon. Senator, 1849
Postal rates, decrease of, 1779
Raisins and currants, duty, 2990, 3017, 3069, 3474
Senate, constitution of, 1370
Tariff shutting out Fiji Islands fruit, 1848
Trade treaty with, 36, 245, 1848, 2815, 2964, 2990, 3069, 3474, 3476
Visit of Minister of Trade and Commerce to, 1849. *See also* Robb
Wool-combing industry, 2866

Austria
Bean-growing industry, 2982
Senate, constitution of, 1371
West Ukrainian Republic. *See that title*

Authors. *See* Copyright Act Amdt. bill.

Automobiles
Accidents, 3958

Automobiles—*Con.*
Admission fee to national parks, 3942, 3943
Automobile industry, protection, 2841
Canadian National Safety League, 3954
Civil servants, and, 1772
Customs and sales taxes, 2841
Duty on, 2908, 3075
Farmers, and, 100, 2812, 2874
Ford car, farmers and, 1466
Ford Motor Company
Organization and efficiency, 2544
Prices, fixing of, 2525
French treaty, 1982, 1990, 1996, 2236
Gasoline
Price, 2547
Short measure, 810
Highways. *See* Canada Highways
Immigration of United States garage owners, 1416
India, shipments to, 508
Insurance, 3147, 3977
Ottawa, in, 2874
Purchase of by instalments, 2874
Railways and, 1619
Sales tax on, qu. 1993, 2841
Saskatchewan in, 82, 148
Taxation, 52%, 2841
Western provinces, 1889

Autonomy. *See* Canada's participation in War; Imperial Conference

Aviation. *See* Air Service

Aylesworth, Sir Allen, decisions. *See* Disallowance

Backus, Mr. E. W. *See* Lake of the Woods Regulation Bill

Bacon. *See also* Live Stock
Bacon industry, 2864
British market, 2864
Canadian, selling price in Great Britain, 1905
Corn-fed, 2865
Danish, 2864, 2865
Grades, 590.
Hog grading, 590
Imports and exports, 938
Pork products, and, 1978
Price of, 2585, 2933
Salty, 3301
Wiltshire sides, 2864

Bait. *See* Fish and Fisheries

Baker, the Late Colonel G. H., M.P.
Memorial to
Special Committee, report, 435, 730, 1256, 1991

Balance of Trade. *See* Treaties, French Treaty

Baldwin, Mr. W. K. (Stanstead)
Annual training, 875

Baldwin, Mr. W. K.—*Con.*
Excise taxes, payment with postage stamps, 1822
Hudson Bay railway, M. (Mr. Knox) 1054
Immigration policy, 1247
Labour, demand for, 1248
Military expenditure, 875
Rural mail service
Carriers, remuneration, 1822
Spur lines, 1826
Tariff protection, 1249
Taxation, increase of, 1822
Woollen industry, 3470

Baldwin, Right Hon. Stanley, budget, 2824

Baldwin Tinplate Industry, 2819. *See* also Tinplate

Balfour, Colonel N. H. *See* Canadian National Railways

Balkan States, credit to. *See* Roumania

Bamfield, B.C., public building, 1024

Bananas
Production in Fiji Islands, 1848
Trust, 2979

Bancroft, Mr. L. P. (Selkirk)
Address in reply, 99. Mr. Carroll and prosperity of the western farmer, 99-100; farmers and automobiles, 100; condition of the West, 100-101; causes of emigration; mixed farming, 101
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4035
Budget, 2736. Liberal tariff policy; amendments moved when in opposition; high cost of living; duties upon necessaries of life; reciprocity; tariff plank chief issue in last election, 2736; rejection of Conservative policy by western provinces; low tariff sentiment; Liberal and Progressive tariff planks almost identical; mandate clear and unmistakable; Tory reactionaries in garb of official Liberalism; tariff; protection responsible for immigration; high prices; reduced purchasing power, 2737; United States largest free trade area in world; per capita customs tax; United States and Canada; prices, comparison of United States and Canada; mail order catalogues, 2738; clothing; sewing machines; paints; agricultural implements; harness, 2739; nails; wire fencing and poultry netting; washing machines; dairy supplies; tools; rubber boots safety razors; prosperity impossible with present production costs; barriers obstructing development of natural industries, 2740
Dominion Lands and Parks branch, 3251
Drawbacks on steel, coal and woollen goods, qu., 1994
Dredging, Grassy Narrows, 1013
Emerson public building, 4628
Grain for exhibition purposes, 1455
Highways, federal grant, 519
Homesteads, improvements, 3251
Indian Affairs, department, salaries, 2165
Indians
Manitoba, 2153
St. Peter's reserve, 2153
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4231, 4283
Lake Manitoba, flooding, 999
Masters and mates, 2610
Parliament buildings, Commons chamber, lighting, 1728
Patrol of northern waters, 3360
Penitentiaries, 771
Privilege—titles—amdt. (Mr. Neill) 1308
Raisins and dried currants, duty, 3476
Royal military college, expenditure, 4628
Rural credit system, 4035
St. Andrew's dam, fishway, 1000
Selkirk wharf, 1000
Shipping combines, 4283
Soldier settlement, 2021
Steamship services, 2173, 2174
West Ukrainian republic, M. (Mr. Campbell) 655

Banff National Park, 3434
Calgary Power Company and, 3442, 3750, 3938
Canmore sanitation, 3434, 3941
Electric plant, 3949
Hotel, 3435
Power privileges, 496, 3750
Water powers, 3420

Banff-Windermere Highway, opening, 3584

Bank Act. *See* also Bank Act Amdt. bill; Banks and Banking; Credit; Finance
Revision, 26, 70, 77, 170, 496, 634, 638, 644, 858, 4014, 4035. *See also* Address; Bank Act Amdt. bill; Budget
Alberta legislature, res., 2084
Canadian Council of Agriculture, 255, 4016, 4041, 4045
Proposed extension of charters for twelve months M. (Mr. Spencer) 683, ruled out of order, 643

Bank Act Amdt. Bill. *See also* Bank Act; Banks and Banking
Res., 1167, 1310; 1r., 2r., 1314; ref. to

Bank Act Amdt. Bill—*Con.*
Banking and Commerce Com., 1314; com., 4013, 4014, 4077, 4133; 3r., 4162; Senate amdts. 4058
Sections and subjects discussed:
Agency, 4093-8
Agreement of sale, 4138
Amendments to Bank Act, 4052, 4056
Antagonism of financiers and farmers, 4044
Assets, sale to another bank, 4134
Audit, chartered accountants, 1311. *See also under this bill,* Shareholders
Australian Commonwealth bank, 4067, 4075, 4092
Bank charters continued to July 1, 1923, as to some particulars, 4014
Amdt. (Mr. Speakman) extending charters for one year 4017, neg. 4075
Amdt. (Mr. Good) to M. for 3r., 4141, neg. 4147
Bank circulation redemption fund continued
Amdt. (Mr. Coote) interest on, neg. 4093
Bank loans, approval by directors, 4098
Bank may sell assets to another bank, 4134
Bank of British North America, 1312, 1313
Bank premises, value of, 4085
Bank statements, 4020, 4030, 4047, 4085, 4139
Banking and Commerce Committee
Evidence, 4039, 4142
Printing, 3887
Banking monopoly, 4045, 4047, 4050, 4087 4103, 4157, 4166
Banking system, 4016, 4029, 4036, 4046, 4051, 4059, 4065
Bradford Chamber of Commerce, prior lien, 1312
Branch banks, 4047, 4122, 4128
Business and powers of the bank, 4093
Amdt, agency (Mr. Garland, Bow River) 4093; withdrawn, 4094
Amdt., insurance, agents for (Mr. Garland, Bow River) 4094, neg. 4098
Canadian Bankers' Association, representation before Com. 4058
Cash reserves in Dominion notes, 4091
Centralization, 4079
Circulation, 4092
Security of, 1312
Co-operative banking, 4067
Criticism of the banks, 4039
Currency, 4072
Depreciated, 4027
National, 4048
Definitions, 4014
Delay in 1909, 1910 and 1911, 4033, 4035

Bank Act Amdt. Bill—*Con.*
Sections and Subjects—*Con.*
Directors, 1313, 4084
Amdt. (Mr. Good) 4084 neg. 4084
Attendance at meetings, 1313
Qualifications of, 4077
Discount, 4509
Discussion, opportunity for, 4063, 4225
Dividends, 4039, 4121, 4124
Division between East and West, 4040
Divisions
Bank charters, renewal of, amdt. (Mr. Good), 4141, 4147
Interest rate, amdt. (Mr. Shaw) 4148, neg. 4148
Interest rate, maximum, amdt. (Mr. Coote) 4149, neg. 4149
Merchants' Bank investigation, amdt. (Mr. Bird) 4150, neg. 4161
Right of association of officers, amdt. (Mr. Woodsworth) 4161, neg. 4161
Failures, 1312, 4037
"Fantastic" schemes, 4038
Federal reserve system, 4069
Financial system, re-adjustment of, 4053, 4057
First lien upon seed grain and crop, 4102
First meeting of subscribers, 4075
Gold standard, 4021, 4027, 4047, 4093
Government audit, 4020, 4030, 4087
Government inspection, 1310
"Gramophones" 4058
Hicks, Mr. T., and Merchants Bank, 4059
Industrial conditions, 4054
Insurance, agency, 4093, 4509
Interest at 7 per cent may be charged, 4103
Amdt. (Mr. Shaw) 4105, neg. 4119
Maximum rate, amdt. (Mr. Coote) 4125, neg. 4131; 4149; neg. 4149
Maximum rate, amdt. (Mr. Shaw) 4148, neg. on div. 4148
Interest rates, 4119, 4020, 4028, 4047, 4050, 4062, 4065, 4509
Locality and security, 4120
Interlocking directorates, 4022, 4157
Investment bankers, 4157
Liberal and Conservative union, 4019, 4048, 4125, 4126, 4142, 4245
Loans
Live stock, 4103
Officials, to, 1313
Wholesale dealers, 4101
Merchants' Bank investigation
Amdt. (Mr. Bird) 4150, neg. on div. 4161
Mergers, 1311, 4031, 4050, 4071, 4072, 4080, 4134

Bank Act Amdt. Bill—*Con.*
Sections and Subjects—*Con.*
Money
Nature and function, 4020, 4055
Purchasing power, 4067
Trust, 4026
Montreal Standard, editorial, 4125, 4142
Mortgages and hypothecs of realty and agreement of sale, 4099
Property exempt from seizure, amdt. (Mr. Kellner) 4099, withdrawn, 4133
Motion (Mr. Fielding) for Com. not debatable
Ruling (Mr. Speaker), 4013
National currency, 4048
Notes, issue of, 4092, 4122
Officers
Appointment of, 4048
Right of association, amdt. (Mr. Woodsworth) 4084, neg. 4085; 4161, neg. on div. 4161
One vote for each share, 4085
Particulars of act of incorporation, 4075
Pension fund, 1313
Percentage chargeable for collection, 4133
Price level, stabilization of, 4069
Prices, control of, 4047
Prior claim of bank over unpaid vendor, 4103
Prior liens, 1312
Private bankers, licensing of, 1314
Production and consumption, 4054
Profits, 4121, 4124
Property, 1313
To be sold within certain time, 4101
Protection of the public, 1312
Questionaire and answers, 4062, 4128
Re-discount system, 4081
Returns of interest rates charged, 4119
Revision, postponement of. *See* Bank Act
Rural credits, 4015, 4028, 4035, 4037, 4039, 4041, 4066. *See also* Credits
Shareholders' audit, 1311, 4037, 4087
Auditors to report to Minister, amdt. (Mr. Coote) 4090, neg. 4091
Government audit, amdt. (Mr. Woodsworth) neg. 4090
Short title, 4014
Small banks, 4077
Stability, 4078
Statement of liabilities, assets, etc., 4085
Stock, allotment of, 1312
Taxes, refusal to pay, 4099
"Unholy alliance," 4031
United Farmers of Ontario, co-operative stores, 4068
Unpaid vendor, 4509
Warehouse receipts and bills of lading, 4101
Weyburn Security bank, 4509. *See also* Banks and Banking

Banking and Commerce Committee
Bank Act, proceedings, 4039, 4142
Printing, 3887
Inquiry by, 2937
Leave to sit while House in session, 986
Members in attendance at, 2167, 2171
Personnel, 2639, 2926, 3261
Reports
Inquiry, 2612
First and second, 986
Third, 1080
Fourth, 1538
Fifth, 2926
Sixth, 3505
Seventh, 3887
Eighth, 4131
Rural credits, 2929. *See also* Credits
Williams-Taylor, Sir Frederick, 4019

Bankruptcy
Farmers, 1412. *See also* Credits
Number of failures, 648

Bankruptcy Act. *See also* Bankruptcy Act Amdt.
Administration, 780
Amendment or abrogation, M. (Mr. Casgrain) 1490, withdrawn 1528
Assignments
Preliminary expense, 1412
Since 1916, 1495
Galipeault, Hon. Mr., 1499
Girouard, Judge, law of 1864, 1497
Perrault, Hon. Mr., 1499
Taschereau, Hon. L. A. 1499
Assignments, 1916-1922, qu. 937

Bankruptcy Act Amdt. Bill (Trustees; custodian; sales of property; landlord's privileges; examination of debtor; composition; discharge of trustees; claim of wife; examination of relatives; distribution between assignment and composition; doubt as to interpretation)
1r., 2252-2253; 2r., 3085-3091; com. 3091, 3209; 3r., 3222; Senate amendments, 4201
Sections and Subjects discussed:
Abstract of receipts and disbursements, 3116
Application by trustee for discharge, 3116
Assignment
Authorized, 3106
For general benefit of creditors, 3110

Bankruptcy Act Amdt. Bill—*Con.*
Sections and Subjects—*Con.*
Assignment—*Con.*
Form of, 3110
Bankruptcy proceedings, cost of, 3090
British North America Act, 3095
Canadian Credit Men's Association, 3088, 3093
Canadian Manufacturers' Association, 3093
Commencement of act, 3127
Composition, extension or scheme of arrangement, 3110, 3209
Debtor
Conditional discharge, powers of court, 3125
Description of property, 3115
Discharge of, 3086
Examination of, 3124
Examination of bankrupt by official receiver, 3121
Farmers, 3211
Claims of, 3214
Fees of attorney and trustees, 3087, 3090
Hypothecated immovable property, sales of, 3114
Jurisdiction, 3095
Landlords, claim of, 3086
Marriage settlement, 3087
Married woman, claim, 3087, 3121
Meetings of creditors, 3117
Objections to, statement, 3098
Officer to be assigned to duty by Chief Justice, 3126, 3220
Official receivers, 3087
Petitioning creditor secured, 3108
Priority of claim, 3214
Proof of debt, 3119
Publication of notice, etc., 3110
Quebec, sales in, 3114
Release of security, 3116
Remedy of creditor against property, 3109
Repeal of, 3091
Right of manufacture, 3114
Secured creditor to value security, 3119
Security to be furnished by trustee, 3111
Short title, 3091
Stay of proceedings, 3109
Tariff of costs and fees, 3126
Trustees, 1412, 3088, 3113, 3210
Remuneration of, 3116
Vestment of property in, 3109
Voting by proxy, 3119
Wife's claim, 3087, 3121
Banks and Banking. *See also* Bank Act Amdt. bill
Advances to chartered banks, 4249, 4408. *See also* Finance Act Amdt. bill
Agricultural credits. *See* Credits, Rural
Australian Commonwealth Bank, 4067, 4075, 4092

Banks and Banking—*Con.*
Bank Note Act, 4093
Bank of British North America, 1312, 1313
Bank of Commerce
Aird, Sir John, 1407
Domestic debts, 1343
Overgovernment and taxation, 1391
Prices of agricultural and manufactured products, 1409
Bank clearings, increase of, 3055
Bank directors dominating industrial and commercial affairs, 4022
Bank draft tax, 3925
Bank notes
Bank Note Act, 4093
Issues, 4408
Substitution for national notes, 4408
Bank returns
False, 4030
M. (Mr. Coote) 3264
Bank robberies, 776
Bank statements, 4020, 4047
Banking system, 634, 4016, 4017, 4029, 4036, 4046, 4051, 4059, 4065
Borrowings, 4030
Bradford Chamber of Commerce, prior lien, 1312
Branch banks, 4047, 4122, 4128
Capital, control of, 4026. *See also* capital
Central gold reserve, qu. 1739, 4406
Circulation
"Bank specials" 1739
Security of, 1312
Combinations, 2578, 4083
Commission on banking and credit, 2929
Cost of living and, 1409
Credits. *See also that title*
Control, 631, 2725
Financial machinery, control of, 2725
Monopoly, 2725
System, 1252
Dividends, 4121, 4124
Dollar, stabilizing of, 4666
Dominion Bank, statement as to economic conditions, 1394
Dominion notes, circulation, qu. 1739
Employees, married, 4084
Farmers' bank, 4034
Farmers
Credits. *See* Credits
Pressure on, 1202
Shareholders, qu. 1486, 2846
Treatment of, 2929
Federal jurisdiction, 2592
Federal reserve bank, 4067
Financial influence in parliament, 2733
Gambling in staples of life, 3058
Gold, percentage of national wealth, 2720

Banks and Banking—*Con.*
Gold standard, 4249, 4405, 4666. *See also* Bank Act Amdt. bill
Government audit, 4020
Hail insurance, 4509
Immigration and, 1133, 4042
Interest rates, 635, 2812, 2962, 4020
Western Canada, 1088, 1440
Interlocking directorates, 636, 4022, 4157
Legislation, 3060. *See also* Bank Act Amdt.
Lobbyists, 4029
Merchants' Bank, 70, 1310, 3990, 4020, 4025, 4028, 4029, 4031, 4034, 4036, 4042, 4047, 4049, 4057, 4058, 4066, 4087, 4139, 4145, 4150, 4297
Government action, 2576
Investigation
Amdt. (Mr. Bird) 4150, neg. 4161
Proposed resolution, 4068, 4069
Merger with Bank of Montreal, 4031
Mergers, 1311, 4019, 4031, 4134. *See also* Bank Act Amdt. bill
Money. *See also* Credits; Money
Nature and function, 4020
Origin and meaning of exchange, 633
Paper, 635
Purchasing power, 4666
Monopoly, 636, 4018
Montreal, Bank of
Directorships, 4022-25
Merchants' Bank merger, 4031
Statement of agricultural exports, 1390
National City bank, bulletin on potatoes, 2820
National Land bank, 4366
Nationalization of banking system, 2728
Northern Crown bank, 4080
Note issues, 4405. *See also under this title,* Bank notes
Nova Scotia, Bank of, 4079
Officers, right to organize, 4084, 4161
Ontario government savings office, qu. 1488
Ottawa, Bank of, 4081
Payments in bank notes instead of gold, 4249
Penny Bank of Toronto. *See that title*
Profits, 1209, 4121, 4124. *See also under this title,* Dividends
Promissory notes, taxation, 3923
Quebec savings bank, 4183, 4392, 4405
Rural bank shareholders, 2846
Rural credits. *See* Credit
Salaries and wages, 4084
Savings deposits, increase of, 3055
Security market and, 4157
Small banks, establishment of, 4019

Banks and Banking—*Con.*
Toronto, Bank of
Gooderham, President, debt, aggregate and per capita, 2721
Union Bank, position of, 4225, 4250, 4272
M. (Mr. Forke) to adjourn the House to consider, 4296; withdrawn, 4300
United States Federal Reserve bank, 3059, 4106, 4407
Universities and educational institutions, 4025, 4073
Vancouver, Bank of, failure, qu. 4011
Weyburn Security bank, 2813, 4081, 4122, 4509
Widows and orphans, stockholders, 2743

Banting, Dr. F. G., discoverer of insulin, 703, 1285-1287
Annuity, 4645, 4676
Expression of nation's gratitude, 4437
Patenting of insulin, 2077

Barnardo, Dr., child immigration. *See* Immigration, Child

Barnhill, Mr., 60

Barnjum, Mr. Frank J. D. *See* Export Act Amdt. bill; Forests and Forestry

Barrow, Hon. E. D., Asiatic immigration, 1900

Bartlett, Captain, Hudson Bay railway, 1017

Basic Industries. *See* Industries

Battlefields Memorials. *See* Canadian National Parks and Historic sites; Martell; Monuments and Memorials; Vimy Ridge Memorial

Baxter, Hon. J. B. M. (St. John city and counties of St. John and Albert)
Address in reply, 132. Necessity for economizing time of session, 132; Mr. Hoey's speech, 133; government ownership of railways, 133-134; Sir Henry Thornton, 134; national railways and political patronage; regional administration of Canadian National Railways, 135; Crowsnest pass agreement, 135-136; sectionalism; potato-growers and grain growers, 136; freight rates on potatoes, 137-138; lumber rates on; Canadian ports, development, 139; the Conservative party in Quebec, 140; achievements of government; Near East crisis; Imperial centralization, 141; League of Nations; amdt. and sub-amdt.; amdt. of Mr. Fielding in 1921, 142; standard of living, 143; waste of time in legislating, 144
Automobiles, insurance, 3977

Baxter, Hon. J. B. M.—*Con.*
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4094
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3087-3127, 3220
Banks, federal jurisdiction, 2592
Belle River harbour, 4607
Board of Commerce Act, 2590
Boots and shoes, duty on, 3500
Boulay, Mlle., postmistress, Sayabec, dismissal, 387, 3706, 3750
British North America Act, amendment of, 2592
British preference, limitation to Canadian ports, 1757, 2678
Canada Highways bill, 2341
Canada Shipping Act amdt. bill, 3973
Canada-West Indies steamship service, 3390
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, advances, 3377
Canadian National Railways
Advances
Additional amount, 3376
$73,000,000, 3629
Branch lines construction bill, 4304
Express and electric lines bill, 2481
Management, responsibility and powers, 3638, 3697
Maritime region, boundaries, 1754
Mileage, 3197
Paris offices, 3637, 3697
Providence, R. I., building, 1755
St. John
Station, 3645
Train shed, 3188
Terminals
Atlantic division, qu. 1363
Maritime regions, qu. 1662
United States, 1755
Toronto office building, 3629
Canadian National Safety League grant, 3953, 3955, 3960
Chinese immigration bill, 2309
Combines bill, 2589
Combines and Fair Prices Act, 2590
Privy Council decisions, 2590
Companies Act Amdt. bill, 4210-4217
Conley, Mr. James, dismissal, qu. 4183
Criminal Code, combines clause, 2592
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 2362
Distressed seamen, 3974
Duke and Duchess of York, congratulations, 2251
Exchequer Court, judgeship, 2499
Export Act Amdt. bill, pulpwood, 4350
False Creek bridge, 3375
Freight rates, Crowsnest pass agreement, 135-136, 3239
French Treaty bill, 2243
Fuel supply, 803

Baxter, Hon. J. B. M.—*Con.*
Government publications, waste, 1734
Grain and grain trade
Shipments from Portland, St. John and Halifax, qu. 1484
Shipping rates on, 2517
Harbours and rivers
New Brunswick wharves transferred to Dominion govt. 947
Nova Scotia, 942, 4566
High Commissioner's office, London, 4630
Historic sites, 3407
Hoppe leases, 3128
Hudson Bay railway, construction vote, 4683, 4685
Immigration
Maritime provinces and, 1131
Policy, 1130-32
Immigration Act Amdt, bill, 2430
Exclusion, 2436
Ship's crews, 2435
Undesirable classes, 2669
Income War Tax Act 1917 Amdt. bill, 4497
Insurance Act 1917 Amdt, bill, 3977
Isle Perrot bridge, 3646
Lake Grain Rates inquiry, 247
Lake of the Woods Regulation bill, 4173, 4178
Lee, Miss Barbara, dismissal, qu. 385, qu. 2393
Lumber, sales tax, 3181, 4418
Marine dept. salaries, 3373
Maritime provinces, secession, 1757, 2245
Martello tower, St. John, 3444
Matapedia bridge, repairs, qu. 4184
Motion, increasing taxation, 3936
Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. bill, 2118
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2108, 2110, 2196, 2437 2462, 3984
British system, 2438
Consolidation of the law, 2437
Judges, 2438
Secretary of State, 2437
Negro Point breakwater, 4587
Official report of debates, abolition of, 1734
Patents of Invention bill, 2102
Penitentiaries, 774
Petition of Right Act Amdt bill, 3128
Pilots, pensions, 3359
Preston, W. T. R., Mr., qu. 206, 247
Printing bureau new building, 1733, 1737
Public buildings, renting or building, 1734
Public ownership, 3640
Pugsley, Hon. William, appointment, 2499
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4350
Railway Commission, 3188
Railways, surveys and inspections, 3648

Baxter, Hon. J. B. M.—*Con.*
Registration of ships purchased from foreigners, 3973
Rush-Bagot treaty, negotiations, qu. 2700
St. John
Harbour improvements, 2676
Station and train shed, 3188, 3645
St. John and Quebec railway bill, 3404
St. Lawrence river ship channel, 3375
Sales tax, 4418
Salmon river protection work, 946
Secession, Nova Scotia 1757, 2245
Shipping combines, statement in Toronto Globe qu. 1362
Sorel shipyard, dismissals, 3374
Steamship services, 3397
Canada-Newfoundland, 3377
Canada-West Indies, 3390
Three Rivers harbour bill, 3964
Wheat board, 2592

Bay of Fundy, icebreakers, 2615

Bayfield, Ont., pier, 981

Bean-Growing Industry, competition from abroad, 2981

Beatty, Mr. E. W., President of the C.P.R.
Appointment as President, 373
Bank director, 4024
Immigration 1337-8

Beaubien, Mr. A. L. (Provencher)
Assiniboine river, flooding 998
Auditor General, appointment, qu. 2298
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2414
Drainage, 3257
Grain dockage, 783
Grand Trunk arbitration, payments to Hon. Howard G. Taft, qu. 1157
Immigration
Empire settlement scheme, 1461
Policy, 1461
Western provinces, natural resources and policy, 1092
Indians, St. Pie reserve, fencing, 2154
Lake Grain Rates bill 4285
Marketing of grain, M. (Mr. Millar) 299, 305
Political patronage, 3348
Prosecutions for operating illicit stills, Vita, Manitoba, 3280
Public Works expenditure, Manitoba, 998
Sawdust pollution of rivers and streams, 3364
West Ukrainian republic, M. (Mr. Campbell) 655
Wheat, grading of, 305

Beck, Sir Adam. *See* Hydro Electric Power.

Beckett, Matt C., appointment and dismissal, qu. 283, 816

Bee-Keeping, suppression of foul brood, 4675

Beef. *See* Live stock; Meats

Beer. *See* Liquor.

Beet Sugar. *See* Sugar.

Behring Sea Fisheries. *See* Northern Pacific Halibut bill; Treaties, Halibut Treaty

Beland, Hon. H. S. (Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment and Minister in charge of the Department of Health)
Banting, Dr. F. G., recognition of, 704, 4438
Blinded soldiers, travelling expenses, 693
Business of the House, 3750
Deportation of British soldier, 2255
Dominion Council of Health, lady members, 3649
Dry Dock Subsidies Act Amdt. bill, 3583
Estimates, time of presentation, 4703
Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia, 4565
Health, Department of
Estimates, 2167, 2170
Marine hospitals, 701, 2167
Quarantine stations
Grosse Isle, 2168
St. John, 4614
Salaries and contingencies, 2170
Leprosy, treatment of, 702
Pharmaceutical preparations, 3261
Pollution of boundary waters, 700
Proprietary or patent medicines, 700
Venereal diseases, 705
Housing Act, administration, 2171
Insulin treatment for diabetes, 704
Maple products industry, 1810
Marine hospitals, 701, 2167
Medical advisory boards, 677, 697
Medical inspection of immigrants, 702
Meighen, Right Hon., alleged speech in North Essex, 670, 708
Military hospitals, 670
Mental cases, 671
Neurological cases, 696
Nursing hospitals, 686
Motions, opportunity to speak to, 3583
Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. bill, 1136, 2114, 2116, 2124
Deportation of convicted alien, 2123

Beland, Hon. H. S.—*Con.*
Opium and Narcotic Drugs Act
Administration, 697, 698, 3149. *See also under this title,* Narcotic Drugs
Prosecutions, 698
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3401, 3748, 3848-85
District appeal boards, 4703
Senate amdts. 4744
Pension regulations, review of, 3851
Pensions
Appeal boards, 677, 681, 697, 4703
District board of review, 4703
European war and active militia, 2166 3706, 3718, 3735
Fenian raid and Northwest rebellion, 3742
Pension Commissioners, Board of
Interpretation of act, 2640
Report, 4736
Salaries, etc., 2168, 3742
Royal Commission, 288
Recommendations, legislation to be introduced, 2394, 2519, 2639, 2983, 3400
Reports
First, interim, on second part of investigation, 1631, 2166, 2167, 2926
Printing, 1992, 2128, 2983
Opportunity for discussion, 674
Printing, 3401
Unemployed pensioners, relief, 2168
Printing bureau, new building, M. to reduce item, 1730
Provincial employment offices, 2169
Public buildings, new, departmental, 1729
Redistribution committee report, 4736
Returned soldiers, emigration to United States, 691
Returned Soldiers Insurance Act Amdt. bill, 3582, 3743, 3892, 4734, 4751
St. John river, pollution of, 701
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment
Department
Estimates, 668, 2166, 2168
Expenditure, 3893
Reduction of, 2032
Salaries and contingencies, 668, 687
Vancouver employees, 3085, 3822
Employers' liability compensation, 691
Hospitals, Brant House and Euclid Hall, closing, 1995, 4075
Interest on war service gratuity, 689
Operating expenses, etc., 690
Sheltered employment, 694
Unemployment relief, 690, 695
Vocational loans, 687
Vocational training, 686

Beland, Hon. H. S.—*Con.*
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment—*Con.*
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment Act Amdt. bill, 3648, 3745, 3892, 4750
Tracadie lazaretto, 702
Van Koughnet, Mrs., 4727

Belanger, Mr. U., agent at St. Moise, 1489

Belgium. *See also* Germany Reparations
Belgian exposition, 496
Butter, export to, 2217
Economic organization, 1857
Immigration from, 1085, 1096, 1173. *See also* Immigration
Imports and exports, 1977
Senate, constitution of, 1371
Treaty with, 246

Bell, the late Dr. Alexander Graham, contributions to scientific knowledge, 1287

Bell, Major Graham A. *See* Railways and Canals

Bell, the late Dr. Robert, Hudson Bay route, 1052

Belle River Harbour, 4594, 4638
M. (Mr. Meighen) to reduce, 4600, neg. 4610

Belleville harbour commissioners, qu. 490

Belloc, Mr. Hilaire, European situation, 1231

Benoit, Mr. A. J. (St. Johns and Iberville)
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, Mr. H. Milburn, qu. 1138
Grand Trunk arbitration
Doherty, Right Hon. Charles J., pension, qu. 1029
Purchase, arbitrators, fees, profit and loss, qu. 1257
Tilley, Mr. W. N., K.C., qu. 1029; qu. 1661
Introduction of, 3
Judges
Pensions, qu. 492
Retirement fund, qu. 1362
Metric system, qu. 914
Welland canal, towing, qu. 4132

Bernasconi, Mr., report of, 4723

Berne Convention. *See* Copyright Act Amdt. bill; Patents of Invention bill

Bernier, Captain. *See* Hudson Bay railway

Berry Containers. *See* Fruit

Best, Mr. C. H., associate of Dr. Banting, 703, 4439

Betting. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.; Race Track Betting
Tax on in Great Britain, 2824

Beverages, tax on, 2979, 3046. *See also* Budget; Special War Revenue Act; Taxation

Bienfait briquetting plant, 789, 3206

Big Bay Point, wharf, 981

Big Interests. *See also* Combines bill
Political parties and, 2856, 3070

Biggar, Mr. W. H., K.C. *See* Canadian National Railways

Bill of Exchange. *See* Taxation

Bill of Rights. *See* Immigration Act Amdt. bill

Bills. *See* Deputy Speaker; House of Commons; Speaker
For Public Bills, *See* their individual titles
For Private Bills. *See* Private Bills Discussed

Bilodeau, Mr. Jean, qu. 1487

Binder Twine, 2780
Bounty, 4369. *See also* Hemp Bounty bill
Duty removal of, 2965, 4379
Imports and exports, 2965
Industry
Discrimination, 2964
History of, 2965
Manufacture, amendment of act respecting, 3231
Prices and abolition of duty, 2965, 4379
Production in Canada, 2780

Binders. *See* Agricultural Implements

Bindings. *See* Books; Public Libraries

Binette, Mr. Joseph (Prescott)
Hawkesbury government offices, revenue and salaries, qu. 2205
Judges' salaries, qu. 491
Ottawa river, Pointe Fortune water power, qu. 1974.
Peat investigation at Alfred, qu. 1487

Biological Board. *See* Marine

Biological Board Act Amdt. Bill (Representation of Marine and Fisheries department and fishing industries)
Res., 1r., 3820; 2r., com., 3974; 3r., 3974

Bird, Mr. T. W. (Nelson)
Agricultural conditions, 1861
Agriculture, economic organization, 1863

Bird, Mr. T. W.—*Con.*
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4029, 4150
Merchants' Bank investigation, amdt. 4150, neg. 4161
Point of order, interruptions, 4064
Ruling, Mr. Speaker, 4013
Bright, John, free trade in Great Britain, 3051
Budget, 2787. Minister of Agriculture and Moose Jaw election; speech of Mr. Raymond; tariff stability, 2787; taxation, experiments in perpetuation of crude methods; income tax, costly and inequitably graduated; well-to-do not bearing fair share; unearned and earned incomes; war profits; inheritance tax, 2788; business profits tax; sales tax; luxury tax; taxation, indirect; taxing the consumer; necessities of life, taxation of; apportionment of taxes in Great Britain, 2789; emigration to the United States; Winnipeg *Free Press,* statement of; Minister of Agriculture and Free Press; Right Hon. Mr. Meighen, reported statement as to emigration in New York *Tribune,* 2790; taxation and immigration; agriculture pushed into background by industrialism; governmental neglect of the farmer; world organization of farmers; National Farmers' Union of Great Britain; Farmers' Bloc in United States; Progressive Party in Canada, 2791; future of farmers' organizations; principle of protection; no difference between Tory and Liberal budgets; tariff variation not over two and a half per cent; 2792; the Big-endians and the Little-endians, two parties but one policy; total of tariff taxation for 50 years; tribute to Minister of Finance; violation of pledges by Liberal party; Progressive party, policy, 2793; political ideals; patriotism and love of country, a transformed country-side; Mr. Fielding's budget speeches past and future, 2794
Canadian National Railways, branch lines, 4688
Civil Service, deputy ministers, 368
Combines bill, 2625
Crowsnest pass agreement, Progressives and, 2855
Drainage of agricultural lands, 3257
Emigration to the United States
Meighen, Mr., reported statement in New York Tribune, 2790
Winnipeg, from, 1975

Bird, Mr. T. W.—*Con.*
Great Britain, free trade and protection, 1862, 3051
Hemp bounty bill, 4388
Homesteaders, relinquishment of holdings, 3257
Hudson Bay railway
Commercial feasibility of, 3006
Construction vote, 4688
M. (Mr. Knox) 1037
Income tax, total assessment, qu. 2393
Macphail, Miss, members and party funds, 4239
Merchants' Bank merger, 4029, 4030, 4031, 4050, 4061
Napoleonic wars, problems after, 1233
Non-confidence, M., (Mr. Irvine) 225
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3567, 4387
Political parties and big interests, 2856
Progressive party, economic not political, 1863
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good), 760
Rules of the House, M. (Mr. Johnston) 1303
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4239
Taxation, luxury taxes, collections, qu. 2393
West and protected industries, 1222-3

Bird Sanctuaries. *See* National Parks and Reservations bill

Birmingham, Bishop of, on immigration, 1205

Birth Rate, 1197. *See also* Population
Decline in, 1195

Bituminous Coal. *See* Coal; Fuel Supply

Bituminous Sands, Alberta, 3198

Black, Mr. George (Yukon)
Address in reply, 85. Visit of their Excellencies to the Yukon, 85; the Yukon territory, its history, and mineral wealth, 85-89
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3112
Blackwood, Mr. H. P., Winnipeg, 856
British Columbia
Fishing licenses, 1557
Liquor law, administration of, 2419
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2419, 2428
Canadian National Railways, Paris offices, 3683
Chinese Immigration bill, 2337
Civil Service list, publication, qu. 3134
Contracts with newspapers and printing companies, 1974, 2394, 2614
Copyright Act Amdt. bill, 3155

Black, Mr. George—*Con.*
Customs and Excise dept. legal work, 856
Dominion Bureau of Statistics, qu. 938
Farmers, shareholders in banks, qu. 1486
Guessing competitions, qu. 733
Income tax, farmers paying, qu. 1486
Members' stenographers, qu. 518
Mining fees, Yukon, 1636
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2467
Judges, Yukon Territory, 2458
Secretary of State, administration, 2458, 2467
Northwest territories
Administration, 3949
Wireless telegraph service, 3945
Oleomargarine
Further legislation, inquiry, 2927
Members circularized, 3402
M. (Mr. Carroll) 3544
Pension Act Amdt. bill
District review board
Appeals, amdt., 3875, neg. 3881
Appointments to, amdt. 3875, neg. 3875
Pensions
Commuted, qu. 4132
European war and active militia, 3732
Royal commission, qu. 207
Proportional representation, M. (Mr. Good) 423
Quartz-mining claims, Yukon territory, 249
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 1143
Thompson, Mr. F. G., Winnipeg, 856
Timber protection, qu. 2205
Vancouver, Second Narrows bridge, qu. 1258
Yukon Act Amdt. bill, 767, 4247
Yukon territory
Administration, 3943
Egg inspector, qu. 2516
Minerals, exhibit at British Empire exhibition, qu. 3143
Quartz-mining claims, 249
Telegraphs, qu. 1662, qu. 2206, 3945
Revenue from, qu. 2417

Black, Mr. William (South Huron)
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4034
Bayfield harbour, 981
Customs and excise taxes and collections, qu. 814
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4539
Income tax collection, cost, qu. 733
Merchants' bank case, 4034
Toronto seed branch building, 4623

Black, Mr. W. J. *See* Immigration

Black Point, N.S., breakwater, 941

Blackadder, the late Dr. Edward, M.P., references to, 4, 6, 8, 102

Blackfeet Indians. *See* Indians

Blackwood, Mr. H. P., Winnipeg, 856

Blake, Mr. Charles, Brandon, 4513

Blind. *See* Canadian National Institute; Soldiers

Blind River wharf, 981

Blondin, Mr. Charles E., Pierreville postmaster, qu. 4511

"Blue Ruin" speeches. *See* Immigration

Board of Audit Act (Inquiry into auditing and accounting system) Res., 4249; 4355; 1r., 2r., com., 4356; com., 3r., 4369; Senate amdts., 4733

Board of Commerce. *See also* Combines
Repeal of Act, 2521
"Wooden gun" 2564

Board of Grain Commissioners. *See* Grain

Board of Pension Commissioners. *See* Pensions

Board of Railway Commissioners. *See* Railway Commission

Boats. *See* Canadian Government Merchant Marine; Marine and Fisheries; Vessels

Boivin, Mr. George H. (Shefford)
Indemnity of members, 4008, 4236
Joint Committee on legislation, report, 3887, 4007
Macphail, Miss, members and party funds, 4239
Members, attendance of, 4008
Questions passed as orders for returns, 939
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4236-46
Deduction for non-attendance, 4244

Bolshevism
Bolshevists, socialists, communists and anarchists, 2744
Children of Russian and Polish parents at Welland, 2844
Discontent and, 2982
Farmers, 4045
Oriental immigration, 505
Russia, example of, 2744
Trade unions bulwark against, 2887

Bolte, Mr. Camille, 1032, qu. 1138

Bonaventure
Forest fires, relief, 4010
Railway facilities, 4186

Bonded Warehouses. *See* Liquor

Bonds. *See* Canadian National Railways; Finance; Loans

Bonus. *See* Civil Service

Book-Making. *See* Criminal Code Amdt. bill

Books. *See also* Copyright Act
Purchase of. *See* Library of Parliament
Sales tax on, 1870

Bootlegging. *See* Canada Temperance Act Amdt.; Liquor; Tobacco

Boots and Shoes. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget; Customs
Duty, 2849, 3033
French treaty, 1990, 2240
Prices, increased, 2873
Sales tax, 2999
United States markets, free entry to, 2856, 3016, 3062, 3499

Borden, Camp. *See* Camp Borden

Borden, Right Hon. Sir Robert
Administration, 2815
Canada, constitutional development, 4465
National debt, diminution of, 2920
"No truck or trade with the Yankees," 3080
Treaties, signing of, 4465

Border States. *See* Treaties, French Treaty

Botany Yarn. *See* Textiles, Silk

Bouchard, Mr. George J. (Kamouraska)
Agriculture department, employees, 815
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3562
Ste. Anne de la Pocatiere experimental farm, qu. 1028

Boucher, Mr. Aime (Yamaska)
Bankruptcy Act, M. (Mr. Casgrain) 1510

Boucher, Mrs., postmistress, Pierreville, qu. 4511

Boudreau, the late Mr. Rodolphe, 1805

Boudrot, Mr. Edward E., dismissal, qu. 2613

Boulay, Mlle. Adrienne, postmistress, Sayabec, dismissal, 387, 3706, 3750

Boulay, Mr. Hermengilde, Sayabec post office, 3750

Boundaries. *See* International Boundaries; Surveys
Forest areas. *See* Dominion Forest Reserves

Boundary Waters, Pollution of, 700, 3362

Bounties, 2948. *See also* Trade and Commerce
Advances to be repayable, 4369, 4376
Agricultural and manufactured products, 1196
Agriculture and, 3237
Artificial silk, 2931
Binder twine, 4369
Copper bars or rods, 2646, 2709, 2734, 2778, 2827, 2861, 2931, 2943, 2944, 2958, 3017, 3031, 3035, 3069, 3231, 4369, 4376
Cordage, 4369
Fishing, report on, 911
Hemp, 2647, 2709, 2778, 2780, 2823, 2827, 2931, 2957, 2958, 2964, 3017, 3031, 3911, 3963, 4376
Extension of time, 3911
Resolutions, 3911
Increased, demand for, 3076
Iron and steel, 4371, 4381
Linen thread, 2647, 2897
Loans, repayable, 4369, 4376
Manila fibre, 2657, 3231, 3242, 4369
News, 3062
Oil. *See under this head,* Petroleum
Permanent when established, 2957
Petroleum, 2648, 2657, 2949, qu. 3262, 3914, 3963, 4392
Administration of, 780
Protection and, 2778
Wheat, on, 1196
Wool, 2866

Bounties on Copper Bars or Rods, Act Respecting Res. 3231; 1r., 3242; 2r., com., 4369; 3r., 4376
Advances to be repayable, amdt. (Mr. McMaster) 4369, neg., 4376

Bounties on Manila Fibre, Repeal Bill Res. 2657, 3231; 1r., 3242; 2r., com., 3r., 4369

Bourassa, Mr. Henri, Nationalist party, 2924

Bourassa, Mr. J. B. (Levis)
Levis county postmasters, qu. 519
Nolin, Mrs. J., postmistress, St. David, 1489
Quarantine station, Levis, purchase of beef, qu. 3141

Boville, Mr. T. C., service and superannuation allowance, qu. 3135

Bovine Tuberculosis. *See* Animal Contagious Diseases; Live Stock, Health of Animals

Bowder, Mr. W. R. *See* Immigration

Bowen, Mr. Fred W. (Durham)
Grain surveys, qu. 4131

Boy Scouts Association, 114, 879

Boyer, Dr. G. F., appointment, qu. 2418

Boys, Mr. W. A. (South Simcoe)
Ammunition, 887
Received from England, 1741
Annual training, 874
Annuities, old age, 1640
Basis of computation, 1683, 1694
Cost of at various ages, 1641
Postmasters as agents, 1642
Atherley bridge, 3648
Bankruptcy Act, M. (Mr. Casgrain) 1495, 1506, 1513
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3085-3127
Big Bay point wharf, 981
Buffalo and Fort Erie Bridge Company, 1835
Business of the House
Easter adjournment, 1162
Empire day adjournment, 2795
Camp Borden, approach to, 4565
Canada Gazette, printing, 1709
Canada-West Indies Steamship service, 3384
Canadian Air Force, Camp Borden, 1749, 4565
Hospital accommodation, 1777
Canadian National railways
Branch lines construction bill, 4327
Crowsnest pass agreement, 1620
Paris offices, 3630
Property, purchases and sales, 3324
Canadian Press, Limited, 1464
Cayouette, Miss Evangeline, postmistress, Ste. Claire, qu. 1031
Combines bill, 2621-37
Commissioners, appointment of, 2629
Distribution of report, 2632
Registrar, inquiry, 2621
Copyright Act Amdt. bill, 2144
Criminal Code Amdt. bill, 2053
Debates, official report, omission of undiscussed item in supply, 1638
Dominion arsenal, Quebec, 1740
Evidence in marriage or divorce proceedings, bill, 2053
Excise taxes, use of postage stamps, 1820-1
Exhibitions, 1465
Federal printing company, 1623
Fuel supply, M. (Mr. Church), amdt. (Mr. Carroll) 1281

Boys, Mr. W. A.—*Con.*
Grain elevators, Montreal, qu. 1663
Harbours and rivers
Nova Scotia, 4564
Ontario, 981
Quebec, 969
Highways
Bradford-Barrie, 2489
Hamilton-Brantford, 2493
Statement of, 3174
Hopper barge construction, 3351
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1323
Agreement, 1104
McRae, General, salary, 1324
Policy, 1095
Income tax, unearned income, 2882
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1629, 1655, 1706, 2062.
Insurance Act 1917 Amdt. bill, 3147
Labour
Conciliation and Labour Act, 1621
Department
Estimates, 1621
Staff, reduction, 1671
Technical Education Act, 1638
Labour Gazette, printing, 1622-1625, 1709
Lighthouses, maintenance and repairs, 3353
Lindsay arsenal, 883
L'Islet wharf, 970
Lunenberg harbour, dredging, 4578
Marine agencies, 3351
Marine signal service, 3358
Matane harbour improvements, 970
Meaford-Clarksburg highway, 4565
Military hospitals, 669, 672
Morrison, Mr. T. D., Little Anse breakwater, claim, 4574
National Defence
Canadian Air Force, Camp Borden 1749, 1777, 4565
Militia payments, qu. 205, qu. 344, 386
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2184, 2193
Navigation, aids to, 3357
Old age annuities, 1640, 1683. *See also under this title,* Annuities
Ontario government savings office, interest rate, 1697
Parliament buildings, 1719
Committee on, 1724
Cost, estimated and actual, 1723, 1726
Patents of Invention bill, 2069, 2075, 2079, 2086, 2099, 2129
Peat, experiments, 3199
Pensions
Appeal boards, 680
European war and active militia, 3739

Boys, Mr. W. A.—*Con.*
Pensions—*Con.*
Unemployed pensioners, relief, 2169
Widows, 681
Port Burwell harbour works, 983
Printing bureau, new building, 1733
Quebec wharves, 977
Railway lands, purchases or sales, 1739
Returned Soldiers Insurance bill, 3744
Revenue and postage stamps, 1820-1
Rural mail service.
Carriers, remuneration, 1780, 1785
Spur lines, 1822, 1826
Ste. Anne des Monts pier, 979
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 668
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment bill, 3746
Soldier Settlement Board, insurance, 3506
Steamer Murray Stewart, purchase, 3356
Steamship services, 2173
Canada-West Indies, 3384
Quebec-Natashquam-Harrington, 2175
Toronto union station, 4326
Trade Mark and Designs bill, 2063
Trent canal, qu. 205, 3648
Troops, use of in labour troubles, 869
Unemployment relief, 690, 1655, 2169
Vocational loans, 687

Bracken, Premier of Manitoba, on immigration, 1123

Bran and Shorts. *See* Feeding Stuffs Act

Branch Lines. *See* Canadian National Railways

Brandeis, Judge Louis, on banking, 4022

Brandon, Man., damage by flood, 999.

Brandy. *See* Liquor; Treaties, French Treaty

Brant Military Hospital, closing, 677, 1995, 4075

Brantford binder twine industry. *See* Binder Twine; Hemp Bounties bill

Brazil, constitution of Senate, 1373

Breadner, Mr. R. W. *See* Taxation, Commissioner of

"Breezes Blowing in Mulberry Trees." *See* Secession

Brenner, Meyer, release on parole, 1975

Brethen, Mr. G. A. (East Peterborough)
Accredited herd system, 577, 586, 3303
Bacon, salting, 3301
Cheese grading, 3295
Experimental farms, 483

Brethen, Mr. G. A.—*Con.*
Grain, new varieties, introduction, 483
Health of animals, 586
Hebridean immigrants, treatment of, 3599
Potatoes, prices, 2821
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 751
Shire horses, gift from Great Britain, 2253
Weights and Measures inspector, qu. 492

Breweries. *See* Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill; Liquor

Brick. *See* Building

Bridges. *See also* Public Works
Atherley, 3648
Buffalo and Fort Erie, 1834
Burlington channel, 2682
Burrard inlet, 4709
Calumet-Bryson, 1014
Clair, N.B.-Fort Kent, Maine, 4590
Edmundston, N.B.-Fort Kent, Maine, 1014, 2342, 4589
False Creek, 3375, 4708
Fredericton, 3645, 4310
Girrard Bridge Company, charter, 1008
Grand Etang, 4589
Hawkesbury, 4589
International, 2342, 3647
Interprovincial and, 2342
Isle Perrot, Ste. Anne's lock, 3646
Kingston, 2682
Lachine canal, Montreal, 2299
McAdam-Vanceboro, 2342
Matapedia, Restigouche river, 1014
Repairs, qu. 4184
Michigan Central at Niagara Falls, qu. 1257, qu. 1864
Montreal-Longueuil, 2086, 2615, 2640
Report of harbour commissioners, 3507
Orleans island, 3646
Ottawa-Hull, 1015, 4590
Roads and bridges, 1014
St. Croix river, 2342
St. John and Quebec railway, 3644
St. John river, 2342
Second Narrows, Vancouver, qu. 1258, 4708
Trent Valley canal, qu. 205
Vancouver-North Vancouver, 1008

Bright, John
British free trade movement, 3050
Repeal of Corn Laws, 3013

Briquetting. *See* Bienfait

Bristol, Hon. Edmund (Centre Toronto)
Patents of Invention bill, 2096, 2103
Postmasters, appointment of, 1828-9
Woodbridge postmaster, 1828

Britain. *See* Great Britain

British Admiralty, war claims. *See* War Claims

British Ambassador at Washington. *See also* Treaties
Signature of treaties, 2403
Halibut Fishery Treaty, 734, 858, 1308, 4457, 4480, 4664

British and Foreign News Service, 4712

British Columbia
Aerial forest patrol, 1776
Agricultural conditions, 2769
Agriculture, increased production, 1432
Associated boards of trade, letter of Hon. Mr. Carvell, 1915
Bootlegging, 2419. *See also under this title,* Canada Temperance Act; Liquor
Attorney General and, 2407
British Columbia building, London, 4630
British Columbia Prohibition Association, 2408
Canada Temperance Act Amdt.
Bill, 2284
Correspondence, 1032, 1307
Canadian air force, 1748, 1776
Canadian Northern railway guarantee, 1946
Canadian Pacific railway, construction, 1916
Chilliwack reclamation project, 3431
Chinese immigration. *See that title*
Civil Service appointments in, 372
Claims against federal government, 708
Coal
Competition of fuel oil with, 1245
Deposits, investigation, 3198, 3202
Production, 1244
Copper bounty, 2734
Creosoting industry, 1245
Creosoted piling, use in, qu. 1137
Debt, per capita, 2941
Dominion forest reserves and parks, 2061
Dredging, 1014, 4590
Esquimalt dry dock, 2671
Experimental farms, 457
Fisheries
Commission, 1453, 1540, 3372
Fishing licenses, M. (Mr. Clark) 1540
Japanese engaged in, 1540, 1889, 1901, 4484
Forests, fungus and insect control, qu. 2697
Fraser river improvements, 1003
Freight rates
Discrimination, 1936
Equalization of, 1911, 1914
Fruit-growing industry, 2942
Fuel oil, importation, 1245
Geological survey explorations, 2504
Harbours and rivers, 1002, 2671

British Columbia—*Con.*
Highways, 2341, 2941, 3186. *See also* Canada Highways; Highways
Hindu franchise and, 4640-4651
Hydrographic survey, 3336
Immigration, 1096, 1112, 1327
Indian army officers, settlement in, 1096
Indians, 2152, 2163
Kitsilano reserve, 383
Schools, 2164
Iron ore deposits, 2505
Japanese fishermen, 1540, 1889, 1901, 4484
Kitsilano Indian reserve, 383
Kootenay flats reclamation scheme, 3431
Labour conditions, 1125
Legislation, disallowance of, 1261
Life-saving appliances, 1659
Liquor
Breweries and export liquor houses, licensing, 1636
Exportation of, qu. 1260
Importation, 2404. *See also* Canada Temperance Act Amdt.
Liquor laws, administration, 2419, 2423
Corruption, charge of, 2412-13
Ottawa Citizen, editorial, 2412
Public accounts com. investigation, 2410-13
Purchases, 2410
Warehouses, qu. 1974
Bonded, qu. 1260, qu. 1971, 2404
Licenses, qu. 1866
Lumber industry, 1245
Marine biological board of Canada, 3372
Oil companies, 2505
Oliver, Hon. John, freight rates, 1915, 2505
Correspondence, 1307
Orientals
Business interests of, 1896, 1901-03
Correspondence, 1307
Fishery licenses, 1541. *See also under this title,* Japanese
Immigration, 1217. *See also* Chinese Immigration; Immigration, Oriental
Restriction, 1453
Steveston fishing industry, 1901
Public buildings, 1024
Railway grades, 1917
Resources, 2940
Salmon-canning industry, 1540
Steamship services, 4003
Sumas lake reclamation project, 3431
Telegraphs and telephone lines, 2683, 3946
Terms of union, 1916
Trade with Britain via Panama canal, 3053
Unemployment, 1678
Relief, discontinuance of Federal aid, 1658

British Columbia Fisheries Commission 1453, 3372
Salmon-canning licenses, 1540

British Columbia Salmon Canners' Association, licenses, 1541

British Constitution. *See* Lack of Confidence, M. (Mr. Irvine)

British Dominions, Senates, constitution of, 1370, 1375

British Empire Exhibition. *See* Exhibitions

British Empire Settlement Board. *See* Immigration, Empire Settlement

British Empire Steel Corporation, 1391. *See also* Labour, Strikes
Letters from Messrs. McNeil and McLachlan to Prime Minister, 1704
Wolvin, Mr. Roy, 1704

British Goods, importation. *See* British Preference; Customs; Trade

British-Japanese Treaty. *See* Japan

British Market. *See* British Preference; Grain; Live Stock, Cattle Trade

British National Labour Party. *See* Labour

British North America Act
Amendment of, 2592, 4660
Bankruptcy legislation, 3095
Constitution, control over, 2895
Intercolonial railway and, 1765
International labour conference, 1645
Labour organizations, jurisdiction, 2891, 2892
Readjustment of representation. *See* Redistribution bill
Right to revise, 1378, 3059
Unemployment relief, responsibility, 1680

British Preference, 2734, 2948, 3082. *See also* Budget; Customs; Trade; Treaties, French Treaty
Australia, 1850
British goods free, 3039
Canadian industry penalized, 2957
Cattle embargo and, 3053. *See also this title under* Live Stock
Clothing, 3032
Direct importation by Canadian ports, 1757, 1772, 2645, 2678, 2734, 2898, 2948, 3015, 3039, 3053, 3068, 3082, 3454, 3895
Goods via Suez canal and Hong Kong, 3454, 3895
Transhipment at port in British colony, 3895

British Preference—*Con.*
Discount of 10 per cent, 2645, 2650
French treaty and. *See that title under* Treaties
Hudson Bay railway and, 2878
Increase, 453, 2243, 2713, 2741, 2832, 2854, 2898, 2907, 2937, 2989, 3034, 3039, 3053, 3454, 3487
Benefit to maritime provinces, 2968
Fifty per cent of general tariff, 2718, 2928, 3039, 3048
Knitting industry, 2958
Petition against, 2958
Woollen industry affected, 2958
Introduction of, 2832, 3009
Liberal policy and, 3007
Limitation to Canadian ports. *See under this title,* Direct Importation
Percentage of duties to general rate, 2776
Progressive party and, 2776, 2777
Rates under government and Progressive proposals, 2809
Sugar, 2651
Ways and Means committee, 3454
Woollen industry, 2989, 3034, 3458

British Shipping Board, loss of Llandovery Castle, 1745

British Subjects, definition. *See* Naturalization Act Amdt. bill

British War Medals. *See* War, Medals

British Wars, participation in. *See* Canada's Participation in War; Near East Crisis

Broadcasting Stations. *See* Radiotelegraphy

Bronze Powder industry. *See* Treaties, French Treaty

Brown, Mr. J. L. (Lisgar)
Address in reply, 47. Inheritance and pride in family traditions, William Lyon Mackenzie, 47; conditions in the West; lake grain rates; cattle embargo, 48; inquiry into grain trade; the British Empire, 49; national obligations, 49-50
Agricultural instruction grant, 607
Annuities, advertising, 1642
Breweries and export liquor houses, Licenses, 1636
Violation of liquor laws, 1866
Canadian National Railways, Paris offices, 3691
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 566
Dredging, maritime provinces, 1009
Elevators, overages, 2043

Brown, Mr. J. L.—*Con.*
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4538
Conference, 606
Fishing schooner race, 115
Freight rates, Manitoba-Canadian Northern agreement, 1934
French treaty bill, 2223
Fruit and fruit containers bill, 194
Health of animals, 576
Hog grading, 592
Hudson Bay railway, 3784
Iron ore discovery, Lake Athabaska, 2513
Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. bill, 2119
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill (value of citizenship) 2441
Ottawa-Hull bridge, 1016
Penitentiaries, 771
Proportional representation, 402
Public buildings, New Brunswick, 4613
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 716, 743
St. Lawrence river waterway, 3783
School lands, unpaid balances, 1385, 4203
Seed inspection, 196,198
Steamship services, 2172
Toronto seed branch building, 4621, 4623
Triplets, bonus for, inquiry, 3145
Vimy Ridge memorial, 183
Vocational training, 687
Welland canal construction, 3783

Brown, Mr. M. A., Medicine Hat. *See* Immigration, Canada Colonization Association

Browntail Moth. *See* Insect Pests

Bruce County pioneering conditions, 2870

Brussels Exhibition. *See* Exhibitions

Bryant's Landing, wharf, 950.

Bryce, Lord, proportional representation, 390

Budget. *See also* Ways and Means
Alterations in budget of 1922 and results, 2988
Amendment (Mr. Forke) 2717, 2755, 2776, 2787, 2803, 2809, 2817, 2820, 2822, 2837, 2845, 2854, 2861, 2884, 2932, 2944, 2947, 2955, 2966, 2973, 2976, 3010, 3014, 3015, 3023, 3039, 3051, 3073, 3077; neg. on division, 3082
Planks of Liberal platform included in 2861
Balanced, 2986, 3005, 3078. *See also* speeches on Budget
Changes, 3082
Date of, inquiry, 1163, 1483, 1740, 1869, 2128, 2254, 2347, 2469,
Debate on, 2701, 2741, 2795, 2837, 2898, 2928, 2984, 3046
Precedence, 2694

Budget—*Con.*
Deficits, 2784
Divisions
Amdt. (Mr. Forke) neg. 3082
Motion (Mr. Fielding) for Ways and Means Com. agreed to, 3084
Finance Minister
Record established by, 2852
Seventeeth budget, 2657, 2852
Speeches, 2701, 3074
Liberal and Conservative, no difference between, 2792
McMaster, Mr., attitude on budget, references, 3013, 3022, 3026, 3029, 3043, 3050, 3055, 4393
Presentation, form of, 2818, 2984, 3001, 3077
Record established by Minister of Finance, 2657, 2852
Resolutions, 2650, 3084, 3229, 3454, 3895, 3963, 4369, 4392, 4408, 4409. *See also* Customs Tariff Items
Amended, 3046
Ruling, Mr. Speaker, as to necessity for M. for Ways and Means, 2640
Speakers in debate: Messrs. Anderson, 2837; Archambault, 2879; Arthurs, 3033; Bancroft, 2736; Bird, 2787; Church, 2817; Denis (St. Denis), 3038; Drayton, Sir Henry, 2657; Drummond, 2973; Evans, 3067; Euler, 2852; Fielding, 2701, 3074; Findlay, 2883; Fontaine, 2814; Forke, 2711, amdt. 2717; neg. on div., 3082; Gould, 2951; Grimmer, 2898; Harris, 2804; Hopkins, 2980; Hudson, 3060; Hughes, 2919; Humphrey, 2940; Kellner, 2809; King, Mackenzie, 3046; King (Huron), 2908; Leader, 3039; Lovett, 2944; Lovie, 2871; Maclaren, 2948; Maclean (Prince), 2967; Maclean (Halifax), 3000; Maclean (York), 3055; McBride, 3031; McKillop, 2981; McMaster, 3012; Manion, 2746; Marler, 3022; Martell, 2904; Meighen, 2984; Morrison, 2928; Motherwell, 2756; Pritchard, 2730; Raymond, 2741; Reed, 2830; Robichaud, 2935; Ross (Kingston), 2832; Ryckman, 2912; Senn, 2957; Sexsmith, 2784; Spence, 2976; Stansell, 3062; Steedsman, 2835; Stewart (Argenteuil), 2795; Stork, 2733; Tolmie, 2861; Ward, 2959; White, 2964; Woods, 2846; Woodsworth, 2718
Statements omitted, 2860, 2926
Inquiry, 2898
Wood, Mr. H. W., Alberta, opinion on, 2771, 2853. 2946

Buffalo
Elk island park, 3435
Lamont park, 3941
Slaughter of, 3435, 3439, 3941, 4702
Tuberculosis, 3439
Wainwright herd, 2773, 3941

Buffalo and Fort Erie Public Bridge Company. *See* Bridges; Private Bills

Building. *See also* Housing; Labour
Bricklayers' wages, $12 per day, 2165, 3017
Building materials
Brick 3017
Cement, free admission, United States, 3017
Firebrick duty, 3481. *See also* Customs Tariff Items
Freight rates, 1961, 3036
French treaty, 1982
Prices, 2164, 3004
Roof coverings, investigation, 4703
Farm homes, 1178. *See also* Housing
Fuel supply and house construction, 3203
Increase of, 3055
United States, activity in, 3004, 3017. *See also* Emigration to United States
Wages, building trades, 2165, 3017. *See also* Labour, Wages

Building Stone, Hudson bay region, 1073

Building Trades. *See* Labour.

Bukowina. *See* West Ukrainian Republic

Bunyan, John, imprisonment, 3157

Burdis, Mr. W. D., salmon canners, 1541

Bureau, Hon. Jacques (Minister of Customs and Excise)
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4101, 4136
Officers and employees, right to organize, 4162
Beckett, Matt C., dismissal, 816
Bonded liquor houses, New Brunswick, 1212
British preference, Canadian ports, 3457
Building trades, 1812
Business of the House
Estimates, method of discussion, 4615-6
Legislation pending, 3265
M. to increase taxation, 3937
Questions passed as orders for returns, 939
Cadet services, 877, 879
Canadian National Railways, branch lines, 4306
Canadian ports, use by United States fishermen, 3361
Canned salmon shipment, Panama canal to Halifax, 2615, 3272

Bureau, Hon. Jacques—*Con.*
Cheque tax, 3926, 3929
Civil service, political partisanship, 286
Customs and Excise
Department, estimates, 3272
Duty on goods from one Canadian port to another, 2615, 3272
Excise taxes, payment with postage stamps, 1815, 3928
New York, Canadian officer at, 1213, 3273
Tomato plants, duty, 4433
Experimental farms, 471
Hamilton customs house, 3278
Ice-breaking, Thunder Bay, 3359
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 4360
Inland Revenue Act Amdt. bill (Certificate of analyst) 3749, 3969, 4131, 4207, 4528
Judges Act Amdt. bill, 3604
Macphail, Miss, members and party funds, 4238
McKenzie, Hon. D. D., appointment to Bench, 1810
Marking Act, 931
Masters and mates, 2610
Petroleum and Naphtha Act Inspection bill, 3969, 4248, 4276
Pilot boats, 3358
Postage stamps, for revenue purposes, 1815, 3298
Post Office
Postmasters, appointment, 1830
St. Baranabe Nord, Mr. Gelinas, 1830
Superintendent of Mail Contracts, 1814
Preston, Mr. W. T. R., 249
Prince Edward Island car ferry terminals claim, 4680
Prosecutions for operating illicit stills, 3280
Radiotelegraphy, 3374
Reciprocity. "No truck or trade with the Yankees" 3080
St. Lawrence river ship channel, 3375
Sales tax, 4429
M. (Mr. Stevens) for committee of inquiry, 245, 923
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4238-4246
Sorel shipyard, dismissals, 3345, 3374
Special War Revenue Act, M. (Mr. Stevens) 245, 923
Three Rivers harbour bill, 3863, 4207
Toronto
Customs building, 3278, 3282
Viaduct, 4441
Woollen industry, M. (Mr. Drummond) 931, 936

Bureau of Standards, 788

Bureau of Statistics. *See* Statistics

Burke, Edmund
Function of Parliament, 3018
Relation of member to constituent, 3022

Burne, Mr. Joseph, Immigration department, qu. 3141

Burns, Mr. Pat, price of live stock, 1101

Business Depression, 2798. *See* Address; Budget; Immigration

Business of the House. *See* House of Commons

Business Profits Tax. *See* Taxation

Business Profits War Tax Act, 1916, Amdt. Bill (Removal of restrictions as to liability for)
Res. 4440, 4489; 1r., 2r., 4491; com., 3r., 4492

Butter. *See* Dairy Industry Act; Dairying Industry

By-Elections. *See* House of Commons

Byng, Lord, Governor General. *See* Governor General; reference to in address

Cabinet. *See* Government

Cables. *See* Telegraphs and Telephones

Cabot Strait, ice obstruction, 2614

Cadet Services. *See* National Defence

Cahill, Mr. Frank S. (Pontiac)
Belle River harbour, 4600
Business profits tax, 4490
Canadian exhibition in France, 4711
Canadian Press Limited
Bill, 1464
Subsidy, 4727
Combines bill, 2628
Esquimalt dry dock, 2674
Halifax grain elevator, 4714
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1133
Empire settlement scheme, 1132
Policy, 1132
Reference to speech on, 1209
St. John immigration building, 1460
Newspaper combine, 4728

Cahill, Mr. Frank S.—*Con.*
Paternalism, excess of, 1133
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4513
Railways, Canals & Telegraph lines Com., report, 2252
Riordan Pulp and Paper Company, business profits tax, 4490
Rural depopulation, causes of, 1133
Supply, relevancy, 4719
Tariff, immigration and, 1133

Calcium Carbide, free admission to United States, 3017

Calder Act. *See* Civil Service, Superannuation

Caldwell, Mr. Thomas W. (Victoria and Carleton, N.B.)
Accredited herd system, 577, 582, 585, 626
Agricultural conditions, 1845
Agricultural publications, 598
Agriculture department, salaries, 610
Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt. bill, 2048, 2133, 2136
Annual drill, 4637
Audibility of debates, 976
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4115
Bonded warehouses, New Brunswick, 1212
Business of the House
Private members' days, 574
Prorogation, postponement of, 4754
Questions, as orders for returns, 938, 1386
Butter, British market for, 3298
Camp Hill hospital, Halifax, qu. 3506
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill 3973
Coasting regulations, 4276
Canadian National Railways
Branch lines construction bill, 4311
Expenditure, appropriation by Parliament, 4401
Rejection by Senate, 4698
Capital punishment, 768
Civil government estimates, form of, 610
Dairying industry, 609, 1845
Destructive insects and pests, 596
Dominion Lands Act (homesteads), 4365
Duties, revenue loss and smuggling, 3231
Emigration to the United States, 1845
Execution in Carleton county, 778
Exhibitions, 1465
Experimental farms, 484
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4273, 4541
Fertilizer Act, administration, 601
Fertilizers, duty on, 3486
Fisheries
Fishways in Salmon river, 3362
Pollution of streams, 701, 3362
Forest protection, M. (Mr. Michaud) 819
Fox-breeding industry, 588
Freight cars, interchange, 4697

Caldwell, Mr. Thomas W.—*Con.*
Gasoline and oil pumps, inspection, 810
Government workshops, Ottawa, 4617
Governor General's cars, repairs, 4691
Grand Falls railway, 4311
Harbours and rivers, Manitoba, 4589
Health of Animals, 582, 586, 3989. *See also under this title,* Accredited herds; Animal contagious diseases
Hector celebration, 4637
Highways, 3188
House of Commons. *See also under this title,* Business
Acoustics, 1722
Members' rooms, lighting and ventilation, 1728
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1480
Child, 1470
Indians
Tobique reserve, 2154-55
Victoria reserve, roads, 2153
Inland Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 3231
Intercolonial, employees' pensions, 3196
Interest rate, 4115
International boundaries, surveys, 3248
International Institute of Agriculture, 599
Judges' Act. Amdt. bill, 3265
La Société des Artisans Canadiens Français, 1027
Lake Grain rates bill, 4232
Live stock, 587, 588
Magazines, M. (Mr. Hocken) 835
Manitoba Plup and Paper Company, 3256
Marketing of grain, M. (Mr. Millar) 308
New Brunswick export warehouses, 815
New departmental building, Ottawa, 4617
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3271
Parliament buildings, 1718
Acoustics, 1721
Reconstruction committee, 1724
Patents of Invention bill, 2077, 3154
Penitentiaries, earnings of inmates, 772
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3848-3884
Widow who marries after disability appears, amdt. 3882, agreed to, 3884
Pensions, royal commission, 674, 681
Recommendations, 2394
Point of order (Mr. Carroll) 3267
Potatoes
Duty, 2707
Grading, 598
Growing and marketing, 308
Wharfage tolls, 975
Prince Edward Island railway, 3196
Privilege (Mr. Carroll) 3268, 3270
Radiotelegraph service, 3374
Root vegetables bill, 937

Caldwell, Mr. Thomas W.—*Con.*
Roumanian and Greek loans, qu. 623
St. John and Quebec railway
Connection with Eastern Maine railway, 4311
Interruption of traffic, 3644
St. John river, pollution of, 701, 3362
St. John-Westfield branch line, 4312
Seed inspection, 197
Soldier settlement, 2030
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment
Hospitals, 669
Salaries and contingencies, 669
Soldiers, venereal diseases, 705
Spruce bud worm, 596
Steamship services, 2171
St. John-Digby, 2176
Taxes, unpaid, 3258
Testing dairy cattle, 1307
Vancouver harbour bill, 332
Wharfage tolls, 974

Calgary
Customs examining warehouse, 1023
Post office, 629, 1024
Hayes, Mr. John J., dismissal, 1687, 1868
Returned soldiers, unemployment relief, 1679, 1683

Calgary Power Company, 3442
Banff national park, power rights, 3750, 3939

Calves, inspection of. *See* Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill

Camp Borden. *See* National Defence, Canadian Air Force

Camp Hill hospital, Halifax, qu. 3506

Campaign Funds and Literature. *See* Elections; Senate and House of Commons bill

Campbell, Mr. A. W. *See* Highways

Campbell, Commander, report, St. Andrew's harbour, 2900

Campbell, Mr. Milton N. (Mackenzie)
Agricultural conditions, 1402
Agricultural implements, standardizing, 805
Agriculture, sacrifices, 3065
Alberta coal, transportation, 1283
Bank Act Amdt. bill, interest rate, 4118
Binder twine duty, removal, 4387
Canada-West Indies service, 3379, 3386
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, 3798
Advance, 3824
Shipping combines, 3845
West Indies service, 3379, 3386

Campbell, Mr. Milton N.—*Con.*
Canadian National Railways
Advance of $73,000,000, 3651
Capitalization and fixed charges, qu. 3323, 3680
Paris offices, 3197
Transcontinental, condition of, 3680
Canadian Pacific railway
Dividends, 1406
Mail contracts, qu. 3143
Cheque tax, 3934
Copper bounty bill, 3240
Dominion Lands Act (homesteads) 3982
Dredging, 1012
Experimental farms, 3240, 4631
Farm labourers' dwellings, 1406
Fort Churchill townsite, qu. 284
Freight rates, Railway Commission, 3194
Fuel supply, 806
Governor General, expenditure, 4628
Grain-growing and freight rates, 3194
Hebridean immigrants, treatment of, 3599
Hemp bounty, 3913, 4387
Hudson Bay railway
Commercial feasibility of, 3006
Land, qu. 283
M. (Mr. Knox) 1070
Immigration
Land settlement, 1406, 1883
Policy, 1402
Soldier settlement board, 1406
Insurance branch, salaries, 3987
Interest rate, 4118
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4222-34
Land settlement policy, 1406, 1883
National Gallery, 1018
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 3983
Northover, Major H. R., claim, 4635
Passports, issuing of, 3988
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 4750
Prices, farm and manufactured products, 1403
Prince Edward Island railway, 3196
Printing bureau, improvements, 1022
Public archives, 3985
Quebec elevator, grain shipment, 4233
Rural depopulation, 1406
Taxation, burden of, 1403
West Ukrainian republic, M. 651, 657
Western provinces, conditions in, 1402
Wheat board, 2857

Campbell, Mr. Orin, claim, 626

Campbellton wharf, 945

Camps, Militia. *See* Militia and Defence, Annual Drill; Petawawa

Canada Colonization Association. *See this title under* Immigration.

Canada-France Convention of Commerce. *See* Treaties, French Treaty

Canada Gazette, 1707

Canada Grain Act. *See* Grain

Canada Highways Act Amdt. Bill. *See also* Highways, (Time for earning and receiving payment of grant extended for two years.)
Res. 2253, 2338; 1r., 2343; 2r., com., 2469; 3r., 2470

Canada, Status of, 40, 165. *See also* British North America Act; Imperial Conference; Near East Crisis; Treaties, Halibut treaty

Canada's Claims. *See* Germany, Reparations

Canada's Constitutional Development, 4455-80. *See also* Treaties, Halibut

Canada's Participation in War, 4655. *See also* Imperial Conference; Near East Crisis
M. (Mr. Power) 1529

Canada Shipping Act. *See also* Marine; Shipping and Shipbuilding; Vessels
Announcement of legislation on lake freight rates, 3507. *See also* Lake Grain Rates bill

Canada Shipping Act Amdt. Bills
1. Certificates to masters and mates; pilotage
Res. 2418; 2668; 1r., 2668; 2r., com., 3r., 3146
2. Distressed seamen; certificate of registration; certificate of inspection
Res. 574, 3969; 1r., 2r., com., 3973; 3r., 4207
3. Restoration of ships purchased from foreign subjects; loading of grain cargoes; port wardens; returns by surveyors
Res. 3749, 3961, 4235; 1r., 4236; 2r., com., 3r., 4276

Canada Steamship Lines, Limited
Capitalization, 1391
Hanna, Mr. D. B., director, 3208
Shipping combine, 4278
Sifton, Sir Clifford, director, 4285
Thornton, Sir Henry, director, 2983, 3208, 3845, 3848
Traffic, exchange, 2983, 3208

Canada Steamship Lines Limited—*Con.*
War claims, qu. 3142

Canada Temperance Act, 2942. *See also* Liquor
Administration, 2495
Plebiscites under, 2495

Canada Temperance Act Amdt. Bill (Importation into prohibition province prohibited)
Res. 574, 767; 1r., 767; 2r., 2284; com., 2284; 2404, 2419; 3r., 2428; Senate amendments, 4732
Sections and subjects discussed:
Amdt. (Mr. McQuarrie) 2414-15, neg. 2428
Amdt. (Sir Lomer Gouin) 2419, agreed to, 2428
Blending, 2408, 2419
Brewers, 2404
British Columbia
Administration of law, 2404-13
Correspondence with, 1032, 1307
Exportation, 2404
Government control, 2406
Importation prohibited, 2404, 2419. Exceptions, 2404, 2419
Manson, Hon. A. M., Attorney General of British Columbia, 2412
Newcombe, Mr. E. L., K.C., opinion of, 2408

Canadian Air Force. *See* National Defence

Canadian Ambassador at Washington. *See* Canadian Representation

Canadian Athletic Team at Olympic Games, 4706

Canadian Authors Association. *See* Copyright Act Amdt. Bill

Canadian Bronze Powder Works, Valleyfield, 1998. *See also* Treaties, French

Canadian Citizenship. *See* Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill

Canadian Council of Agriculture
Bank Act revision, 4016, 4041, 4045
Res. respecting, 255

Canadian Council of Horticulture, 2307

Canadian Council of Immigration, 1876

Canadian Credit Men's Association. *See* Bankruptcy Act

Canadian Domicile. *See* Immigration Act Amdt. bill

Canadian Economic Conference, Sir Charles Gordon, 4023

Canadian Engineering Standards Association, 788

Canadian Expeditionary Force. *See* War

Canadian Express Company. *See* Canadian National Railways

Canadian Forestry Association, 3409. *See also* Forests and Forestry

Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 110, 2172. *See also* Canadian National Railways; Canals; Freight Rates; Shipping and Shipbuilding; Steamship Services
- Advances to, 2641, 3830
  - $1,700,000, 3376
  - $1,500,000, 3798, 3824
- Assets and liabilities, 3804
- Atlantic combines, qu. 2613
- Cattle shipments, 2758, 2807, 3040, 3811
- Coal cargoes, 3807, 3814, 3826
- Committee, 2474
- Construction, 3780
  - Cost per ton, 957
  - Without tender and contract, 957
- Deficit, 2928, 3006, 3038, 3072, 3377, 3798, 3802, 3843
- Directors, 3811
- Expenditure, 3802
  - Earnings and, 1868
- Flour, discrimination against Canadian, 2761
- Freight rates, regulation of, 3806
- Grain trade, 2828, 3263, 3812, 4234
- Insurance, 1568
- Lake grain-carrying trade, 3776, 4223, 4284. *See also* Freight Rates, Shipping; Lake Grain Rates bill
- Lease of freighters to Great Lakes Transportation Company, 3848
- Loan to, 113-114. *See also* under this title, Advances
- Management, 3637
- Mediterranean service, qu. 1488, 1636
- Milburn, Mr. H., qu. 1138
- Negotiations for sale of 27 ships, 1975. *See also under this title,* Vessels, sale of
- New York pool, 3806
- North Atlantic Conference, 2127, 2761
- Ocean rates, 2760
- Policy, 3798, 3827, 3830
  - Unemployment, 3828, 3846
- Prince Rupert Dry Dock Company, 4708
- Public ownership, 3798
- Return cargoes, absence of, 2928
- St. Lawrence and Great Lakes, service on, qu. 2613
- Sailings, qu. 4511
  - Arrangements for 1924, qu. 4751
- Scrap metal and material, qu. 1138
- Shipping combines, 1395, 2127, 2760, 3848, 4223
- Ships, sale of. *See under this title,* Vessels
- Subsidized steamship services, competition, 3378
- Tank cars, transportation, qu. 1361
- Thornton, Sir Henry, 3811
  - Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, 2983, 3208, 3845, 3848
  - Utilization of boats for cattle, 3040
  - West Indies service, 3379
- Trade with Fiji Islands, 1848
- Trader, wreck of, qu. 1763
- Transportation combine. *See under this title* Shipping Combines
- Vessels
  - Earnings, etc., 3324, 3399
  - Laid up, 3379, 3386
  - Sale of, 1975, 2518, qu. 2613, 2828, 3385-6, 3705, 3813, 3822, 3846
- Vote under closure 4598
- West Indies and South American trade, 3378, 3808, 3835, 3840

Canadian Government Railways. *See this title* under Canadian National Railways

Canadian High Commissioner. *See* High Commissioner

Canadian Liner Committee. *See* Freight Rates, Shipping

Canadian Magazines, Encouragement of. *See* Magazines

Canadian Manufacturers Association. *See also* Budget; Manufacturers
- Bankruptcy, 3093
- Canada Colonization Association, disbursements to, 1164, 1171
- Canadian Trade Index, 2217
- Copyright, 2142, 2289
- French treaty, 1997, 2001, 2209, 2229
- Greater production campaign, 2725
- Shaw, Mr. J. B., fuel policy, 1265
- Trade Mark and Designs Act bill, 2293

Canadian National Express Company. *See* Canadian National Railways

Canadian National Institute for the Blind, 693

Canadian National Parks and Historic Sites, 3406, 3432. *See also* Dominion Lands and Parks
Administration, 66
Automobiles, admission fee, 3942
Banff National park
Canmore sanitation, 3434, 3941
Electrical equipment, 3434, 3949
Springs and cave, 496
Waterpowers, 496, 3420, 3750
Power rights, Calgary Power Company, 3750, 3442, 3939
Buffalo in. *See* Buffalo
Commissioner, location in Western Canada, 3436
Elk Island buffalo park, 3435
Expenditure, 3941
Further amount, 4702
Fort Edward, Windsor, N.S., 3406, 3432, 3435
Fort Prince of Wales, preservation, 1041
Historic sites commission, 3406
Golf course, Jasper park, 3435
Minette Hot springs, 3949
Moose mountains pleasure resort, 3408
Municipal government in, 3436
Niagara forts, preservation of, 4707
Nova Scotia historical society, 3406
Quebec battlefields commission, 3406, 3432
Playgrounds, 3432
Port Dover, Fathers Dollier and Galinee, 3433
Preservation of, 3249
Roads and bridges, 1014
Supplementary vote, 3948
Timber wolves, destruction by, 597
Tourist traffic, 3435
Revenue, 3942
Wainwright, slaughter of buffalo, 4702
Waterton lakes park, 3435

Canadian National Railways. *See also* Address; Budget; Freight Rates; Railways and Canals;
Accounting, 4328. *See also* Board of Audit
Unification of, 3196
Acquisition, history of, 55
Advances, 2641
$73,000,000, 1619, 3610, 3650, 3676
M. (Mr. Stevens) to reduce by $2,000,000, 3681, neg. 3701
Statement of appropriations, 1922-23, 1923-4, 3789
Additional
$1,550,000, 4692
$13,099,493.34, 1752, 1764, 3376
Advertisements for farm labourers, 1101
Agents for labour supply, 1191
Amalgamation, 18, 28, 56, 61, 2471

Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
Amalgamation—*Con.*
Causes of delay, 56
Economies resulting from, 1616
Orders in council effecting, 34, 53, 3620
Annual statement of minister, 1558
Appointments, 2472
Balfour, Col. H. N., reported, 2794, 2828
From outside Canada, 2827
Promotion, principle of, 3621
Thomas, Mr. A. J., reported, 2794, 2828
Appropriations, statement of, 2898, 2926, 3789
Atlantic division, boundaries, qu. 1363, 1754-62, 1770-72
Atlantic ports, 1754. *See also under this title,* Ocean Ports; Terminals
Audit staff, Moncton, removal, 574, 1756
Bank accounts, qu. 205
Betterments, 1562
Board of Directors. *See under this title,* Directors.
Board of management. *See under this title,* Directors; Management
Branch lines, 1568, 3626, 4688. *See also* Canadian National Railway Bills
Advances, 4329
Baie St. Paul-St. Urbain, 4189, 4197
Bruederheim, 4199, 4316
Brule Lake-Grande Prairie, 4699
Construction of, 1185, 3625
Cost per mile, 4327
Dunblane-Aylesbury, 4308, 4333
Dunlane-Mawer line, 4201
Eston branch, 4201
Expenditure
Appropriations, 4303, 4329, 4337
Authorization by Parliament, 4515
Financing, 4304, 4319, 4329
Grand Falls, 4310
Grande Fresniere-Rinfret Junction, 4312, 4326
Grande Prairie, 1185, 4200
Halifax-Musquodobit, 4317
Hanna-Medicine Hat, 4321
Hanna-Warden-Loverna, 4308, 4322, qu. 4436
Inverness railway, 4198
Inverness and Richmond, 4324
Kamloops-Okanagan, 4314
Kent Northern, 4189, 4197
Lockeport railway, 4326
Long Lac-Nakina, 3224, 4194, 4310, 4326
Meductic-International boundary, 4309, 4311
Melfort, 4319
Moncton-Buctouche railway, 3646, 4197
Moose Jaw-Riverhurst, 4333
Murray Bay-Nairn Falls, 4189, 4197

Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
Branch lines—*Con.*
Okanagan, 4314
Oliver-St. Paul, 4323
Paddockwood, 4319
Peace River, 4324
Peebles-Lampman, 4325
Prince George to Peace River, construction, 1434, 4701
Purchase of, 3646
St. John and Quebec, 4305
St. John and Westfield, 4312
St. Peter's-Louisburg, 4319, 4324
Sunny Brae-Guysborough, 4316, 4320, 4321
Thunderhill, 4311, 4315, 4322
Waterous-Swift Current, 4308
Windsor-Chester, 4333
Yorktown-Willowbrook, 4308
British mails, delay in, 2695
British preference and, 3053
Buffalo and Fort Erie Bridge Company, 1835
Business cars, 489, 4527
Canada Colonization Association, 1181, 1328, 3400, 3633
Canada Steamship Lines, Limited
Exchange of traffic, 2983, 3208
Thornton, Sir Henry, director, 2983, 3208, 3845, 3848
Canadian customs officer at New York, 3275
Canadian Government Merchant Marine. *See that title*
Canadian government railways
Advances, 1565
Audit office, transfer, Moncton to Montreal, 574, 1756
Deficit, 1560
Operating divisions, earnings and expenses, qu. 2298
Canadian National Safety League, 3956
Canadian National telegraphs, qu. 707, 2471
Canadian Northern, 1760. *See also under this title,* Annual Statement of Minister
Acquisition of, 56-57, 1937
Advances, 1565
Aid, conditions of, 1766
Amalgamation, causes of delay, 56-58
Arbitration, 56
British Columbia guarantee, 1946
Embezzlement of funds, 381
Fixed charges, 1565, qu. 3323
Gratuities to directors and officials, disclosure of, 2962
Insurance, 1568
Manitoba, agreement with, 1932, 1939
Securities, 1564
System, 55-56
Canadian Northern Express Company. *See under this title,* Express

Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
Canadian ports, 3454. *See also under this title,* Ocean Ports, Terminals
Capital expenditure, control of, 2827
Capitalization, 3192
Fixed charges and, qu. 3323
Reduction of, 3058
Car shortage, 62
Champlain market station, 4446
Chicago, traffic originating at, 1760-1770
Coal. *See also that title*
Freight rates on, 1264, 1268, 1277, 1280, 2828, 3200, 3621. *See also* Coal; Freight Rates; Fuel Supply
Increase of 300 per cent, 1277
Purchases, 1277, 1561, qu. 4303, 4708, qu. 4752
Alberta coal, qu. 1363, qu. 4437, qu. 4752
Maccan and river Hébert, mines, 1027
United States, in, 1277, 3493, qu. 4511
Transportation, 1264
Commitments, 18-19
Committee on, 2473
Construction, new, 1562, 1922
Co-ordination, 18, 28, 34, 53, 56, 61, 1616, 2471, 3620
Correspondence, M. for, 244
Cost of taking over, 92
Courtesy, 2859, 2971
Debt, 2802
Deficits, 1613, 2658, 2802, 2827, 2831, 3006, 3024, 3038, 3078, 3610, 3620, 3651, 4190. *See also* speeches on Budget; Supply
Taxation and, 3006
Directors, 36, 60, 62, qu. 1973, 2833
Additional, for Quebec, 34. *See also this head,* Talbot
Address and occupation, qu. 1973
British Columbia appointment, 373
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, 3811
Cattle shipments, 2758
Dawson, Mr. F. G., 373, qu. 1973
Gratuities to, 1687, 2962
Inspection trip, qu. 489
Labour, representation of, 1652, 1656, 3636
M. (Mr. Lapointe) 1653-56
Moore, Mr. Tom, 1654
New board of, 13
New Brunswick representation, qu. 282
Private cars, qu. 489
Removal of late board, correspondence, 3962
Responsibilities and powers, 2478, 3610, 3653. *See also under this title,* Management
Retiring allowances, 1483, qu. 1632
Sinclair, Mr. John A. statement, qu. 1363

Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
Directors—*Con.*
Special train, qu. 489
Stewart, Mr. James, qu. 205
Talbot, Mr. Onesiphore, qu. 707, qu. 1031, qu. 1258, 2004
Doctors, qu. 814
Dominion Express Company. *See also under this title,* Express
Dorchester employees, qu. 2086
Earnings, 3620, 3651
Eastern division
Brown, Mr. L. S., superintendent, 2971
Improved situation, 2971
Moncton headquarters, 2971
Eastern Land Company, purchase of land at Capreol, 626, 1635
Efficiency, 2859
Electric lines, sale of to municipalities, 2475. *See also* Canadian National Railway bills
Electrification, qu. 283, 3203, 3422, 3425
Employees, 55, 3621
Pensions, 14, 288. *See also under this title,* Pensions
Equipment, 1561, 4692
Orders, 2701
Estimates, 1566, 1619, 1764
Expenditure, 2987, 3078, 3620, 4305
Authorization by Parliament, 3615-40, 4304, 4397, 4515
Express. *See also* Canadian National Railway bills
Canadian Express Company, 2470
Canadian National Express, qu. 707
Canadian Northern Express, 2470
Dominion Express Company, termination of contract with, 2473
Intercolonial Express Company, 2470
Rates, 2876
Fish, on, 3365
Fidelity insurance, qu. 1029
Finance
Advances by government, 1565
Consolidated income figures, 1564
Financial statement, inquiry, 666
Financing in 1922, 1564
Securities, approval of, 4402. *See also under this title,* Securities
Fixed charges, qu. 708, qu. 814, 1565
Flavelle, Sir Joseph, 1612
Foster, Mr. A. de Witt, qu. 1633
Fredericton bridge, 3645, 4310
Freight cars, 4692
Interchange with United States, 4697
Purchase of in United States, 4692
Freight rates. *See also that title*
Coal, 1264, 1268, 1277, 1280, 2828, 3200, 3621. *See also* Coal; Fuel Supply

Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
General conditions, 1559
Georgetown wharf, 4587
Grades, 1965
British Columbia, 1917
Grain shipments, qu. 1484. *See also* Grain
Canadian and United States ports, 1756
Diversion to American ports, 2899
Portland, 1756
St. John, 1768
Grand Trunk, 1562
Additions and betterments, 1564
Advances, 1565
Amalgamation, delay in, 18, 56
Arbitration, 59, 1154, 1307
Arbitrators, fees, etc., qu. 624, qu. 1257
Doherty, Right Hon. C. J., qu. 1029
Legal expenses, qu. 730
Taft, Hon. Howard G., payments to, qu. 1157
Tilley, Mr. W. N., K.C., qu. 1029, qu. 1661, 2813
Assets, disposal of, 1665
Atwater, Mr. A. R., gratuity, qu. 1632
Biggar, Mr. W. H., K.C., gratuity, qu. 1632
Central Vermont
Deficits, 1563
Operating results, 1613
Transportation Company, 1564
Chicago, New York & Boston Refrigerator Company, 1563
Coal purchases, 1564
Commitments, qu. 206, qu. 207
Crowsnest pass agreement, rates, 1563
Dalrymple, Mr. J. E., gratuity, qu. 1632
Deer, Mr. H., gratuity, qu. 1632
Deficits, 1563
Electrification, qu. 283, 3203
Elevator, Montreal, qu. 1974
Equipment, all lines, 1564
Galloway, Mr. D. E., gratuity, qu. 1632
Grades, 1965
Gratuities to retiring directors and officials, 1664-68
British board of directors, qu. 1632
Disclosure of, 2962
Payments out of insurance, 1632, 1665
Progressive party and, 1687
Refund, 1667
Royal commission, 1665
Congdon, Mr. F. T., appointment, 2297, 2710, qu. 3131
Order in Council, tabled, 2347
Inquiry, 1976, 2297
Income account, 1563
Insurance, 1568
Insurance fund, payment of gratuities out of, 1632, 1665
International bridge company, 1563

Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
Grand Trunk—*Con.*
Kelley, Mr. Howard G., gratuity, qu. 1632
Logan, Mr. R. S., gratuity, qu. 1632
Management, personnel, 1612. *See also under this title,* Directors; Management
Martin, Mr. H. G., gratuity, qu. 1632
Montreal and Southern Counties Railway, 1564
Montreal Warehousing Company, 1564
Norman, Mr. H. H., gratuity, qu. 1632
Ocean ports, 1758. *See also under this title,* Terminals
Providence, 1755, 1762
Operating results, 1560-3
Oshawa Railway, Rail and River Coal Company, 1564
Pensioners, annual passes, qu. 2418
Pension rights of employees, 14
Preference and common shareholders, representations, 3960
President, retiring allowance, 2785
Prince Rupert dry dock, qu. 1664
Profit and loss, qu. 1257
Pullen, Mr., 2472
Purchase price, qu. 1257
Robb, Mr. W. D., gratuity, qu. 1632
Rosevear, Mr. J. M., gratuity, qu. 1632
Scott, Mr. Frank, gratuity, qu. 1632
Separately-owned companies, 1563
Shareholders, list of, 939
Stock, 61
Terminal Warehousing Company, 1564
Terminals in United States, 815
Portland, 1755, 1758, 1768, 2898
Providence, 1755, 1762
Thousand Island railway, 1564
Ties, tenders, qu. 3821
Traffic, 1563
Grand Trunk Pacific, 58-59, 152, 1761
Aid, conditions of, 1766
Bell, Mr. G. T., gratuity, qu. 1632
Construction, cost of, 1918
Debenture holders, representation, 3507, 3581
Fixed charges, 1565
Hansard, Mr. H. H., gratuity, qu. 1632
Hinton, Mr. W. P., gratuity, qu. 1632
Loan of $15,000,000, 2920
Porter, Mr. S. P., gratuity, qu. 1632
Gratuities. *See under this title,* Grand Trunk
Refund of, 1667
"Greatest railway in the world," 3056
Halifax grain elevator, qu. 4751
Halifax terminals, qu. 4518. *See also under this title* Terminals

Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
Hanna, Mr. D. B.—*Con.*
Hanna, Mr. D. B., 1612, 2050
Director, Canadian Steamship Lines, 3208
Retirement, 1666
Gratuity, qu. 1632
Hayes, Mr. 2471
Headquarters, 62, 3224. *See also under this title,* Moncton
Divisional, 63
Montreal, 1757
Hotel Scribe. *See under this title,* Paris Offices
Hotels, 938, qu. 1257
Deficits, 2976
Manager, qu. 1257
Hudson Bay railway and. *See that title*
Immigration, 1121
Canada Colonization Association, 1181, 1328, 3400, 3633
Conference, 1193
Income account, 1559
Inquiry into, 19
Insurance, 1567, 1616. *See also* Canadian National Railways bill, Insurance
Hanna, Mr. D. B. and Mitchell, Mr. A. J., interests in, 2050
Mortgaged premises. *See this title under* Canadian National Railway bills
Rates of, statement, 2106
Intercolonial, 135, 1756, 1760, 1765
Atlantic ports, 1754-62
British North America Act and, 1765
Express. *See under this title,* Express
Moncton headquarters, 13
Paradis, Mr. Telesphore, claim, 4691
Pensioners, annual pass, qu. 2418
Pensions, 3195
Kelley, Mr. Howard, 1612, qu. 1632
Labour, representation, 1561. *See under this title, also,* Directors; Moore
Land
Contiguous to, 1880
Purchases or sales, 1739
Legislation, qu. 4300. *See also* Canadian National Railway bills
Liquor transportation, 1868, 3324
Mail contracts, qu. 3143
Management, 1616, 2832, 3041, 3623. *See also under this title,* Directors
Details of, 2472
Liberal resolution of 1921, 3685, 3688
Non-interference with, 2473, 3670
Personnel, 3058
Responsibility and powers, 3615, 3620, 3623, 3653, 3811. *See also under this title,* Paris Offices; Thornton
Capital investments. *See under this*

Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
title, Paris Offices
Maritime provinces in, 126-130
Maritime region, 1754, 1757
Mileage, 55, 1765, 3197
Cost, and, 914
Operated, 1558
Traffic and, comparison, 2949
Minister, acting, statement by, 55-63
Minister's annual statement, 1558; operated mileage, 1558; general conditions, 1559; income account, 1559; net operating deficit, 1560; decreased operating expenses, 1560; operating ratio, 1560; traffic results, steam lines, 1561; operating expenses, 1561; labour, 1561; locomotive coal purchases, 1561; equipment, 1561; betterments, 1562; new construction, 1922, 1562; Grand Trunk, 1562; income account, 1563; Grand Trunk traffic, 1563; separately-owned companies, 1563; employees and compensation, 1564; equipment, Grand Trunk, all lines, 1564; coal, 1564; additions and betterments, 1564; finance; consolidated income figures, 1564; financing in 1922, 1564; advances by government, 1565; fixed charges, 1565; estimates, 1566; reorganization, Sir Henry Thornton, 1566; insurance, 1567; tabulated statements, 1570-1611
Mitchell, Mr. A. J.,
Insurance, interest in, 2050
Retiring gratuity, qu. 1632, 1667
Moncton and Buctouche railway, 3646, 4197
Montford railway, 4199
Moore, Mr. Tom
Labour representative, directors, 1652, 1654, 3636
Statement on immigration, 1167
Mulligan, Mr. D. B., qu. 1257
National Transcontinental. *See under this title,* Transcontinental
Net operating deficits, 1560
New positions and salaries, 2701
Niagara and St. Catharines railway, 2475
Niagara Central railway, 2480
No politics order, 3623
Ocean ports and terminals, 1754, 1757-1762, 1767, 1768, 2898, 2899, 2937, 3454. *See also under this title,* Terminals
Official cars, 3621
Officials, retiring allowances, 1483, qu. 1632
Operation
Costs, 1919
Deficits, 3701
Expenses, decreased, 1560, 1561

Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
Ratio, 1560
Orders in council, 815
Over-capitalization, 2860
Ownership, 3192, 3224
Page, Supt., alleged statement, 4514
Paris offices, purchase of Hotel Scribe, 3197, 3208, 3224, 3279, 3610, 3610-46, 3650-76, 3676-3708, 3811, 3813, 3838, 4514
Amdt. (Mr. Stevens) 3664, ruled out of order, 3667
Aronovici, Mr. A., 3612, 3652
Peace river
Branch lines, 1434, 4324, 4701
Survey, 4898
Policy, 1764, 3620
Pre-audit, 3701
Preferential treatment of localities, 1762
President, appointment of, 2827
Prince Edward Island car ferry claim, 4676
Prince Rupert, 2734
Printing, 1623
Contracts, 3144
Winnipeg, qu. 3323
Private cars, 489, 4527
Property, purchases and sales, 1739, 2518, 3324
Prospects of success, 2830
Providence, Rhode Island, building, 1755
Public ownership, 1614, 1618, 1770, 2859, 3007, 3056, 3622, 4190. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget
Quebec terminals, 446
Railway Commission and, 666
Railway mail service, 1783, 1786
Rates. *See under this title,* Freight Rates
Real estate, 1739, 2518, 3324
Regional areas, 135, 3621
Regulations, 496
Reorganization, Thornton, Sir Henry, 1566
Report, 3223
Retirement fund, 1667
Retiring allowances to officials and directors, 1483. *See also under this title,* Grand Trunk, Gratuities
Revaluation, 2859
Earning power, 2860
Replacement, 2860
Revenue, detailed, 2898
Riley's army, transportation, 3042
Robb, Mr., qu. 1632, 2471
Rolling stock and equipment, 61, 1561, 3962
St. Croix, 2899
St. John and Quebec railway, 3403
Interruption of traffic, 3644
St. John terminal, 3645. *See also* St. John, *and under this title,* Terminals
St. Malo repair shops, 4447

Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
Sales tax, qu. 1157
Scarfe Varnish Works, purchases, qu. 1485
Service, improved, 2859, 3041
Settlement along, 1185
Shannon, Mr. L. S., gratuity, qu. 1632
Shipping. *See* Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Combine, 2127
Steel, lifting of, 1664
Strategic advantages, 3057
Superannuation fund, qu. 2418
Tabulated statements, 1570-1611
Talbot, Mr. Onesiphore. *See under this title,* Directors
Teakle, Mr. R. B. letter as to cattle shipments, 2758
Telegraph service, Canadian Press, 4728
Terminals. *See also under this title* Ocean ports
Atlantic division, qu. 1363, 1771
Halifax, 1756, 1759, 1768, 4713, qu. 4751
Maritime region, qu. 1662
Ocean. *See also under this title,* Ocean Winter ports, 2902
Portland, Maine, 1755, 1768
Providence, 1755, 1762
St. John, 1756, 1759, 1768
Thornton, Sir Henry, 13, 52, 1566, 1612, 2833. *See also under this title,* Paris Offices
Appointment, 2828
Agreement tabled, 574
Correspondence, 495
Assistants, reported appointment of Messrs. Balfour and Thomas, 2794, 2828
Atlantic division, 1771
Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, director, 2983, 3208, 3845, 3848
Cattle shipments, 2758
Coal transportation, 1264
Criticism of, 3640
Crowsnest pass agreement, 1966
Financial statement, 666
Freight rates on Alberta coal, 1268
Immigration, 1167, 2795, 2840
Maritime boards of trade, conference, 1755, 1771
Ocean ports, 1758-69
Operating costs, 1919
Paris offices, 3208, 3611, 3615, 3653
Radial railways, sale of, 2476
Rate discrimination, 1914
Sale of 27 ships, 2828
Speeches, 3637
Ties, purchase of, qu. 516
Toronto
Approaches and terminals, 4193, 4447
Connection between lines, 3224

Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
Toronto—*Con.*
Level crossings, 2477
Office building, qu. 814, qu. 1663, 2481
King and Yonge Streets property, qu. 1994, 2518, 3224, 3399, 3629, 3642
Union station, 3620, 4325, 4442
Viaduct, qu. 517, 4306, 4325, 4441, 4442
Toronto Eastern railway, 2475
Toronto Suburban railway, 2181, 2475
Sale of, qu. 2612, 3399
Traffic, 3041
Results, steam lines, 1561
Staff, removal from Truro to Halifax, 4708
Train to carry troops to Sydney, qu. 624
Transcontinental, 1760
Branch line to Montreal, qu. 2393
Cattle shipments, 2807
Development of northern Ontario and Quebec, 2833
Fortin & Moffat claim, 3646
Freight rates, 3680
Operating results, 1560
Strategic advantages, 3057
Winnipeg-St. Croix projected route, 2898
Transportation combine, 1395. *See also* Freight rates
Truro subway, 4454
Unification of system, 1615, 1666, 3196, 3223
Union stockyards, 2762
United States
Lines, 3197
Terminals, 1755, 1762, 1768
Value of property, 55
Wages, reduction, qu. 1363. *See also* Labour
Waterways, 3057

Canadian National Railways Bills
1. Insurance of mortgaged premises
Res. 1635, 2048; 1r., 2050; 2r., com., 2105; 3r., 2107
2. Express business and sale of electric lines; radial railways
1r., 2392; 2r., com., 2470; 3r., 2481
3. Construction of branch lines
Res. 3961, 4185; 1r., 4201; 2r., 4303-4308; com., 4308; 3r., on div. 4397, 4401
Sections and subjects discussed:
Advances for government railway lines, 4329
Advances pending issue of guaranteed securities, 4344
Amdts. (Mr. Meighen) expenditure, appropriation of by Parliament, 4337, neg. 4339; 4398, neg. 4401
Guarantee of securities of other lines up to $40,000 per mile, 4339
Lines connecting with Canadian government railways and constructed by company, 4327

Canadian National Railways Bills—*Con.*
Construction of branch lines—*Con.*
Sections and subjects discussed—*Con.*
Nature and form of securities, 4339
Power to construct described in schedule, 4308
Rejection by Senate, 4753, 4688, 4689, 4694, 4695
4. Securities, approval of
Res, 4012, 4402; lr., 4405; 2r., com., 4515; m. for 3r., amdt. (Sir Henry Drayton) to refer back neg., 4732; 3r., 4732
Senate amendments, 4754
Amdt. (Mr. Meighen) expenditure, appropriation of by Parliament, 4527, neg. 4528
Form, term and amount of securities to be approved, 4515

Canadian National Safety League grant, 3953

Canadian Naval Volunteer Reserve. *See* National Defence, Naval Service

Canadian Northern Railway. *See this title under* Canadian National Railways

Canadian Pacific Railway. *See also* Address; Budget; Freight Rates
Advertisements for farm labourers, 1101
Agents for labour supply, 1191
Assets, obligations, etc., qu. 625
Attitude towards Canadian National Railways, 3056
Banff hotel, 3435
British Columbia, qu. 626, 1916
Canada Colonization Association, 1172, 1324, 1328, 3400
Canadian customs officer at New York, 3275
Canadian Pacific "party", 3056
Cattle shipments, 3043
Chinese sailors, 2334
Consolidated Mining & Smelting Company, 3235
Construction, 1880, 1916, 1918
Crowsnest pass agreemet, 1620. *See also that title.*
Dividends, 1203, 1392, 1406, 3190
Dominion Express Company, 2470
Earnings, 1919
Net, 1130
Surplus, 1130
Efficient service, 127
Express charges, 2876
False Creek bridge, 3375, 4708
Freight Rates. *See also that title*
Copper bounty and, 3239
Dividends, and, 1134
Ocean, 2127

Canadian Pacific Railway—*Con.*
Grades, 1965
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1172, 1324, 1328, 3400
Conference, 1193
Russia, 1340
Labour, shopmen, resolution of, 1338
Land, 3704
Sale contracts, revision of, 2930
Lanigan, Mr., freight rates, 1918
Operation, cost of, 1918
Quebec terminals, 815
Railway mail service, 1783, 1786
Mail contracts, qu. 3143
St. John immigration buildings, 1457, 1458
Shares, transfer under Treaty of Versailles, 2496
Steamship lines, British mails, 2695
Telegraph service, Canadian press, 4728
Toronto, level crossings, 2477
Union stockyards, 2762

Canadian Ports. *See* British Preference; Canadian National Railways; Ports; Treaties, French and Italian

Canadian Press Limited. *See Press*

Canadian Representation in the United States, 65, 2735, 3016, 3085, 4001, 4664. *See also* Treaties, Halibut Fishery
Delay, 3085

Canadian Society of Chemical Industries, 2069

Canadian Trade Index, 2217

Canadian Vickers. *See* Vickers

Canadian Wheat Board. *See* Grain and Grain Trade, Wheat Board

Canadians
Distressed, relief of, 1456
Emigrating. *See* Emigration
Repatriation of. *See* Immigration

Canals. *See also* Railways and Canals; St. Lawrence Waterway
Canadian National railways, and, 3057
Cornwall, employees, political partisanship, qu. 3135
Freight rates, water transportation, 1914
Georgian Bay construction, 2816
Grain shipments and, 2808. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade; Lake Grain Rates
Improvement of, 1619
Isle Perrot bridge, Ste. Anne's lock, 3646
Panama. *See that title*
Rideau
Improvements, 4691
Water powers, qu. 622

Canals—*Con.*
St. Lawrence. *See that title*
Trent
Bridges, qu. 205
Campbell, Mr. Orin, claim, 626
Expenditure, qu. 4301
Improvements, 3647, 4691
Traffic, qu. 4301
Young's Point dam, qu. 1363
Welland
Construction, 3760
Contracts, qu. 1489
Deepening, 2979
Expenditure, 3073, qu. 3820
Inquiry into, 3006
Request for, 3073, 3766, 3772, 3773
Grain shipments, 2808
Grenville by-election, 4606
Hudson Bay railway, 1054, 1068, *See also that title*
Importations of lumber for, qu. 1867
Port Colborne elevator, 4690
Towing, qu. 4132

Canned Goods and Fish, freight rates, 1915

Canned Meats Act, inspection, 2202

Canning Licenses. *See* Fish and Fisheries

Cannon, Mr. Lucien (Dorchester)
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3090-3105
Business of the House, closure, 3668
Business profits and income taxes, qu. 1157
Canadian National railways
Advance, $73,000,000, 3623
Dorchester county employees, qu. 2086
Management, 3623
Details of, Liberal res. of 1921, 3685
Responsibility and powers, 3623, 3684
Paris offices, 3684
Amdt. (Mr. Stevens), ruling, 3667
Civil Service
Dismissals after 1911 election, 3347
Quebec city and district, 387
Freight rates, Manitoba-Canadian Northern, 1933
Grondines wharf, 964
Harbours and rivers, Ontario, 981
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3560
Point of order, letter reflecting on House, 4060
Portage la Prairie sewage system, 996
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 754
St. John immigration building, 1461
Toronto Harbour improvements, 985
Toronto island breakwater, 984
Votes of parliament and pledges, 3536

Canso, N. S. wharf, 941

Cap de la Madeleine wharf, 950

Cape Breton North and Victoria, vacancy, 1763, 2469

Cape Breton Strike. *See* Labour, Strikes

Capital. *See also* Banks and Banking; Credits; Finance
Attraction of, 2802, 3050
Basic industries, and, 3239
Canadian National railways, ownership of, 3192, 3224
Capital levy to pay war debt, 2728, 2743, 2909
Capitalistic system
Control of educational agencies, 2725
Defence of, 2743
Failure of, 2722
Government, influence over, 2726
Labour organization and, 2895
Political parties and, 2810
Capitalists, position of, 2583
Carvell, Hon. F. B., and, 3191
Centralization of, 4047
Control of interlocking directorates, 4026
Definition of, 3068
Diverted by income tax to tax-free bonds, 2914
Domination of, 4026
Farmers, 4045. *See also that title*
Investment in production, 2720
Investment, knowledge as to conditions, 2966
Natural resources, development of, 3027
Rights of, Abraham Lincoln on, 2967
Tariff and, 3025
Taxation of, 2801, 2879, 3010

Capital and Labour. *See also* Labour
Royal commission on industrial relations, report, 2890

Capital Investment, power to make. *See* Canadian National Railways, Paris Offices

Capital Punishment
Abolition of, 487. *See also* Criminal Code Amdt. bills
Carleton county execution, 768

Caraquet and Gulf Shore Railway, qu. 204, 1258, 2938, 2939

Carbonic Acid Gas. *See* Budget; Special War Revenue; Taxation

Carleton Point, Que., lightkeeper, qu. 285

Carleton County, N.B., execution in, 768

Carmichael, Mr. A. M. (Kindersley)
Annual training, 868
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 255, 4110
Butter factories in new districts, 3284
Canadian National parks, automobile admission fee, 3942
Canadian National Railways, branch lines, 4201
Cheque tax, 3932
Divorces granted, qu. 622
Dominion Lands Act, school lands, 4202
Eston branch railway, 4201
Grain Commission, salaries, 787
Indians, 2153
Interest rates, 4110
Military hospitals, 672
Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. bill, 2123
Opium and Narcotic Drugs, 699
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2113
Penitentiaries, 770
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 735
Relief of distressed Canadians, 1456
School lands
Reversion of, 3445
Unpaid balance of purchase price, 4202
Seed grain advances, 3444
Vancouver harbour bill, 260

Carnegie, Colonel, 1648

Carney, Stephen P., conviction, qu. 3582

Caron, Mr. E., postmaster, Tadoussac, qu. 3139

Carroll, Mr. William F. (Cape Breton South and Richmond)
Address in reply, 80; unemployment decrease; anti-combine legislation, 80; immigration, desirable types; United Farmers of Alberta and immigration 81; prosperity of western farmers; Soldier Settlement board as an aid to immigration, 82; amendments; Vancouver harbour expenditure, 83; coal resources of Canada, 83-84; strikes, 84; the farmers and larger markets; question of tariff reduction, 85
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3088-3121
Brule Lake-Grande Prairie railway, 4700
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill, 3973
Chinese immigration bill, 4537
"Merchants" definition of, 2483
Civil Service appointments, postmasters, 377
Coal
Eastern and Western Canada, 3204
Freight rates, 3204
Coasting laws, suspension of, 4231
Cold storage warehouses, 189
Combines bill, 2529, 2626

Carroll, Mr. William F.—*Con.*
Dairy Act 1914 Amdt. bill
Notice of M. for 2r., 3402
Renovated butter, 4262
Estimates, method of discussion, 4616
Fuel supply, 3203. *See under this title,* Mines and Minerals
M. (Mr. Church)
Amdt. proposing reference to Mines and Minerals Committee, 1271
Grain shipments, 4230
Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia, 4561
Howat and Meyerscough, Messrs., detention at border, 3157
Immigration Act Amdt. bill, 2428
Record of immigrants, 2670
Undesirable classes, 2669
Imperial Conference, 4643
Inverness-Richmond railway, extension, 4324
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4230
Mines and Minerals Committee
First report, 1384
Third report, 4436, 4592, 4743
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2462
Repatriation, M. 1379
Oleomargarine, 4263
Committee on Agriculture, discussion, 3266
M. to permit manufacture, importation and sale, 1382, 3399, 3508, 3573
Point of order, anticipatory motion, 3327
Peace river railway, 4324, 4700
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3850-3881, 4747
Pensions
Appeal board, Ottawa, 3731
Royal commission on, opportunity for discussion of report, 674
Petition of Right Act Amdt. bill, 3128
Privilege, Com. on Agriculture, 3266
Public Works, salaries, 2685
Public Works Act, tender and contract, 954
Railway Commission, criticism of judgment, 1916
Registration of ships, 3973
Renovated butter, 4262
St. Peter's Louisburg railway, 4324
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment bill, 3747
Taxation, 2837
Wheat board, Manitoba legislature, 2836

Carruthers, Mrs. James. *See* Labour, International Labour Conference

Carruthers, Mr. John (East Algoma)
Eastern Lands Development Company, 1635
Young, Mr. C. T., qu. 1739

Cartwright, Right Hon. Sir Richard, on protection, 3070

Carvell, Hon. F. B. *See* Railway Commission

Casgrain, Mr. Pierre F. (Charlevoix-Montmorency
Baie St. Paul-St. Urbain railway, 4189
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4102, 4509
Bankruptcy Act
Amdt. or abrogation, M., 1490, 1528
Repeal of, 1158
Business of the House
Audibility, 4594
Private members' day, 1158
Canadian National Railways, branch lines, 4189
Chairman, ruling:
Comittee report not debatable in advance of presentation, 1906
Combines bill, 2549, 2618, 2627
Commissioners, appointment of, 2627
Murray Bay-Nairn Falls railway, 4189
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) point of order, 3570
Quebec and Saguenay railway, 4190
Senate and House of Commons, bill, 4244

Cattle. *See this title,* under Live Stock

Cattle Diseases. *See* Animal Contagious Diseases, Live Stock, Health of Animals

Cattle Embargo. *See* Live Stock

Caucus, Party. *See* Lack of Confidence

Cayouette, Miss Evangeline, postmistress, Ste. Claire, qu. 1031

Cecil, Lord Robert, lecture, adjournment, 1685

Cedar Rapids power, Aluminium Company of America, 659
Cement, French Treaty, 1984

Central Research Institute, 788

Census. *See* Immigration; Population; Redistribution; Statistics

Central Supply Association, decision, 2593

Chair, Rulings of. *See* Deputy Speaker; Speaker

Chairman. *See* Deputy Speaker

Champlain Dock. *See* Quebec (port)

Champoux, Mr. J. E., Sorel postmaster, qu. 1487

Chanak Affair. *See* Near East Crisis

Chapel Cove, N.S., breakwater, 941

Chaplin, Mr. James D. (Lincoln)
Agriculture department, salaries, 611
Ammunition, 884, 1741
Apple-grading, 194
Artificial silk, duty, 3489, 3491
Atlanta exhibition, 1465
Canada Colonization Association, 1172
Canadian Manufacturers' Association, and, 1171
Canadian National railways
Express and electric lines bill, 2480
Grand Trunk, gratuities, 1667
Toronto office building, 2481
Civil government estimates, form of, 611
Cold Storage Act Amdt. bill, 2054, 2060
Cold storage companies, 186
Experimental farms, 480
Firebrick, duty, 3481
French treaty, 453, 1977, 1995
Analysis of, 1978
Bronze powder, 1979, 2217
Customs index, 2269-70
Butter, 2273
Cobalt products, 2263
Cotton, 2263
Silks, 448
Wines, 442
Government elevators, 2036
Hamilton-Queenston highway, qu., 813
Harbours and rivers
New Brunswick, 945
Nova Scotia, 4566
Ontario, 981
Quebec, 968
Highway, Canboro-Allanburg, qu. 1139
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1172
Contributions of Canadian Manufacturers' Association, 1164, 1171
Policy, 1171
St. John immigration building, 1457
Italian treaty bill, 2401
Labour department
Staff, 1672, 1678, 1699, 1701
Statistics, 1677, 1682
Technical education, director of, 1674
Lindsay arsenal, 883
Little Anse breakwater, claim of Mr. T. D. Morrison, 4573
Macdonald, Sir John A., reciprocity, 2922
Maritime provinces, dredging, 4569
Military properties, maintenance, 889
National defence
Ammunition, 884, 1741
Dominion arsenal, Quebec, 884, 1741, 1744
Estimates, 1741
Salaries and contingencies, 902
Niagara Central railway, 2480
Patents of Invention bill, 2073

Chaplin, Mr. James D.—*Con.*
Penitentiaries, 774
Point of order, Mr. Caldwell, 3267
Port Burwell harbour works, 983
Printing bureau, 1710
Quebec
Arsenal, 884, 1741, 1744
Wharves, 978
Raisins and dried currants, duty, 3476
Relief of distressed Canadians abroad, 1456
Rolled iron or steel hoops, bands, etc., 3484
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 777
Ste. Anne des Monts pier, 979
Seed grain advances, 3446
Toronto island breakwater, 984
Trade returns, incomplete, 2269
Wedge, Mr. George, qu. 2697

Charges of Management. *See* Finance

Charlottetown public building, 4614

Charlottetown-Pictou steamship service, 2171

Chartered Accountants Association of Canada. *See* Bank Act Amdt. bill

Charters, Bank. *See* Bank Act Amdt. bill

Charters, Mr. Samuel (Peel)
Immigrants
Overcharging at Quebec, 3324
Supplies, 496
Labour Gazette, Mr. Ronald Hooper, 1626
Pugsley, Hon. William, appointment, qu. 1993
Scarfe Varnish works, qu. 1485

Chateau Laurier. *See* Canadian National Railways, Hotels

Chatham, Ont., wharf, 982

Cheese. *See* Dairying Industry

Chemical Industries, Canadian Society, 2069

Chemicals
Freight rates, 1920
French treaty, 1985

Cheque Tax. *See* Budget; Special War Revenue Act Amdt. bill; Taxation

Chevrier, Mr. E. R. E. (Ottawa)
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 362, 546, 554, 556
Mansfield, Mr. William, dismissal of, qu. 4512
Ottawa government workshops, 4619

Chicago
Chicago Drainage Canal, 2993
Diversion of water, qu. 3821
Exhibition, 1454, 1466

Chicago—*Con.*
Fat Stock Show, 1398

Chicoutimi wharf, 950

Chicoutimi-Saguenay county
Postmasters, qu. 3138
Telegraph lines, qu., 3138
Verrault, Mr. Gedeon, qu. 3148

Chidley, Cape. *See* Hudson Bay Railway

Chief Electoral Officer, salaries and contingencies, 4001

Children
Chinese, born in Canada. *See* Chinese Immigration bill
Deaths through fuel shortage, 751, 1657
Immigration of. *See* Immigration
Income tax exemptions for, 1382, 2128, 3038, 4502
Mortality of, 1179
Oleomargarine, effect on health. *See* Oleomargarine
Playgrounds, 3407, 3432

Chili, Senate, constitution of, 1373

Chimes. *See* Parliament Buildings, Tower

Chimney Corner, N.S., wharf, 941

China
Bandits in, 2932
Butter shipments to, 1840, 1853
Canadian trade commissioner, 1840
Cheese shipments to, 1853
Chinese Consul General, immigration 1488
Civilization of, 2486
Conditions in, 2316
Immigration from. *See* Chinese Immigration; Immigration
Lowe, Dr. A. M., capture and maltreatment in, 2695, 2795
Political disturbances, 2325
Trade relations with, 2313, 2316, 2320

Chinese Immigration. *See also* Immigration

Chinese Immigration Bill (Entry limited to diplomatic corps; Chinese children born in Canada; merchants and students) 1r., 768; 2r., com., 2308, com., 2481; 3r., 2489; Senate amendments, 4536
Sections and subjects discussed:
Admission for specified period, 2329
Agreement with China, 2317
Appeal to Minister, 2331
Arrest and deportation, 2334
Canadian officers in China, 2308
Chief controller, Department of Immigration, 2308, 2482

Chinese Immigration Bill—*Con.*
Sections and subjects discussed:
Chinese
Children, 2484
En route, admission, 2488
Landing in violation of act, 2336
Not to leave ship without permit, 2333
Sailors on Canadian vessels, 2334
To register within 12 months, 2333
Women, 2310, 2318, 2484
Representations from British Columbia, 2310
Conductor to furnish list of Chinese persons carried, 2333
Definition, 2308
Deportation, 2488
Entry and landing, 2309
Vancouver and Victoria only, 2327
Evasions, 2315, 2324
Exclusion, 2324, 2482
Head tax, 2312
Identification and registration: certificates, 2331
Immigration confined to certain classes, 2482
Jurisdiction of courts, 2337
Labourers, 2310, 2316
Liability of transportation companies, 2334
Merchants
Definition of, 2317, 2319, 2487
New Westminster Retail Merchants Association, 2320
Students and, 2310
Evasions, 2324
Wives, 2318
Nationality, 2309
Number carried on ship limited, 2333
Offences and penalties, 2488
Officer in China, 2322
Officers in other countries, 2308, 2482
Organizing, unlawful courts, 2337
Passports, 2325
Powers of Governor in council, 2308
Prohibited classes, 2327
Re-entry, 2333
Registered person, 2488
Status, substantiation of, 2487
Students, 2310, 2316, 2324
Violation of act or fraud, 2488
Violation of act, order or regulation, 2337
Wives, 2484. *See also under this title,* Chinese, Women; Merchants

Chisby, Captain, Hudson Bay route, 1052

Chisholm, Mr. A. W. (Inverness)
Eastern harbour improvements, 4569
Margaree River Salmon Fisheries Association, 3369
Pension commissioners, salaries, 3743

Chisholm, Hon. C. P. *See* Disallowance of Nova Scotia Statute

Christie, Mr. Loring C., resignation, 3988

Church, Mr. Thomas L. (North Toronto)
Abbott's harbour, breakwater, 4563
Address, legislation referred to, in, qu. 2612
Agricultural Conditions, report, qu. 2612
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4068
Banking and Commerce Com. report, qu. 2612
Banting, Dr. F. G., recognition of, 703, 4439
Basic industries, assistance, 2822, 3238
Best, Mr. C. H., recognition of, 703
Blinded soldiers, travelling expenses, 693
Board of Commerce, 2583
Budget, 2817; congratulations to Finance Minister, 2817; delay in bringing down budget; tariff not political but economic question; Liberal-Conservative party always protectionist; National policy made Canada great, 2818; protection budget introduced by Minister of Finance; home market; Ontario farmers and protection; Progressive party plank; amendment; industrial conditions preceding adoption of protective policy; tariff stability; Baldwin tinplate industry; loss of due to tariff uncertainty, 2819; government, change of policy; tariff proposals high protection; amendment, Mr. Forke; national policy should be brought up to date; conservation of industries and markets; free trade in potatoes; prices, 2820; eggs, importation from United States; butter; western provinces, conditions in, 2821; houses for harvesters; tendency from free trade and towards protection; industrial conditions in Great Britain; strikes of agricultural labourers; adequate protection of basic industries; unemployment; emigration to United States; industrial possibilities, 2822; wool-combing; hemp industry; skilled workmen going to United States; tariff not responsible for exodus; climate and high taxation; causes of depression; world conditions; high taxation and prices; United States not free trade country; Fordney-McCumber tariff; thirty-five per cent duty on wheat; economy, preaching and practising; deficit in Canada, surplus in Great Britain, France and United States, 2823; Drury government and economy plank; United Farmers of

Church, Mr. Thomas L.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
Ontario; Ontario, increase of expenditure and debt; British budget, reduction in taxation and expenditure; taxation, increase in Canada, reduction in Great Britain and United States; taxation of luxuries and necessities; "free breakfast table;" coal and food prices; postal rates, reduction of, 2824; public debt; inheritance and income tax; income tax, federal and municipal; cigarette duty; sugar duty, 2825; receipt tax; evasion of; cheque tax; provincial amusement tax, 2826; copper bounty; hemp bounty; wool-combing industry; old age pensions; public health; mother's pensions; railway deficit; Canadian National Railways; capital expenditure; President, appointment of; Col. H. N. Balfour and Mr. A. J. Thomas, appointment of, 2827; principle of promotion; Sir Henry Thornton; Canadian Government Merchant Marine, sale of ships; shipping combine; rates; grain-carrying trade; export tax on pulpwood; water powers, export of electrical energy; Canadian coal, freight rate on, 2828; agricultural conditions; Mr. Thomas Bradshaw, evidence before Agricultural Conditions Committee; agricultural conditions in United States; rural credits; rural depopulation; prices, spread between producer and consumer; reciprocity, 2829
Business of the House
Committees, reports, qu. 2612
Private members' day, 1160
Progress of, 2469
Sessional programme, 2469
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Returns, 3399
Sale of ships, qu. 2613, 2828, 2518, 3846
Shipping combines, 3846
Canadian National railways, 2828
Advance $73,000,000, 3619
Management, 3620
Radial railways, sale of, 2475
Rates, 1761
Securities, 4526
Toronto office building, qu. 1663, 2518
Canadian Press Limited, subsidy, 4729
Canadian team at Olympic games, 4707
Capital and labour, 2583
Chicago drainage canal, diversion, qu. 3821
Civil service, underpaid, 4672
Coal. *See also under this title,* Fuel Supply

Church, Mr. Thomas L.—*Con.*
Coal—*Con.*
Freight rate, 2828
Imports, qu. 516
Combines and Fair Prices Act, 2583
Combines bill, 2583, 2634
Combines, prosecutions of, qu. 1662
Copper bounty bill, 3238
Cost of living inquiry, qu. 3703
Deputy ministers salaries, 4672
Drayton-Acworth commission, 1761
Elevators
Edmonton, 4721
Ontario, 2038, 4719, 4721
Emigration to United States, 2822
Employers' liability compensation, 692
Euclid hall and Brant house, hospitals, closing, 4075, 4303
Expenditure on wharves, 4568
Fielding, Right Hon. Mr., congratulations, 4742
Freight rates
Operating costs and, 1761
Railway rates, equalization of, M. (Mr. Clark) 1969
Shipping, Railway Commission control, qu. 2611
Fuel supply
Freight rates, 1268, 2828
M. for a national fuel policy, 1262
Nova Scotia coal, 1269
Special committee, appointment, qu. 617
Transportation, 3200
Grain shipments, 3775
Grand Trunk. *See also under this title.* Canadian National railways
Commitments, qu. 207
Electrification, qu. 283
Halifax elevator, 4721
Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia, 4562
Historic sites, preservation of, 3249, 4707
Housing, legislation, qu. 2517, 2822
Hudson Bay railway
Construction vote, 4681
Motherwell, Hon. Mr., reported statement of, 2774
Hydro electric, power supply, 1266, 1270, 2828
Imperial conference, 4661
Income War Tax Act Amdt, bill, 4493
Judges Act Amdt. bill, 3604
Judges serving on royal commissions, 3604
Medical students, summer employment, 704
Military hospitals, 696, 4075, 4303
Mines and Minerals Com. report, 4743
Moose Jaw election, 2774
National fuel policy, M., 1262
Near East Crisis, 1266
Newsprint, export duty, 1267

Church, Mr. Thomas L.—*Con.*
Niagara forts, preservation of, 4707
Ontario grain elevators, 2038, 4719, 4721
Old age pensions, legislation, qu. 2517, 2827
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3873, 4749
Pensions
British Expeditionary force, 3885
Fenian raid, 3873
Royal commission, report, qu. 2516
South African war, 3873
Postal rates, decrease of, 1779, 2824
Post office salaries, 1780
Prices, high, 2583, 2820, 2822
Proportional representation, 424
Public ownership, 2475, 3622, 3847
Pulpwod, export duty on, 2828
Radial railways, sale of, 2475
Railway excursion tickets, qu. 1485
Redistribution Committee report, qu. 2612
St. Lawrence river waterway, 3773
Power development, qu. 490
United States, negotiations, 3208, 3705, 4513
Shipping combines, 2828, 3846, 3848
Soldiers, destitute, burial of, 695
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, hospitals, closing, 4075, 4303
Soldiers' Comforts Branch, Toronto, 3507
Steamship services
Extension to Great Lakes, 2175
Rates, control of, 2174
St. Lawrence-Great Lakes, ships, qu. 2613
Taxation
High, 2583, 2823
"Taxed to death," 4493
Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner) 1294
Toronto
Customs house, 3277, 3282, 4621, 4624
Postal receipts, 1779
Postal station "A" building, 4624
Post office building, 1780
Soldiers' Comforts branch, qu. 3506
Union station, 4442
Viaduct, qu. 206, qu. 4011, 4441, 4442
Toronto Suburban railway, qu. 280, 2181, 3324
Sale of, qu. 2612, 3399
Unemployment relief, 690
United Farmers of Ontario, 2824
Co-operative stores, 4068
Platform, 4661
Water powers
Electrical energy, export, 2828
National policy, development, 1270
Welland canal construction
Expenditure, qu. 3820
Request for, 3774

Church, Mr. Thomas L.—*Con.*
Woollen industry, legislation to assist, 2823, 2827, qu. 4184
Churches, capitalistic system and, 2725
Churchill, Fort. *See* Hudson Bay Railway
Cigars and Cigarettes. *See* Customs Tariff Items; Inland Revenue bill; Taxation; Tobacco
Civil Rights. *See* Bank Act Amdt. bill; Labour, right to organize; Woodsworth
Civil Service. *See also* Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power); Supply. For individual departments, *See their titles.* For references, generally, *see* speeches on Address; Budget
Act. *See* Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power)
Amalgamation of departments. *See* National Defence
Appointments, 208. *See also under this title,* Commission
After 1911 election, 2920
Grazing inspectors, 3253
Local committee and, 2816
Postal, 1800. *See also* Post Office
Postmasters. *See* Post Office
Promotions and, 330
Returned soldiers, 386, 1797, 1799
Services and, unnecessary, 2969
Soldiers' civil re-establishment, qu. 2297
Temporary employees made permanent, qu. 4814
Year 1922, 3324
Arthur Young Company, cost of, qu. 1137
Bonus, qu. 204, 1664, 1812, 3352
Employees unmarried or without dependents, qu. 1257
Dependents, non-resident, 1811
Dominion arsenal, Quebec, employees, 1751, 1752, 1772
Interim supply bill, 3705
Salaries and, qu. 2179
Vote, 1811
Calder Act, 2926, 3266. *See* also Public Service Retirement Act
Statement of, 3402
Civil service list, publication of, qu. 3134
Classification. *See* Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power)
Commission.
Abolition, proposed. *See* Civil Service Act M. (Mr. Power)
Advice by local committees, 2816
Agricultural produce marketing agent in Great Britain, 4675
"A joke; a farce," 3347
Alleged partisanship, 3347
Anderson, Mr., 1821

Civil Service—*Con.*
Commission—*Con.*
Annual report tabled, 3887
Appointments
British Columbia in, 372
Combines, staff, 2661
Delay in making, 1086, 3292
Fruit inspectors, 3150
Immigration Department
Black, Mr. W. J., 2664
Immigration agents, 1188, 2663
Bowder, Mr., 1199
Chinese immigration officials, 2308, 2482
Ingram, Mr., 2664
Lemont, Mr. Arthur, 1085-6
May, Mr., 2663
Indian affairs
Agents, 2151
Doctors, 2160
Live stock Act, inspectors, 3150
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, 3284, 3290, 3303. *See also* Marshall
Montreal post office, qu. 1361
Postmasters, 1798, 1800, 1801, 1823. *See also* Post Office.
Clementsport, N.S., 1795
Disregarded, 1821-22
Returned soldiers as, 1799
St. Peter's N.S., 1795
Soldier advisers, 3747
Temporary, 2663
Without regard to politics, 3345
Civil Service Act, withdrawal of positions from 561, 914
Commissioners, appointment of, 3348
Cost of, 370, 525, 530
In 1917-1922, qu. 1137
Employees, number of, 370, 3986
And cost, 2970
Temporary, 1385
Employment service, director of, 1676
Examination, 366, 2816, 3986
Exceptions, 1821
House of Commons staff, 2691
Jurisdiction
Positions exempted from, 561, 914
Removal of certain classes from, qu. 278. *See also* Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power)
Technical officers, removal of, 519
Lightkeepers, 3351
Political patronage, 3347
Postmasters, appointments and dismissals. *See* Post Office
Pugsley, Hon. William, appointment, 2502
Purchasing Commission, 4704
Report, 812
Roche, Hon. Dr., 354, 3348

Civil Service—*Con.*
Commission—*Con.*
Salaries and contingencies, 668, 3986
Staff, number of, See under this title Employes
Unconstitutionality of, 2816
Committee of the House. *See* Civil Service Act
Cost, 2756, 3076
Deputy ministers
Committee, report, 562
French-speaking, 1805
Powers of. *See* Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power)
Salaries, 4557, 4667
Dismissals, 856
Appointments and, after 1911 election, 2817, 2920, 3344, 3345, 3349
In 1922, 3324
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, Vancouver office, qu. 2297, 3085, qu. 3137, 3822
Dominion Lands and Parks branch, employees, 3252
Economy in. *See* speeches on Address; Budget
Employees, number of, 2970, 3264
And salaries, 1912 and 1922, 2712
Estimates, preparation of, 3242
Examinations, 366, 2816, 3986
Exemptions, 354, 367
Expenditure, 2785, 2915, 2987, 3027
Reduction in England, 1803
Grant, Dr., 354, 523, 541, 558, 560
Griffenhagen and Associates, 1826
Cost of, qu. 1137
Verrett, Mr. Hector, 1826
History of. *See* Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power)
Hours, 1427
Holidays and, 24
Inside service, employees, 911
Interim supply bill, 3705
"Lady who rides to work in automobile" 1772
List, publication of, qu. 3134
Merit system. *See* Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power)
Murray, Sir George, report, 3343
Offensive partisanship, dismissals for, 285, 3344
Political patronage, 2816, 3344. *See also* Civil Service Act
Positions excluded from Act, 1156
Post Office department
Griffenhagen and Associates, 1826
Postmasters, dismissals. *See* Post Office
Public Service retirement. *See that title*
Quebec and district employees, 387

Civil Service—*Con.*
Reform, 39-40, 409
Reorganization, 24. *See also* Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power)
Griffenhagen and Associates, 1826, 2817
Responsibility, 368
Retiring allowances, Printing Bureau, 3949
Returned soldiers, 1772
Appointments, 386, 1797, 1799
Dismissals, 1772
Salaries, 2805, 3070, 4672. *See also* Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power)
Bonus and, qu. 2179
Revision,, qu. 204, 1794
Statement by Prime Minister, 1811
Total expenditure, qu. 2086
Seasonal or temporary employment, *See* Civil Service Act Amdt. bill
Statistics, qu. 207
Superannuation, 4593. *See also* Public Service Retirement Act
Boville, Mr. T. C., qu. 3135
Calder Act, 2926, 3266
Cost of, 2785
Coulter, Dr. R. M., qu. 3135
Fiset, General Sir Eugene, qu. 3135
Legislation, inquiry, qu. 940, 3266
Statement of Prime Minister, 4593
Technical and professional officials, 367, 815
Temporary employees, made permanent, 1385
Underpaid, 4672
Whitley councils, 1654
Women, employment of, 1772
Work outside regular duties, 1675

Civil Service Act. *See also* Civil Service
Abolition of. *See under this title,* M. (Mr. Power)
Alleged violation of, 1794
M. (Mr. Power) for repeal, 345, 519
Amdt. (Mr. Hughes) for special committee, 534; agreed to on div. 571
Grant, Dr., 354, 523, 541, 558, 560
"Notwithstanding anything in Act" 3276
Special Committee of inquiry, 2970
Appointment of, 936, 986
Membership, change in, 2417
Order of reference, 1256
Pope, Sir Joseph, evidence before, 2970
Reports
First, 1136, 1256
Second, 4248
M. to concur, withdrawn, 4592-3
Privilege, Mr. Martell, 4363

Civil Service Act 1919 Amdt. Bill
(Seasonal or temporary employment)—Mr. German—1r., 666

Civil Service Superannuation and Retirement Act Amdt. Bill
(Repeal of clause permitting additions to term of service) 1r., 2896-7; 2r., com., 3146; 3r., 3147

Civilization, evolution of, 1856

Citizen's Liberty League, 715

Citizenship. *See* Immigration Act Amdt.; Naturalization

Clark, Mr. J. A. (Burrard)
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3093-3126, 3219
British Columbia
Bonded warehouses, qu. 1260, 2404
Licenses, qu. 1866, qu. 1971, 2404
Fishing licenses, M., 1540
Oriental immigration, 507, 1217, 2310
Burrard Inlet bridge, 4709
Business of the House
Private members' day, 1159
Privilege, equalization of rates, 1911
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2404-06
Canadian Air Force, Hudson Bay route, 1748, 1750
Canadian customs officer at New York, 1920, 3274
Chinese Immigration bill, 2310-19
Students, 2314
Creosoted lumber and timber
Duties, qu. 813
Use in British Columbia, qu. 1137
Vancouver Creosoting Company, limited, 3231
Duty on goods passing from one Canadian port to another, 1920, 3274
Equalization of railway rates. *See under* this title, Freight Rates
Firebrick, duty, 3896
Freight rates
Railway rates, equalization of, M. 1284, 1490, 1910, 1914, 1956
Original motion, effect of, 1953
Privilege, 1910
Westward from prairie provinces, 1159
Girrard Bridge Company, charter, 1008
Immigration
Oriental, 507, 1217, 2310-19
Policy, 1217
Liquor
Export, qu. 1260
Warehouse licenses, British Columbia, qu. 1260, qu. 1866, qu. 1971, 2404
Military hospitals, 669, 672
Medical staff, 675

Clark, Mr. J. A.—*Con.*
Military hospitals—*Con.*
Nursing hospitals, 686
New York, Canadian customs officer, 1920 3274
North Vancouver dry dock, 1002
Panama canal, competition, 1920
Pension Act, administration of, 682
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3867-3886
Amdt. death within five years, 3884; agreed to, 3885
Senate amendments, 4745
Pensions
District board of review, 4703
European war and active militia, 3730
Federal appeal board, 4703
Royal commission on, report, 675
Privilege, equalization of railway rates, 1910
Salmon-canning industry, licenses, 1540
Soldiers
Sheltered employment, 694
Unemployment, 695
Vetcraft shops, 695
Stanley park foreshore protection, 1008
United States army, mental tests, 1219
Vancouver harbour bill, 268
Vancouver income tax offices, qu. 912

Classification. *See* Civil Service

Clementsport postmaster, qu. 1363, 1795, 1831, 4534

Clifford, Mr. L. O. (South Ontario)
Campbell, Mr. Orin D., claim, 626

Climate
Emigration and, 2747, 2823
Winter conditions in Canadian Northwest, Nebraska and Iowa, 1423

Closure. *See* House of Commons

Clothing, duty on, 2981. *See also* Budget; Taxation; Textiles

Clyde, The, mechanics from, 1204

Coal. *See also* Freight Rates; Fuel; Mines and Minerals; Natural Resources; Railways
Alberta, 709, 1247, 1262, 1264, 1268, 1275-82, 3424, qu. 4437, 4692
Freight rates on, 1268, 1272, 1275, 1282, 3009, 3781
Suggested rate of $6 per ton, 1276
Heating appliances for, 4629
Shipment
Hudson bay railway, 1055
Ontario, to, 1163
All-British supply, 1268
Anthracite
Duty, 3493
Supply, 1262, 4692
Welsh, 84, 1263, 1267, 3199

Coal—*Con.*
Areas in Canada, 1344
Bituminous, 83
Duty, 1275, 1278
Edmonton Board of Trade, res, 1275
Briquetting, 789, 3206
Brule lake deposits, 4699
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 3807, 3814, 3826
Canadian National railways
Purchases, qu. 1363, 1561, 1564, qu. 4303
Alberta, qu. 4437
United States, qu. 4511
Chimney Corner, N.S., 941
Coke, 1265, 1267, 1268, 1273, 3199
Coke ovens, establishment, 788
Cost of. *See* Cost of Living; Price
Deposits, 2750
Duties and drawbacks, qu. 1994, 2654
Embargo, 1265, 1279, 4394
Export, 1275
United States, from, 1249, 1265, 1277
Freight rates, 795, 1268, 1278, 1280, 1964, 2828, 2875, 3199, 3621. *See also that title*
Mines and Minerals Committee, 4514
Hoppe-Isenberg leases, 2502, 3128, 3146, 3222
Cancellation, 3146
Fiat, issue of, 4442
Hoover, Mr. Herbert, Europe and coal supplies, 1263
Hudson bay region, 1073
Hudson's Hope, possibilities, 3198, 3202, 4699
Imports, qu. 516, 1266, 2828
And production, qu. 490
From United States, 1249, 1277
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1706
Interstate Commerce Commission, investigation, 1279
"Invisible" 1262
Lands, 1344. *See also* Dominion Lands Act
Leases, 3424. *See also* Dominion Lands Act; Petition of Right Act
Disbursements, repayments, 3129
Hoppe-Isenberg. *See under this title,* Hoppe and Isenberg
Lignite, 789
Bienfait briquetting plant, 789, 3206
Duty, 3493
Miners
Importation of from Belgium, 1177
Oriental, 1901
Strikes. *See* Labour, Strikes
Mines, 2785
Mining rights. *See* Dominion Lands Act
Public ownership, 2727, 3205
Mines and Minerals Committee report, 4743
National fuel policy, M. (Mr. Church) 1262
New Brunswick, 804

Coal—*Con.*
Northern Ontario, 1050
Nova Scotia, 83, 800
Freight rates, 3781
Miners' strike, 1627
Ontario, reported discovery, 2512
Peace river district, 1433
Price, 2824, 3198
Production
British Columbia, 1244
Canada, 2780
Provincial revenue from, 2802
Public ownership, 2785, 3205
Railways. *See also* Canadian National Railways
Purchase of in United States, 3493, qu. 4511
Rates on, 1272. *See also under this title,* Freight Rates
Red Deer Valley Coal Operators Association, 1275
Resources, 83, 1264
Scarcity, 254
Substitutes, 3199
Tariff, bituminous coal, 1275, 1278
Transportation, 789, 1264
United States embargo, 1265, 1279, 4394
Welsh anthracite, 84, 1263, 1267, 3199
Quality of, 1279

Coal Tar Derivatives, French Treaty, 1986

Coast Range Steel Company, 2508

Coastal Regulations. *See* Canada Shipping Act Amdt; Freight Rates, Shipping
Suspension of, 4219, 4222, 4231, 4235, 4276, 4290

Cobalt Products. *See* Treaties, French Treaty

Cobden, Richard, British Free Trade, 3050

Cobourg, Ont., breakwater, 981

Cochrane, the late Hon. Frank, Hudson Bay railway, 1033, 1046

Code Napoleon, 1558, 1526

Coke. *See* Coal

Cold Storage. *See also* Cold Storage Act Amdt. bill; Dairying Industry
Canadian-Australian boats, 1848
Co-operative, 2054
Dairying and, 2764, 2978
Eggs, producer and consumer, 1852
Incorporated companies, 2058
Mechanical, 2056
Montreal, qu. 1488, qu. 1633, qu. 2204, 3289

Cold Storage—*Con.*
Municipal, 2054
Plants, 104
Montreal, qu. 2204, 3289
Quebec Harbour Commission, 2055

Cold Storage Act Amdt. Bill
(Subsidy contracts with co-operative societies or associations and municipalities)
Res. 184; 1r., 191; 2r., 271-276; ref. to Com. on Agriculture 276; com., 2054; 3r., 2086, 2199

Collison, Mr. B. W., Rocky Mountains park, 1739

Colombia, Senate, constitution of, 1373

Colonial Status. *See* Imperial Conference; Treaties, Halibut Fishery

Colonization. *See* Agriculture; Building; Farm Homes; Immigration, Canada Colonization Association; Labour; Soldier Settlement

Colt Machine Guns. *See* National Defence

Combines, 145, 3072. *See also* Address; Budget; Canadian National Railways; Combines, Monopolies, Trusts and Mergers Bill; Freight Rates, Shipping; Grain and Grain Trade; Prices; Shipping and Shipbuilding; Transportation
Agriculture and, 2786, 2787
Attorney General vs. Wholesale Grocers, decision, 2521, 2527
Banana trust, 2979
Banking system, 4019, 4047, 4083
Big business, 2603
Big interests, 2559
Great Britain in, 2726
Political parties and, 2855
Binder twine, 4376
British North America Act, amendment, 2592
British Parliamentary Com. on trusts, 2544
British preference, 2989
Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, 2983
Canadian Press, Limited, 4727
Coal situation and, 254
Combines Investigation Act of 1910, 2605, 3073
Prosecutions, 2575
Control, 2725
Co-operative buying and, 3018
Cotton manufacturers, 2534, 3464
Dominion Textile Company, 2563
Duties, reduction of, 2608

Combines—*Con.*
Federal jurisdiction over. *See* speeches on Combines bill
Legislation, 39, 145. *See also* Combines bill
Lumber, 2593
Master Plumbers & Steamfitters' Association, decision, 2593
Milk, 2526, 2559, 2569, 2593
Modern business organization, 2524
Money, 648, 4026
Newspaper, 2555, 2580, 2587, 2591, 2630
North Atlantic and U. K. Conference Eastbound, 2127, qu. 2613
Price-fixing, 2606, 2786
Printing, 1623
Privy Council decisions, 2585
Prosecutions, qu. 1662
Restaurant trust, 2584
Sherman anti-trust law, 2602
Shipping, 1440, 2127, 2174, 2578, 2583, 2584, 2613, 2666, 2828, 2928, 2954, 2960, 3789, 3845, 3848, 4077, 4223, 4226, 4277. *See also* Agricultural Conditions, Special Committee; Freight rates, shipping
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, qu. 2613
Great Lakes, qu. 1362
Statement in Toronto Globe, qu. 1362
Standard Oil Company, 2601
Sugar, 2563, 2576, 2584, 2586, 3069
Tariff and, 2714
Transportation, 1395. *See also* Freight Rates
United Farmers of Ontario, 2584
United Shoe Machinery Company, 2557, 2560
Webb, Mr. Sydney, report, 2545, 2551
Wheat Board, 2547, 2616, 2857
Wheat pool, 2526
Wholesale grocers case, decision, 2051, 2521

Combines and Fair Prices Act, 2521
Appeal Court of Ontario, decisions, 2527
Privy Council decisions, 2527, 2590

Combines Investigation Act of 1910, 2605, 3073
Prosecutions, 2575
Repeal, 2521

Combines, Monopolies, Trusts and Mergers Bill, (Investigation of alleged combines) Res. 938, 987; 1r., 993; 2r., 2519-2609 on division, 2609; com., 2610, 2615, 2659, 3r., 2701; Senate amendments, 3505
Sections and subjects discussed:
Application for investigation, *See under this title* Investigation
Attorney General of Ontario vs. Wholesale Grocers, 2521, 2527

Combines, Monopolies, Trusts and Mergers Bill—*Con.*
Sections and subjects discussed—*Con.*
Big interests, 2584
Combination no crime, 2527
Combine, definition of, 2520, 2525, 2560, 2595, 2615, 2666
Commissioners, appointment of, 2522, 2626
Competition
Control of, 2526
Lessening of, 2526
Complaints, 2521
Contempt of registrar or commissioner, 2660
Criminal legislation, 2559
Counsel
Conduct of investigation by, 2632
Representation by, 2618
Division on M. for 2r., 2609
Documents, 2521
Enforcement of, 4229
Experts, employment of, 2631
Inquiry as to, 496
Inquisitorial, 2527, 2608
Investigation
Application for, 2616
Restricted to British subjects, 2617
To be made by six persons, 2617
Grand Jury system of, amdt. (Mr. Church) 2585
Powers of registrar, 2626
Private, 2522
Under Enquiries Act, 2522
No person excused, 2631
Parliament
Jurisdiction, 2521-2609
Right to investigate, 2666
Power to reduce tariff, 3049
Patents, revocation of, 2522
Prices, fixing of, 2520
Privy Council decision, 2559, 2590
Proceedings in private, 2632
Profits, regulation of, 2558, 2585
Publicity, 2522
Registrar, 2522, 2616
Appointments of 2628, 2660
Power to investigate, 2626
Shall cause inquiries, 2618
To report and minister to decide as to further inquiry, 2626
Regulations, 2665
Report, distribution of, 2632-4, 2659
Re-sale price, 2525
Staff, appointment of, 2660
Tariff, reduction of duties, 2522, 2528, 2561
Technicality not to invalidate proceedings, 2665

Combines, Monopolies, Trusts and Mergers Bill—*Con.*
Sections and subjects discussed—*Con.*
Trade unions not affected, 2666
Witnesses, evidence and production of papers, 2631

Commerce. *See* Board of Commerce; Trade and Commerce

Commercial Agents. *See* Trade

Commercial Intelligence Service. *See* Trade and Commerce

Commissioner of Agriculture. *See* Agriculture; Marshall

Commissions, government by. *See* Civil Service Commission; Government

Committee of Supply. *See* Supply

Committees. *See* House of Commons

Commodity Prices, 1083, 1851. *See also* speeches on Budget; Prices

Commonwealth Club of California, immigration, 1195

Community Clubs. *See* Immigration

Companies Act Amdt. Bills
1. Mining companies, permission to pay dividends out of capital—Mr. German—1r., 435
2. Private company; shares without nominal or par value; capital, etc.—Mr. Copp—1r., 3261; 2r., com., 4208; 3r., 4218; Senate amendments, 4736

Sections and subjects discussed:
Amount of capital required, 4210
Annual meeting, 4215
Annual returns, 4215
Borrowing powers, 4213
By-laws for increase or decrease of number, 4215
By-law to be sanctioned, 4214
Capital
Increase of, 4213
Reduction of, 4213
Change of name, 4211
Commission for securing subscriptions, 4212
Directors
Powers, 4212
Qualifications, 4215
Dividends payable out of wasting assets, 4214
Issue of shares without nominal or par value, 4208

Companies Act Amdt. Bills—*Con.*
Sections and subjects discussed—*Con.*
Meetings of creditors, 4216
Private company may become public company, 4212
Prospectus, requirements as to particulars, 4212
Repeal, 4212
Stock of other companies, purchases, 4212
Subscriptions in return, 4215
Summary to be filed, 4216
When company may be created a private company, 4208

Compensation for Cattle. *See* Animal Contagious Diseases; Live Stock

Competitive Examinations. *See* Civil Service

Conciliation and Labour Act. *See* Labour

Concurrence. *See* Interim Supply; Supply

Condensed Milk. *See* Dairying Industry

Confectionery and Beverages Tax. *See* Budget; Special War Revenue; Taxation

Confederation. *See also* Maritime Provinces
Charlottetown conference, 1368
Debate, 1367
Intercolonial railway, 1756
Nova Scotia, attitude towards, 1376
Quebec conference, 1368
Senate, nominative or elective, 1366

Conferences, 3411. *See also* Imperial
Disarmament, 2911, 4000
International Labour. *See* Labour

Confidence, Lack of. *See* Lack of Confidence Vote, M. (Mr. Irvine)

Congdon, Mr. Fred T.
Appointment as commissioner, 2710, qu. 3131. *See also* Canadian National railways, Grand Trunk, Gratuities
Correspondence with Justice dept., 2299

Conley, Mr. James, dismissal, qu. 4183

Connaught Park Jockey Club. *See* Race Track Betting

Connaught Place Monument. *See* Monuments and Memorials, Ottawa

Conscription, 2816
"Infamous and anti-Canadian," 3038
Laurier, Sir Wilfrid, and, 3015
Men and wealth, of, 2729

Conseil National des Métiers, qu. 3141

Conservative Party. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget; Political Parties
Administration, 1911-1921, 3038
Agricultural implements duty, 2974
Alleged understanding on Mr. Shaw's amendment to Address, 987
History of party. *See* Proportional Representation
National policy, 3067
"No truck or trade with the Yankees," 3080
Pledges, violation of, 2974
Tariff policy, 3063
Tariff resolution of 1922, 2220

Constituencies, Redistribution of. *See* Redistribution Bill

Constitution, right of Canada to make her own, 1378

Constitutional Development. *See* Address; Budget; Imperial Conference; Lack of Confidence Vote; Treaties; Halibut

Consular Agents. *See* Trade

Consumer. *See also* Address; Budget; Combines; Cost of Living; Prices; Purchasing Power; Taxation
French Treaty and, 3049
Italian treaty and, 3049
Oleomargarine, 3534
Prices. *See also that title*
Meat, 2877
Producer and consumer, 2829, 2972, 3029
Purchasing power, 2812
Raisins and dried currants, duty, 3474
Relief of, 2718
Renovated butter, 4251
Sales tax increases passed on to, 2859, 2804, 2998
Sugar duty, 2987
Tariff and, 2854, 3054
Taxation, 2789, 2801, 4415
Wheat board, 2857

Consumption Tax. *See* Taxation

Contagious Diseases. *See* Animal Contagious Diseases; Health; Live Stock, Health of Animals

Containers, Fruit. *See* Sale and Inspection

Contrecœur wharf, 950-1008

Conventions, Trade. *See* Trade; Treaties, French Treaty, Italian Treaty

Conversion Loan. *See* Loans

Cooke, Mr. Leonard, qu. 2179

Co-operation
Agricultural products, distribution, 1852, 2869
Co-operative buying and selling, 1253. *See also* Markets; Prices
Co-operative association and societies, 3073. *See also* Cold Storage Act Amdt bill
Cold storage, 2054
Failure of, 1419
Co-operative credit associations, 4038
Industrial and financial organizations, 2589
Industrial relations, 2895
Town and country, between, 2972

Co-ordination. *See* National Defence

Coote, Mr. G. G. (Macleod)
Agricultural and manufactured products, prices, 1851
Agricultural conditions, 1407
Agricultural implements, prices, 1407
Alberta
Oil bounty, 2510
Oil-drilling and prospecting, 781
Assignments in bankruptcy, qu. 937, 1412
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4072, 4077-4146, 4140
Interest
Circulation redemption fund on, amdt. 4093, neg. 4093
Maximum rate, amdt. 4125, neg. 4131; 4149, neg. 4149
Issuing of notes, 4092
Shareholders' audit, auditors to report to Minister, amdt. 4090, neg. 4091
Banking and Commerce Committee, proceedings, 4145
Banks and Banking
Cost of living, 1409
Returns, 3264
British preference, cotton goods, 3463
Business of the House, bill not printed, 3974
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, grain shipments, qu. 3263
Canadian National parks, leasing, 3442
Canadian National Railways
Directors, address and occupation, qu. 1973
Hotels, 938
Carvell, Hon. F. B.
Removal of, 3189
Statements of, 1869
Combines, shipping, 2613
Copper bounty bill, 3236, 3240
Cost of living increase, 1408
Crude petroleum bounties 781
Dairying industry, 1851
Dominion Textiles Company, securities and dividends, 3463
Dry Dock Subsidies bill, 3979

Coote, Mr. G. G.—*Con.*
Eggs, price of, 1851
Emigration to the United States, 1412
Experimental farms, 479
Farmers, purchasing power, 1408
Freight rates, increase, 3190
Geological survey, 2508
Grain and grain trade
Government elevator system, 3264
Grain Act, administration
Dockage, 782, qu. 3141
Grain Commissioners, board of
Employees, etc., qu. 2207
Names, etc., qu. 2206
Grain Elevator Commission, qu. 1867
Montreal shipments, qu. 1973, qu. 1974
Shipping rates, M., 2517, 2613
Shortages, complaint by British importers, 1764
Warehousing, qu. 3141
Hansard, subscription rate, 1715
Harbours and rivers, 948
Hemp bounty, 3913
Highwood river, power, 3427
Hoppe-Isenberg leases, 2502
Immigration
Advertising, 1114
Policy, 1407
Immigration Act Amdt. bill 3981
Inflation, inequalities of, 1447
Iron ore, Alberta, 2512
Macarow, Mr. D. C., application to subpoena, 4145
National Gallery, M. to reduce vote, 1018
Ottawa-Hull bridge, 1016
Penman's Limited, securities and dividends, 3463
Printing, Interior department, 3443
Privilege—correction of press report, 2519
Public Works, expenditures by provinces, qu. 3887
Pugsley, Hon. William, appointment, 2494, 2500
Railway Commission, qu. 1973
Carvell, Hon. F. B., 3189
Motherwell, Hon. Mr., statement of, 3188
Statements of, 1869
Robb, Hon. Mr., visit to Australia, 1850
Rugs, purchase of, qu. 1486
Rural depopulation, 1855
Seed grain advances, 3445
Settlers' relief, 3447
Soldier Settlement, 2030
Amounts due Dominion govt., qu. 814
Turkeys, dressed, importation, qu. 1139
Vancouver elevator, qu. 1487
Vancouver harbour bill, 265
War claims, 2498

Coote, Mr. G. G.—*Con.*
Water powers, 3427, 3442
Woollen industry, condition of, 3463

Copp, Hon. A. B. (Secretary of State)
Canada Temperance Act, administration, 2495
Canadian Press Limited bill, 1464
Civil Service
Commission
Annual report, 3887
Salaries and contingencies, 3986
Employees, return showing, 911
Civil Service Act Special Com., report, 4248
Companies Act Amdt. bill, 3261, 4208, 4217, 4736
Dorchester penitentiary, 770
Hazen, Sir Douglas, appointment under Inquiries Act, 2498
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 1384, 2107, 2113, 2182, 2199, 2437-54, 3983
Discretion to Secretary of State, 2447
Judges, 2441, 2446
Justice department, opinion of, 2441
Naturalization Act, M. (Mr. Carroll) 1381
Ottawa-Hull bridge, 1017
Public Archives, 3985
Pugsley, Hon. William, appointment, 2498
Returns, inquiries for, 3324
Secretary of State department
Estimates, 2392, 2494, 3985
War claims, adjustment, 2495
Amdt. (Mr. Stevens) 2503
Investigation, statement of categories, 2500

Copper. *See* Mines and Minerals

Copper Bars or Rods, bounty on, 2703, 2709, 2778, 4369. *See also* Bounties

Copyright. *See also* Trade Marks and Designs
United States, 2289

Copyright Act. *See also* Magazines and Periodicals, M. (Mr. Hocken)
M. (Mr. Rinfret) 495

Copyright Act Amendment Bill
(Compliance with British and international copyright acts.) 1r., 487; 2r., com., 2139; com., 2287; 3r., 2436; Senate amendments, 3154
Sections and subjects discussed:
Amdt. (Mr. Robb) licenses and importation of books, 2291, agreed to on div. 2292
Ref. to, 2344
Authors, memorandum on behalf of, 3155
Berne Convention, 2139, 2288, 2343, 3155
Civil servant, alleged communication to Le Droit D'Auteur, 2140

Copyright Act Amendment Bill—*Con.*
Sections and subjects discussed—*Con.*
Commencement of act, 2145, 2287
Great Britain and, 2140
Le Droit d'Auteur, 2140, 2343
Legislation, history of, 2343
Licenses, importation, 2139, 2287, 2291, 2344
Piracy, 2287
Song writers, 2287

Cordage and Rope
Bounty, 4369. *See also* Hemp
Production in Canada, 2780

Corless, Dr., Hudson bay district, 1040

Corn Laws. *See* Great Britain

Cornwall Canal employees, qu. 3135

Corporations, profits, 1209. *See also* Combines; Immigration

Corsets, duty, 3048

Cory, Mr. W. W. *See* Interior

Cosmos Chemical Company, Port Hope, 2217

Cossar, Dr. George C., immigration, 1471

Cost of Living, 1394, 1812, 2704, 2736, 2835. *See also* Address; Budget; Civil Service Bonus; Combines; Consumer; Immigration; Labour, Unemployment; Prices; Taxation
Banks and, 1409
Budget and, 1410, 1812
Canada and Great Britain, 3468, 3472
Canada and United States, comparison, 3073
Canada, one of most expensive countries, 2715
Charts, 1700
Clerical classes, 3534
Coal, cost of, 1345, 1813. *See also* Coal
Combines and, 2599. *See also* Combines
Consumer and, 2585
Curve, formerly descending now ascending, 3000
Customs and excise duties, 2839
Decrease of, 1700, 1907
Dominion Textile Company, profits, 3465
Dumping clause and, 2535
Emigration and, 2790. *See also* Emigration
"Free breakfast table" 2824
Freight rates and, 1958
Government investigation, inquiry, qu. 3703
Increase of, 1853
Labour Gazette figures, 1812
Liberal platform, 1410
Living within income, 2959

Cost of Living—*Con.*
Members of Parliament. *See* Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill
Michell, Prof., figures, 1700, 1812
Necessity for lower, 1412, 1437
Oleomargarine, 3508-3580
Prices, 1912 and 1922, 1407
Producer and consumer, 2713, 2972
Spread between, 2787
Production, cost of, 2815
Raisins and dried currants, duty, 3474
R. G. Dun & Company, figures, 1812
Special Committee on, 2569
Standard of living, 2959
Statistics, 1684
Tariff and, 2737, 2839, 3048
Reductions offset by sales tax, 3033
Taxation, 2839. *See also that title*
Sales tax, 1813, 2839, 2997
Unorganized workers, 3534
Wages, 2890, 2982. *See also* Labour
Workingman, 2982

Cotton. *See* Textiles; Treaties, French

Coughlan Shipbuilding Company, Vancouver dry dock, 1002

Coulter, Dr. R. M. *See* Post Office

Courtenay Bay. *See* St. John

Craig, Mr. Charles P., qu. 204

Cranfield, Mr. W. T., publicity agent in London, 2927, 2983, 4707

Crawford, Mr., letter to Minister of Immigration, 1396

Crean, Mr. Frank J. B., resources of northern Saskatchewan, 1060

Creditors. *See* Bankruptcy Act

Credits. *See also* Bank Act Amdt. bill; Banks and Banking; Finance; Housing; Loans; Money
Agricultural. *See under this title,* Rural Credit and industry, 626, 645, 650
Douglas credit scheme, 631
Economic problem and, 647
Farm. *See under this title,* Rural
Function and relation to industrial problems
M. (Mr. Irvine) for special com., 626
Amdt. (Mr. Fielding) to refer to Banking and Commerce Com. 645, agreed to, 651
Amdt. (Mr. Spencer) ruled out of order, 643
Improved system, 1252
Monopoly, 648, 4018, 4045
New York loan, April 1922, 2963
Prices and, 4226

Credits—*Con.*
Rural, 639, 640, 1088, 1438, 1907, 2751, 2836, 2869, 2929, 3024, 3060, 3066, 4014, 4016, 4035, 4039, 4041, 4045, 4046, 4066, 4071, 4130, 4144, 4146, 4298
Interest rates, 2962
United States, 642, 2829, 2930
United States system, 4043
Withheld, 3074

Creelman, Dr. George. *See* Immigration, Canada Colonization Association
Imports of farm produce, 1426

Creosoting Industry, 1245, 3234
Creosoted piling, use in British Columbia, qu. 1137
Lumber and timber, customs duty, qu. 813
Vancouver Creosoting Company, 3231

Crerar, Hon. Thomas A. (Marquette)
Banking and Commerce Com., retirement from, 2639
Civil Service statistics, qu. 207
Resignation as leader of Progressive party, 11, 35

Crime. *See* Criminal Code; Justice, Penitentiaries

Criminal Code. *See also* Criminal Code Amdts.
Attorney General vs. Wholesale Grocers, 2051
Board of Commerce and, 2521
Combines, 2521, 2527, 2592. *See also* Combines
Enforcement of, 4229
Guessing competitions, qu. 733
Labour, right to organize, 2890
Race-track betting, 709

Criminal Code Amdt. Bills
1. Capital punishment abolition of (Mr. Irvine) 1r., 180; 1r., second time by error in order paper, 487; explanation of error, 519; opportunity for consideration, inquiry, 1810
2. Scrip frauds. (Mr. Kennedy, Edmonton) 1r., 730
3. Registration of declaration of ownership by proprietors of newspapers (Mr. Jacobs) 1r., 615
4. Opium joints; betting information; age of consent; carnal knowledge; illegal use of badge; appeals (Sir Lomer Gouin) 1r., 1483; 2r., com., 2281; 3r., 2284; Senate amendments, 4733
5. Criminal conspiracy and sedition (Mr. Woodsworth) 1r., 616

Criminal Code Amdt. Bills—*Con.*
6. Publication of evidence in marriage or divorce proceedings. (Sir Lomer Gouin) 1r., 1971; 2r., com., 2053; 3r., 2054

Criminal Matters, procedure, qu. 1974

Crops. *See* Agriculture; Grain and Grain Trade

Cross Benches. *See* McMaster

Cross Point, Que., wharf, 955

Crown Lands. *See* Lands

Crowsnest Pass Agreement, 1563, 1620. *See also* Address; Budget; Canadian National Railways; Canadian Pacific Railway; Freight Rates; Progressive Party
Appropriation of Liberal policy, 2781
Extension, 2741

Crude Oil. *See* Oil; Petroleum

Crude Petroleum. *See* Petroleum

Cuba, trade with, 308. *See also* Steamship Services; West Indies

Cummings Cove, wharf, 945

Cunard Line
Immigration, 1193
Ocean freight rates, 2127

Curie, Monsieur and Madame, discovery of radium, 1287

Currants. *See* Customs Tariff Items

Currency. *See also* Banks and Banking; Finance; Money
Depreciated, 2988, 4027. *See* Money; Purchasing Power
Inflation. *See* Germany, Reparations

Currie, General Sir Arthur, directorships, 4025

Curzon, Lord, of Kedleston, signature of Italian treaty, 2403

Custodians. *See* Bankruptcy Act

Customs and Excise. *See also* Budget; Customs Tariff; Imports and Exports; Special War Revenue Act; Taxation; Trade; Treaties
Average tariff rate 2838
Averages and valuation 90
Bonded warehouses, qu. 1260. *See also* Liquor
British preference. *See that title*

Customs and Excise—*Con.*
Canadian customs officer at New York. *See under this title,* New York
Collections
Cost of, qu. 814
For 1922, 22
Per capita, Canada and United States, 2738
Customs duties. *See also* Customs Tariff
Agricultural and animal products, qu. 1992
Agricultural implements, 2739, 2740, 2743, 2756, 2815, 2848, 2974, 2990, 3033
Automobiles, 2908, 3075
Collections, 1921-22 and 1922-23, 2838
Creosoted lumber and piling, qu. 813
Goods shipped from one Canadian port to another, 2519, 2615, 3272
Goods shipped from Vancouver to Halifax via Panama canal, 2615
Hemp seed, 3474
Lowering, 2221
Nursery stock, 4432
Reduction. *See* British preference; Budget; Treaties, French treaty
Tomato plants, 4432
Wool, 2866
Department
Beckett, Matt C., qu. 283, 816
Blake, Mr. Charles, Brandon, 4513
Deputy minister, salary increase, 4669
Employees, 3282
Estimates, 3272
Halton county officials, 914
Legal work, transfer of, 856
Medicine Hat employees, qu. 3505
Officials, salaries, etc., qu. 3892
Salaries and contingencies, 3272
Depreciated currency clause, 2988
Drawbacks, qu. 1484
Antiseptic surgical dressing, 2655
Artificial silk tops and yarns, 3489, 3896
Barilla or soda ash, 2655, 3502
Copper in blocks or ingots, 2655
Glass tubing, 2655, 3502
Hat sweats, 2655, 3502
Machinery and parts, 2655
Oil, 2655
Oleomargarine, materials for, 3503
Raw materials, qu. 1864
Imported, manufactured, exported, qu. 1259
Steel, coal and woollen goods, qu. 1994
Sugar, 2655
Dumping clause, 2646, 3072, 2988
Sugar, 3046
Excise. *See also* Special War Revenue Act; Taxation
Beer, qu. 518

Customs and Excise—*Con.*
Excise—*Con.*
Beet sugar, 2644, 2706, 2742, 2989, 3229, 4393. *See also* Sugar
Beverages. *See under this title,* Confectionery and beverages
Cigarettes, 2706, 2825, 2850, 2913, 2929, 2979, 2988, 3229, 4392
Cigars and, consumption, qu. 516
516
Smuggling, 3230
Confectionery and beverage tax, revenue, qu. 624, 2644, 2656, 2707, 2979, 3046
Duties, 3026
Payment by consumer, 2839
Irritating taxes, 2858
Payment with postage stamps, 1815, 1820, 2979 3927, 3937, 4435
Revenue, loss of, 1983
Taxation, 3010
Tobacco, duty collected, qu. 1259
Wines, 452, qu. 518, 1977, 2656, 2742, 3036, 3937, 4425
Canadian, 2643, 2710
Hawkesbury, revenue and salaries, qu. 2205
Inspectors, immigration, 1874
Marking Act, 931, qu. 616, 2988
Montreal
Customs house, and revenue 3280
Newsprint, 3046. *See also* Pulp and Paper
New York, Canadian officer at, 1213, 1920, 2419, qu. 2611, 3272
Transfer of goods at, 3272
Printing presses, duty, 2858
Pulpwood, export tax on, 2828. *See also* Export Act
Raw materials, free, 2858
Seizures, qu. 620
Schooner Carrie L. Hirtle, qu. 3323
Toronto
Customs house, 3277, 4621
Revenue, 3277
Valuation for duty, 90, 145. *See also under this title,* Customs duties
Customs Tariff. *See* Customs Tariff Act Amdt. bill; Customs Tariff Items; Tariff

Customs Tariff Act 1907 Amdt. Bill
Res. 2650, 3963; 1r., 3963; 2r., com., 4408; 3r., 4409
Sections and subjects discussed:
British preference, discount of 10 per cent, 2650
Drawbacks, 2655
Reciprocity negotiations with United States, 2650
Resolutions, 2650, 2963
Tariff changes, 2654

Customs Tariff Act 1907 Amdt. Bill—*Con.*
Sections and subjects discussed—*Con.*
United States, duties against, reduction by order in council, 2650

Customs Tariff Items, 3454, 3895
Antiseptic surgical dressings, 2655
Artificial silk, 2645, 2820, 2853, 2931, 2958, 2964, 2990, 3017, 3035, 3069, 3075
Artificial fibre silk fabrics and, 2654, 3492
Manufactures, 2654
Tops and waste or artificial silk fibre tops and waste, 3489
Yarns, 2654, 3035, 3489
Barilla or soda ash, drawback, 2655, 3502
Beverages, 2979. *See also this title under* Customs and Excise
Bisulphate of soda or nitre cake, 2480, 2653, 3895
Boots and shoes, 2999, 3033
Boots, orthopaedic, 2654, 2750
Brass and copper scrap, 2653, 3483
Brass, iron or steel runners, rings, caps, etc. for umbrellas, 3501
Carborundum wheels and stones, 2654, 3500
Casual donations, 2645, 2654
Cigarettes, 2644, 2652, 2706, 2825, 2913, 2929, 2979, 2988
Coal, 2654
Anthracite and lignite, 3493
Composition and plated metal for jewelry and dental supplies, 2653, 3483
Cotton for manufacturers of pneumatic tires, 2654, 3487
Crude petroleum, 2644, 2653, 3035, 3481
Cyanamid or lime nitrogen, 2654
Date when changes become effective, 3504
Dehydrated sulphate of copper, 2653, 3480
Drawbacks, 3501. *See also this title* under Customs and Excise
Artificial silk tops and waste, 3896
Artificials silk yarn, filaments, etc, 3502
Barilla or soda ash, 2655, 3502
Copper for manufacture of wire, 3503
Copper in blocks, ingots, pigs or bars, 2655
Glass tubing, 2655, 3502
Hat sweats, 2655, 3502
Items enumerated in item 236, 3502
Machinery not made in Canada, 3503
Materials used in manufacture of goods enumerated in item 448c, 3503
Oil for manufacture of manila rope, 2655, 3502
Sugar, 2655, 3502
Dumping clause, 2535
Dry red lead, orange mineral, zinc white and white oxide of antimony, 2653, 3034, 3481
Emery and carborundum wheels and stones, 2654, 3500
Firebrick, 2653, 3035, 3481, 3896
Glass tubing, 2655, 3502
Hat sweats, hatters' tips and sides, 2654, 3500
Hemp seed, 2645, 2651, 3017
Iron or steel scrap, 2645, 2653, 3034, 3484
Linen yarn, 3897
Liquorice in rolls and sticks, 2653, 3480
Liquorice paste, 2653, 3017, 3480
Machinery for conversion of fish waste, 2645, 2734, 2946, 3486
Machinery not made in Canada, 2645, 2653, 2655, 3503
Malt flour, 2645, 2652, 3480
Manufactures of artificial silk or artificial fibre silk, 3492
Milk bottles, 3033
Oil used in manufacture of manila rope, 2655, 3502, 3901
Paper caps for milk bottles, 3033
Petroleum, 2644, 2653, 3035, 3481. *See also* Bounties; Petroleum
Porcelain for pumps, 3033
Potatoes, 2651, 2707, 2959, 3017, 3035, 3075, 3474
Printing and photographic presses and type-making accessories, 3486
Printing machinery, 2645, 2653, 2858
Prunes and dried plums, 2651, 3474
Raisins and dried currants, 2644, 2651, qu. 2699, 2718, 2964, 2989, 3017, 3034, 3068, 3474, 3479
Proclamation by Governor in Council, 3474, 3479
Reciprocity with United States, 2649. *See also that title*
Resolutions, 2650, 2963
Rolled iron and steel and cast steel for milling cutters, 2653, 3484
Rolled iron or steel hoops, bands, etc., 3484
Scrap iron, 3034
Silk cloth, woven in the gum, 3489
Silks, 2645, 3046. *See also under this title,* Artificial silk
Spectacle and eyeglass frames, 2653, 3483
Staves of wood, 2654, 3487
Sticks or canes, 2654, 3501
Stumping machines, 2653, 2749, 2955, 3486
Sugar, 2645, 2651, 2744, 2820, 2825, 2968, 2987, 3017, 3034, 3039, 3046, 3069, 3082, 3479
Dumping duty, 2646
Sulphate of copper, 3895
Typewriters and parts, 2653, 3485
Usual coverings containing goods not machinery, 3501

Customs Tariff Items—*Con.*
Value for home consumption, 2535
Velvets, velveteens, silk velvets, plush and silk fabrics, 3488
Well-drilling machinery, 2645, 2653, 3487

Czecho-Slovakia
Senate, constitution of, 1371
Treaty with France, 2219

Dairy Cattle. *See* Live Stock, Accredited herds, Health of Animals

Dairy Industry Act 1914 Amdt. Bills
1. Butter substitutes and re-manufacture of butter. Res. 2518, 3150; 1r., 3154; M. (Mr. Motherwell) that order be discharged, 3329, 3449, agreed to, 3451; notice of M. (Mr. Carroll) for 2r., 3399, 3402
Sections and subjects discussed:
Drafting, 3325
Oleomargarine, 3325
M. anticipating, 3326
Parliamentary counsel, 3325, 3449
2. Butter standard; renovated butter; milk or cream containing fat or oil other than that of milk. Res. 3961, 4251, 1r., 4344; 2r., com., 3r., 4510
Sections and subjects discussed:
Definition, 4510
Establishment of guilt for violation of act, 4510
Minimum standard of fat in butter, 4510

Dairying Industry, 609, 1851. *See also* Address; Budget; Dairy Industry Act; Live Stock; Oleomargarine
Alberta, 1839
Antipodean competition, 2765
Bacteriology, 462
Butter
Adulteration, 3150
British market, in, 2863
China shipments to, 1840, 1853
Compounds, 3152
Disease germs, 3295
Exports to France, 2217, 2273. *See also* Treaties, French Treaty
Freight rates 1961
Fresh, shipment from Enrope, 2273
Grading, 2765, 2864, 3151, 3283, 3297
Imitations of, 3152
Imports 2821, 2959
"Manna" 3152
Oleomargarine and, 386, 3508-81. *See also* Oleomargarine
Pasteurization, 3298
Price, 2821, 3513, 3533
Production, total 1921-1922, 2774

Dairying Industry—*Con.*
Butter—*Con.*
Quality 2863
Poor, 3516
Renovated, 3151. *See also* Dairy Industry Act Amdt. bill
Restrictions, 3153
Salt, too much, 2863, 3297
Standard of fat. *See* Dairy Industry Act
Substitutes, 3150
Weight, 3151
Certified milk. *See under this title,* Milk
Cheese
Acidity and bacteria, 3297
Bacteriology 462
China, shipment to, 1853
Cold storage, 2055
Disease germs, 3295
Grading, 2765, 3283, 3295
Imports, 2959
Prices, 3295
Production, total 1921-1922, 2774
Cold storage, 2978. *See also that title*
Co-operative, 2764
Cow-testing, 3284, 3297
Cream
Fermented, 3151
Pasteurizing, 3283
Dairy branch estimates, 609, 3283
Dairy cattle testing, 1307. *See also* Live Stock, Accredited herds
Dairy produce graders, appointment, 3289
Dairy products and disease germs, 3299
Finch, combined cheese and butter factory, 3284, 3297
French treaty and, 1984
Holstein cow at Agassiz farm, 457, 2769
Leitch, Prof., evidence before Agricultural Conditions Com., 1843
Losses on cheese and butter, 2934
Markets, 2863
Milk
Certified, 3300
Fat or oil content. *See* Dairy Industry Act Amdt. bill
Filled milk, 3152
Fraser Valley Association, 4265
Pasteurizing, 3283
Price of, 2559
Products, imports, qu. 617
Sale of in Toronto, 2731
Supply, monopolies and combines. *See* Combines bill
Modern methods, 2765
Montreal cold storage plant, 3289. *See also* Cold Storage
National Dairy Council of Canada, oleomargarine, 3269

Dairying Industry—*Con.*
Production, total 1921-1922, 2774
Products, grading, 2864
Representative in Great Britain, 3297
Research laboratory, 3297
Ruddick and Wilson, Messrs., trip to New Zealand, 3283, 3288
Supplies, comparison of prices, 2740
Testing system, extension of, 3284
Unprofitable herds, 2863
Value of, 2863
Vancouver Island Milk Producers' Association, 4266
Whey, disease germs, 3299

Daly Building. *See* Public Buildings, Ottawa

Damage to Mortgaged Premises. *See* Canadian National Railways Bills

d'Anjou, Mr. Emmanuel (Rimouski)
Canada's participation in war, 1536
Canadian National railways,, doctors, 814
Grand Trunk arbitration, 1307
Legal expenses, qu. 730
Newspapers and printing companies, 2298

Dartmouth, N.S. pier and dredging, 4568

Davidson Commission. *See* War

Davies, Mr. C. C. (North Battleford)
Canadian National railways branch lines, 4195, 4323
Hudson Bay railway, M. (Mr. Knox) 1051
Oliver-St. Paul branch line railway, 4323
Western provinces, treatment of, 4195
Wheat prices, 1886

Davies, Right Hon. Sir Louis, K.C.M.G., deputy Governor General, 1809

Dawson, Mr. F. G., Prince Rupert. *See* Canadian National Railways, Directors

Daylight Saving
Farmers and, 1427
Montreal post office, qu. 3143
Ottawa, qu. 2612
Parliament, departments and, qu. 2612

Deadman's Island, qu. 1362

Death Rate, 1197

Debates, Official. *See* House of Commons

Debt. *See also* Public Debt; Taxation
Capital levy, 2743
Domestic, 1343
Farmers and, 2768
Federal, provincial and municipal, per capita, 2720, 2721

Debt—*Con.*
Held in foreign countries, 1406
Immigration and. *See* Immigration
Outside of Canada, estimated, 2720
Pyramiding of, 2728
Readjustment of, 2981

Debtor. *See* Bankruptcy Act

Deceased Husband's Brother, Marriage with, Bill—Mr. McMaster, 1r., 1256; 2r., 1836; com., 3r., 1837

Deceased Members, tributes to memory. *See* House of Commons

Dechene, Mr. A. M. (Montmagny)
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3538

Decorations. *See* Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner)

Deep Waterways. *See* St. Lawrence

Defeat of Government Motion. *See* Lack of Confidence, M. (Mr. Irvine)

Defence. *See* National Defence

Deficits. *See* speeches on Budget; Canadian Government Merchant Marine; Canadian National Railways

Deflation. *See* Credit; Finance; Money; Prices; Purchasing Power

Delay in British Mails. *See* Post Office

Delisle, Mr. M. S. (Portneuf)
Grondines wharf, 968
Valcartier camp ground, qu. 2298

Demers, Mr. Amedee, mail contractor, qu. 1868

Democracy, Senate and. *See* Senate, M. (Mr. Denis, Joliette)

Denis, Mr. J. Arthur (St. Denis)
Budget, 3038; sectional and local interests; tribute to Finance Minister, "the man of the hour"; Liberal and Conservative administrations; Conscription Act; extravagance in the name of freedom and civilization; change of government; improvement in financial situation; railway and shipping deficits; balanced budget; taxation, relief from; sales tax; income tax; exemption for children; taxation of dividends; unity of property; confidence in government; amendment, 3038

Denis, Mr. J. Arthur—*Con.*
Immigration
Labour and, 1196
Policy, 1196
Montreal post office,
Inquiry branch, qu. 2516
Promotion examinations, qu. 2298
Morinville postmistress, qu. 1028
Waste paper, disposal, qu. 1028

Denis, Mr. Jean J. (Joliette)
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3091
M. (Mr. Casgrain) 1519
Private members' days, 1158
Senate, M. for elective, 1364

Denmark
Bacon competition, 2864, 2865
Butter competition, 2863
Dairying industry, 3296, 3515
Hog grading, 591
Immigration from, 1096
Land settlement policy, 1406
Oleomargarine, 3515, 3559
Senate, constitution of, 1371

Dennis, Mr. J. S. *See* Immigration, Canada Colonization Association

Dentists, narcotic drugs for. *See* Narcotic Drugs Act

Department of Soldiers Civil Re-establishment Act. *See* Soldiers Civil Re-establishment

Dependency. *See* Pensions, Widowed mothers

Deportation. *See* Chinese Immigration bill; Immigration Act Amdt. bill; Narcotic Drugs

Depression, causes of, 2747. *See* Speeches on Address; Budget; Immigration

Deputy Local Judges. *See* Admiralty Act

Deputy Ministers
Appointment of, 1805
Conference and report, 562
French-speaking, 1805
Responsibility of. *See* Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power)
Retirement and superannuation, 891, 1822-5, qu. 3135, 3342
Salaries, increase, 4557, 4667

Deputy Registrars. *See* Admiralty Act Amdt.

Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees (Mr. George N. Gordon)
Rulings and statements. *See also* Marcil; Speaker

Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees—*Con.*
Rulings and statements—*Con.*
Amendments
Form of, 65-66
Varying nature of grant, 4371
Bills
Amendments
Involving charge upon revenue, 3870, 3888
Proposed in committee, 4371
General argument not permissible on particular clause, 4063, 4073, 4244
Not printed, proceeding, 3968, 3974, 3976
Reading clauses, marginal notes sufficient, 3974
Relevancy, 3238, 3863, 4371
Chair
Criticism of, 2412, 4720
To be addressed, 897
Committee
Anticipation of clause, 4071
Items declared carried, 4704
Relevancy
General discussion permissible, 2414
Newspapers, reading from, 2412
Speeches in, 2137, 2309, 2342, 2414, 2481, 2482, 2624, 2664, 3239, 4025, 4051, 4054, 4058, 4063, 4074, 4191, 4374, 4534
Special, action not reviewable by Committee of Whole 4074
Conversation 4528, 4572, 4581
Debate
Interruptions, 4064
Mover closes, 657, 2602, 4361, 4363
Reference to matter sub judice, 3371
Relevancy, 1407, 1420, 2137, 4025
Debates, Official Report, 1638
Insertion of documents not read, 3174, 3789
Undiscussed item in supply, omission, 1638, 3285, 3292
Estimates, consideration en bloc, 4559, 4614, 4616
Interruptions, cannot prevent if member speaking does not object, 4192
Language, 4238, 4244
Letter reflecting on proceedings of House, 4060
Matters sub-judice, 3371
Member
May ask question but not make speech, 2774
Must confine remarks to section under discussion, 4244
Reflection on 4239
Speaking, not compelled to answer question, 1125, 4064

Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees—*Con.*
Rulings and statements—*Con.*
Member—*Con.*
Speaking not to be interrupted, 1420
Motions
Amendments, 245
Involving charge upon revenue, 3870, 4720
Discussion allowed pending decision, 316
To be in writing, 866
To increase taxation 3935, 3936, 3937
Orders of the day
Explanation in detail not in order, 2255
Reading letters 2254
Questions
Already answered, 3913
Irrelevant 2624, 3863
Supply
General discussion not permissible, 4559
Items
Agricultural Instruction grant, 3285
Classification of, 3287
Consideration en bloc, 4612
Minister not required to give information twice, 3386
M. to reduce item, 1737, 1738
Reconsideration of item by unanimous consent, 609
Relevancy, 486, 594, 608, 778, 888, 898, 1014, 1846, 1902, 2154, 3197, 3250, 3253, 3291, 3293, 3371, 3424, 4558, 4559, 4562, 4566, 4602, 4688, 4699, 4719
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, 3285, 3292, 3293, 3294
Urgency, 4731

Derelicts. *See* Marine and Fisheries, Wrecks

Desbarats, Mr. G. J. *See* National Defence

Descente des femmes, Que. wharf, 955

Descoteaux, Mr. J. F. (Nicolet)
Introduced, 2837

Desertions
Canadian Air Force, 2418
Seamen. *See* Immigration Act Amdt. bill

Designs. *See* Trade Marks and Designs Act

Deslauriers, Mr. Hermas (St. Mary)
Cedar Rapids power, 659
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 379
Electric power, export of, M., 658
Emigration to the United States, 1241
Gaspe, natural resources, 1242
Immigration
Assistance to settlers, 1242
Domestic servants, 1243
Labour, attitude towards, 1241

Deslauriers, Mr. Hermas—*Con.*
Immigration—*Con.*
Lemont, Mr. Arthur, 1243
Policy, 1241
United States from, 1243
Labour, unemployment, 1242
Metagen analysis of, qu. 1867
Monte Grappa, foundering of, qu. 912
Montreal
Harbour master, qu. 1867
Postal station "G," qu. 623
Public Works, chief architect's branch, qu. 2517
Wheat shipments to Montreal, qu. 385

Despatches. *See* Near East Crisis

Destructive Insects and Pests. *See also* Insect Pests
Administration of Act, 595, 3988

Detroit River, regulation of traffic, 3357

Dickie, Mr. C. H. (Nanaimo)
British Columbia fishing licenses, 1546
Canadian products, duty of Canadians to purchase, 1244
Coal production in British Columbia, 1244
Creosoting industry, 1245
Emigration to the United States, 1244
Export Act Amdt. bill, pulpwood, 4353
Free trade, effect of, 1246
Fuel oil importations, 1245
Fuel supply, 1247
Hemp bounty bill, 4390
Hindu franchise, 4661
Immigration
Oriental, 1247
Policy, 1244
Imperial Conference, 4661
Lumber industry of British Columbia, 1245
Nanaimo and Victoria harbours, 1014
Port Renfrew wharf, 1008
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4353
Reciprocity, 1246
Tariff equal to that of United States, 1246
Western provinces, conditions in, 1246

Digby, N.S.
Dredging, 4568
Pier, 942

Direct Importation. *See this title under* British Preference; Treaties, French Treaty

Direct Taxation. *See* Taxation

Directors, Board of. *See* Canadian National Railways, Directors

Directory of government offices, qu. 2085

Disability Cases. *See* Pensions

Disallowance of Nova Scotia Statute, 208, 249, 3097, 4678
Amdt. (Sir Henry Drayton) to M. for Supply, 2347, neg, on div. 2391

Disallowance of Provincial Legislation. *See* Jurisdiction; Legislation

Disarmament. *See also* Great Lakes
Conference at Washington, 2911, 4000

Discrimination. *See* Freight Rates; Railway Act Amdt. bill

Diseases. *See* Health
Cattle, of. *See* Animal Contagious Diseases bill; Live Stock, Health of Animals

Dismissals. *See* Civil Service; Post Office,

Distressed Canadians. *See* Relief

Distressed Seamen. *See* Canada Shipping Act Amdt; Marine

Divisions. *See* House of Commons

Divorces
Number granted, qu. 622
Publication of evidence in marriage or divorce proceedings, 1971

Dockages. *See* Grain; Elevators

Doctors. *See also* Health; Military Hospitals; Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment
Canadian National railways, qu. 814
Charges and standards of living, 2813
Indians, medical service, 2160
Medical and scientific discoveries. *See* Banting; Medical Research; Scientific Research
Narcotic drugs. *See that title*

Doherty, Mr Manning, cattle embargo removal, 2871

Doherty, Right Hon. C. J.
Opinions
Liquor legislation, 2408
Naturalization Act, 2447, 2463-65
Payments to, 1154
Pension, qu. 1029

Doherty Act. *See* Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill

Dollier and Galinee, Fathers, cairn at Port Dover, Ont., 3433

Domestic Loans. *See* Loans

Domestic Servants. *See* Immigration; Labour

Dominion Archives. *See* Public Archives

Dominion Arsenals. *See* National Defence

Dominion Astrophysical Observatory. *See* Interior

Dominion Bureau of Statistics. *See* Statistics

Dominion Canners, Limited, 1420

Dominion Cotton Mills. *See* Textiles

Dominion Elections Act. *See also* Elections; Proportional Representation
Amendments, inquiry as to, 1027
Proportional representation, single transferable vote, 1660, 2181

Dominion Express Company. *See* Canadian National Railways, Express

Dominion Forest Reserves and Parks Act. *See also* Forests and Forestry
(Description of areas 1r., 1256; 2r., com., 2060; 3r., 2086

Dominion Fuel Board. *See* Fuel Supply

Dominion Iron and Steel Company, industrial disputes, 1703

Dominion Lands. *See also* Canadian National Parks and Historic Sites; Dominion Forest Reserves and Parks; Dominion Lands Act; Dominion Lands and Parks; Lands
Alberta, revenue from, qu. 2515
Drainage. *See under this title,* Reclamation
Free land available for settlement, 1087, 1090
Grants to railways, 1353
Grazing lands, 3424
Leases, sale of, 3424
Homesteads. *See also* Dominion Lands Act
Patents in event of death or insanity, 3398
Pre-emption and purchases, qu. 1030
Reversion to Dominion government, 3257
Second. *See also* Dominion Lands Act
In southern Saskatchewan and Alberta, 1353, 3398
Valuation and revision of, 3398
Homesteaders, relief, 3447
Hudson Bay railway, land sales, 1053, 1068
Indian title, extinguishment of, 3398
Interest rates on deferred payments, 1088-9
Pre-emptions and purchased homesteads, qu. 1031
Allocation to Hudson Bay railway, 1353, qu. 2393
Reclamation, 3257, 3428, 3430. *See also* Irrigation

Dominion Lands—*Con.*
Reclamation—*Con.*
Alberta Drainage Company, 3144
Carrot river district, 3431
Kootenay flats, 3431
Lesser Slave lake, 3430
Manitoba and Saskatchewan, 1065
Moose range drainage, qu. 3144, 3259
Waterhen lake district, 3431, qu. 4303
School lands, 3398, 4202
Balance due on purchase price, 1385, 1389. *See also* Dominion Lands Act Amdt.
Reversion of, 3445
Southern Saskatchewan and Alberta, 1353, 3398
Timber, permit to cut, 203, 3398
Unorganized districts, 3258

Dominion Lands Act Amdt Bills
1. Coal lands and mining rights, 1r., 2639; 2r., com., 3149; 3r., 3150
2. Homestead valuations; second homesteads; issue of patents in event of death or insanity; school lands; permits to cut timber; extinguishment of Indian titles. Res. 3398, 3982; 1r., 2r., com., 3983; com., 4201, 4364; 3r., 4369

Sections and subjects discussed
Governor in Council may authorize inquiry, 4206
Issue of patent after death of applicant, 4202
Issue of patent if applicant becomes insane, 4202
No employee to purchase Dominion lands, 4206
Sections set apart as school lands, 4202
Terms of payment for school lands, 4202
Timber limits, areas, 4206
Transfer to another homestead, 4202, 4364

Dominion Lands and Parks, 3938, 4702. *See also* Canadian National Parks and Historic Sites
Appointments, 3252
Cloakey, Mr., 3254
May, Mr., 3254
Drainage, 3257
Moose Range, qu, 3144, 3259
Unorganized districts, 3258
Dwight, Mr. T. W., allowance, 4702
Estimates, 3406
Expenditure, 113
Forest reserves, roads and bridges, 1014
Fortier, Mrs. F. T. E., allowance, 4702
Homesteads, 3251
Manitoba Pulp and Paper Company, 3254
Outside salaries, 3249
Rocky Mountain park
Claim of Hudson Bay company, qu. 2418
Stipendiary magistrate, 1739

Dominion Lands and Parks—*Con.*
Taxes unpaid, 3257
Unorganized districts, improvement, 3256
Wainwright buffalo reserve, 3407. *See also* Buffalo

Dominion Marine Association. *See* Freight Rates, Shipping

Dominion Notes. *See* Finance

Dominion Observatories. *See* Astrophysical; Interior

Dominion Police. *See* Royal Canadian Mounted Police

Dominion Power Board. *See* Water Powers

Dominion Textile Company. *See* Textiles

Dorchester Penitentiary. *See* Justice, Penitentiaries

Doughty, Dr. A. B. *See* Public Archives

Douglas Credit Scheme. *See* Credits

Doukhobors. *See* Immigration

Downie, Mr. Donald. *See* Royal Canadian Mounted Police

Drain Tiles. *See* Taxation, Sales Tax

Drainage. *See* Dominion Lands, Reclamation

Draper, Mr. P. M. *See* Printing Bureau, King's Printer

Drawbacks. *See* Customs and Excise; Customs Tariff Items

Drayton, Hon. Sir Henry L. (West York)
Address in reply, 153. Speech of Mr. Meighen, 153, 154; sales tax; New York loans, 154-155; direct increase of Canada's obligations; surplus of previous years; railway expenditure, 155; Sir Henry Thornton and the railways; National railway board, 156; Intercolonial railway; Mr. D. B. Hanna, 157; Lanark election; domestic loan, 158; cost of placing loans in New York, 158-159; commissions on loans; increase in public expenditure, 159-160; Mr. Shaw's amendment, 160
Agriculture
Agricultural instruction grant, 607
Agricultural produce marketing agent, 4675
Department, salaries and contingencies, 610
Annuities, old age, 1696, 1698
Artificial silk industry, 2659, 2703, 2853. *See also under this title,* Customs Tariff Items

Drayton, Hon. Sir Henry L.—*Con.*
Auditor General, vacancy, 3987, 4355, 4674
Automobile insurance, 3978
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 1314
Bank draft tax, 3925, 3928
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. 3097-3125, 3209-3222
Beet sugar duty, 2657, 2706, 4393
Belle River harbour, 4597 4608
Board of Audit Act, 4355
Botany yarn duty, 3896
British Empire exhibition, 1910, 3949
British preference
Canadian ports, direct importation, 3458
Woollen goods, 3459
Budget
Date of, inquiry, 1163, 1483, 1740, 1868 2128, 2254, 2347, 2469
Protective feature, 3468
Speech, 2657; congratulations to the Minister of Finance; Mr. Fielding's 17th budget; cigarette tax; beet sugar tax; French treaty; raisins and dried currants; tariff stability; United States prosperity, 2657; Canada, condition and prospects; financial situation; railways; debt; deficits; estimates for 1923-24; taxation, 2658; artificial silk industry; hemp bounty, 2659; trade and industry, 2701; comparison with other countries, finances; debt and deficits; budget; tariff, changes in; free trade, 2702; tariff stability; artificial silk industry; copper rods and bars, 2703; hemp bounty; silk; sales tax; cost of living, 2704; receipt tax, 2705; luxuries; cheque tax; income tax; cigarette tax; beet root sugar, 2706; confectionery and beverages; reciprocity with United States; potatoes, duty on; imports and exports, 2707; imports of agricultural products; Fordney-McCumber tariff, 2708; copper bounty; hemp bounty; revenue and expenditure; deficits, 2709; French treaty; taxation of necessities instead of luxuries; political budget; government supporters appointed to Senate and Bench; jobs for political supporters; shipping rates; royal commissions, 2710; timber famine; amendment, opportunity for Progressive party to move, 2711
Reference to, 3074
Buffalo, slaughter of, 3439
Business of the House, 3127
Adjournments at 11 p.m., 1360
Bills, principle, on second reading, 3091

Drayton, Hon. Sir Henry L.—*Con.*
Business of the House—*Con.*
Motion to increase taxation, 3936
Private members' day, 1161
Supply
Calling of, 2295
Undiscussed items not in official report, 3285
Business Profits War Tax bill, 4440, 4489
Canada Colonization Association. *See under this title,* Immigration
Canada, constitutional development, 4466
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill, 3146
Distressed seamen, 3969
Canada Temperance Act, administration, 2495
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, 3814
Advances, 3814, 3824
Coal-carrying trade, 3826
Construction, 3814
Deficit, 3815
Sale of vessels, 3705, 3822
Thornton, Sir Henry, 3817
Canadian National Institute for blind, 694
Canadian National parks and historic sites, 3441
Canadian National railways
Advances
$1,550,000, 4692
$73,000,000, 3789
Audit staff, transfer from Moncton, 575
Balfour, Col., reported appointment, 2794
Branch lines construction bill, 4304-44
Expenditure, appropriation by Parliament, 4329, 4399
Finance, 4319, 4329
Comparison of votes, 1922 and 1923, 3702
Correspondence, M. for, 244
Deficits, 2658
Directors, Talbot, Col. O., 2004, 4525
Grand Trunk
Amalgamation, 56
Ocean ports, 1762
United States terminals, 815
Insurance of mortgaged premises, bill, 2048, 2107
Items, opportunity to discuss, 3703
Management, responsibility and powers, 3616, 3624
Ocean ports, 1759
Operating deficits, 3701
Orders in council, 815
Paris offices, 3611, 3660, 3683, 3701
Pre-audit, 3701
Robb, Mr., 2472
Sales tax, qu. 1157
Securities bill, 4515
Amdt. to refer back, neg. 4732

Drayton, Hon. Sir Henry L.—*Con.*
Canadian National railways—*Con.*
Summary and allocation of vote, 3798
Thomas, Mr. A. J., reported appointment, 2794
Thornton, Sir Henry, responsibility and powers, 3617, 3624
Toronto
Office building, qu. 1994, 3642
Viaduct and union station, 4145
Canadian ports, use of by United States fishermen, 3906
Canadian Press Limited, bill, 1464
Cattle shipment to Great Britain, 4675
Cheque tax, qu. 282, 332, 2706, 3925, 4409, 4423
Amendment, 3933
Enforcement, qu. 492
Chinese immigration bill, 2309
Cigarettes
Consumption of, qu. 516
Duty, 2706, 3229, 4393
Civil government estimates, form of, 668
Civil Service, 1811
Bonus, 1811
Commission
Postmasters, appointments, 1821, 1823, 1827
Salaries and contingencies, 3986
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 350
Civil Service Superannuation and Retirement bill, 3146
Combines bill, 2621-38, 2660-65
Civil Service Act appointments, 2662
Commissioners, appointments, 2627
Registrar, inquiry, 2621
Coal, reported discovery in Ontario, 2512
Commercial union, 3906
Commissioner of Taxation, salary, 3949, 4670
Confectionery and beverages, tax, qu. 624, 2707
Copper bounty, 2709, 3234, 4375
Copyright Act Amdt. bill, 2287, 2288
Cory, Mr. W. W., Deputy Minister of the Interior, salary, 4667
Cost of living, Prof, Michell, figures, 1700
Credits, function, M. (Mr. Irvine) 645
Customs Tariff Act 1907 Amdt. bill, 4408
Customs Tariff items
Artificial silk, 3489
Manufactures, 3492
Tops and waste of artificial fibre silk, 3896
Bisulphate of soda, 3480, 3895
Brass and copper scrap, 3483
Brass, iron or steel parts for umbrellas, 3501

Drayton, Hon. Sir Henry L.—*Con.*
Customs Tariff items—*Con.*
Composition and plated metal for jewelry and dental purposes, 3483
Coverings and containers, 3501
Crude petroleum, 3481
Date when changes became effective, 3504
Dehydrated sulphate of copper, 3480, 3895
Drawbacks
Artificial silk, 3502
Copper for electric wires, 3503
Firebrick, 3482
Liquorice paste, 3480
Malt flour duty, 3480
Printing and lithographic presses, 3486
Raisins and dried currants, 3477
Rolled iron and steel hoops, etc, 3484
Silk cloth, woven in the gum, 3489
Spectacle and eyeglass frames, 3483
Staves of wood, 3487
Sticks or canes, 3501
Stumping machines, 3486
Velvets, velveteens, etc., 3488
Well-drilling machinery, 3487
Wool, botany yarn, 3489
Deputy ministers, salaries
Deputy Minister of Finance, 4670
Increase in, 4667
Destructive Insect and Pest Act, 3988
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 208, 249, 2347-90, 3097
Dominion Lands Act Amdt. bill (Coal lands) 3149
Dominion lands, reclamation, 3431
Dominion lands and parks, salaries, 3249
Dominion observatories, expenditure, 3242
Dominion Power board, 3427
Dredging by government dredges, 4569, 4570
Dry Dock Subsidies Act Amdt., 3980
Electric power, M. (Mr. Deslauriers) 662
Emigration to the United States, 691, 2400
Employers' liability compensation, 692
Estimates
Arrangement of, 610, 668, 1468, 3242
Civil government, form of, 668
Discussion en bloc, 4559, 4588
Supplementary, time of presentation, 4554
Exchequer court judgeship, 2501
Excise taxes, payment with postage stamps, 1815, 3927, 3938
Exhibitions, 1455
Collection of exhibits, 1468
Immigration, attracting, 1466
Experimental farms, 456
Export Act Amdt. bill, 4345
External Affairs department, salaries, 3897
Finance Act Amdt. bill, 4406

Drayton, Hon. Sir Henry L.—*Con.*
Finance department, charges of management, 3987
France, exports and imports, 2004. *See also under this title,* French Treaty
Freight rates
Crowsnest pass agreement, 1960, 2852
Manufactured products, 2855
Railway rates, equalization, M. (Mr. Clark) 1959
French treaty, 443, 456, 2002, 2255, 2299-2303
Agricultural imports, 445
Balance of trade, 2204, 2221
Border states, agreements and concessions, 2219, 2273, 2395
Brandies and wines, 444, 3478
French brandy, Scotch and Canadian whiskies, 3478
Bronze powder, 2002, 2006, 2270
Competition with United States, 443
Embroideries, 2008
Favoured nation, 443, 2271
Luxuries, 444
Sales tax, 2279, 2280, 2299
Silks and silk manufactures, 2255, 2264, 2300, 2397
Treaty of 1907, 2004
United States trade with France, 2277
Velvets, velveteens, etc. 3488
Wines, duty, 438, 444, 3478
Wool, 447
Fruit and fruit containers bill, 2105, 3150
Fuel supply, 802
Georgetown wharf, 4587
Government publications, 811, 1712
Government workshops, Ottawa, 4617
Grain inquiry commission, appeal, 1210
Halibut fishery treaty, 4466
Halifax
Exodus from, 2400
Grain elevator, 4713
Historic events, grants for celebration, 4705
Harbours and rivers
Engineers' reports, 4571
Nova Scotia, 4562
Morrison claim, 4573, 4722
Ontario, 4589
Prince Edward island, 4587
Hawkesbury bridge, 4590
"Hector" celebration, 4705
Hemp bounty, 2659, 2704, 2709, 3912
Highways, Ontario, cost of, 2490, 2493
Hoppe leases, 3128
Housing, loans to provinces, 4705
Hudson Bay railway, McArthur claim, 4686-9
Icebreakers and steamers, 3160

Drayton, Hon. Sir Henry L.—*Con.*
Immigration
Advertising, qu. 518, 1103
Black, Mr. W. J., 2084
Canada Colonization Association, 1480
Salvation army and, 1093
Chinese, 1445, 1447, 2309
Detailed information, 1481
Empire settlement scheme, 667, 1096, 1473, 1480
Estimates, arrangement of, 1468
Medical inspection, 702
Ratio of British to foreign, 1105
St. John immigration buildings, 1457, 1460, 1464, 1908
Salaries and contingencies, 1909
Thornton, Sir Henry, reported statement, 2795
Immigration Act Amdt. bill, 3981
Undesirable classes, 2669
Income tax, qu. 281, 2659, 2706
Income War Tax Act Amdt. bill, 4492, 4495
Indians, 2124
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1361
Inland Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 4393
Cigarettes and beet sugar duties, 3229
Inspection of live stock shipments, 3334
Insulin, patenting of, 2077
Insurance Act Amdt. bill, 3147, 3978
Interim supply bills, 1482, 3705
Interior department, salaries, 1909, 3949
International boundaries, survey, 3247
International bridge at Niagara Falls, qu. 1257, qu. 1864
Irrigation, surveys and inspections, 3430
Italian treaty bill, 2394-2400, 2437
Concessions to border states, 2395
Consideration postponed, 2304
Jugo-Slavia, 2396
Silks, 2397
Johnston, Mr. Alex, salary increase, 4668
Judges Act Amdt. bill, 3604
Labour, strikes in, 1922, 495, 815
Lake Grain Rates commission, 4710
La Société des Artisans Canadiens Français, 1027
League of Nations
Canada's contribution, 3990
Expenses, 3989
Linen yarn duty, 3897
Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill, 3150
Lunenburg harbour, dredging, 4576
Mackenzie district, half-breed claims, 3444
Marketing of grain, M. (Mr. Millar) 300
Marketing of imported goods, qu. 616, 931
Marshall, Mr. Duncan
Appointment, 3317

Drayton, Hon. Sir Henry L.—*Con.*
Marshall, Mr. Duncan—*Con.*
Salary, 608
Visit to Great Britain, 4675
Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur, speech in North Essex, 670
Michigan Central bridge, sales tax, qu. 1257
Military hospitals, 670
Militia Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3975, 3977
Mines and Geological Survey
Estimates, 3197
Explosives division, 2514
Montreal Harbour Commissioners bill, 4508
Morrison, Mr. T. D., Little Anse, 4573, 4722
Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. bill, 2114, 3149.
Naturalization Act, M. (Mr. Carroll) 1381
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2107, 2437
New departmental building, Ottawa, 4617
New York, Canadian customs officer, 3281
Newspaper postage, 4528
Northern Pacific Halibut Fishery bill, 4483
Nova Scotia
Disallowance of provincial legislation, 208, 249, 2347-90, 3097
Miners' strike, 914
Northwest Territories Act, 270
Ontario legal fees, 1155
Opium and Narcotic Drugs, 2114, 3149
Ordnance lands, salaries and expenses, 3443
Pacaud, Mr. Lucien T., 1832
Paradis, Mr. T., claim, 4691
Parliament buildings, 1716, 1719
Estimates, M. to reduce, 1727
Members' rooms, allocation, 1729
Tower, completion of, 1720
Ventilation, 1722
Patents of Invention bill, 2064, 2071, 2083, 2088, 2102
Commissioner, powers of, 2065
Penitentiaries, 706
Pensions
Commissioners, 685
Federal appeal board and district boards of review, 403
Royal commission, expenses, 691
Petition of Right Act Amdt. bill, 3127
Petroleum bounties, 3921, 4392
Pollution of boundary waters, 700
Postage stamps, use for revenue purposes, 1815, 3927, 3938
Post Office Act Amdt. bill, 4528
Post Office department
Coulter, Dr. R. M., retirement, 1822
Estimates, 1778, 1815
Lemaire, Mr. E. J., 1822
Postmaster General, illness, absence, 1821
Postmasters, appointment of, 1821-1827

Drayton, Hon. Sir Henry L.—*Con.*
Post Office department—*Con.*
List of appointments, 1830
Revenue not connected with service, 1815
Rural mail service, Anderson, Mr., 1821
Prince Edward island, terminals claim, 4676
Printing bureau
New building, 1731
Reorganization, 1731
Retiring allowances, 3949
Promissory notes tax, 3925
Provincial rights, bankruptcy, 3097
Public expenditure, 2658
Total $548,750,714, 4554
Public works estimates, 4554
Pugsley, Hon. William, appointment, 2501
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4345
Purchasing Commission, 3950, 4002, 4704
Radiotelegraph service, 2285, 3337
Railway and shipping strikes, 245
Railway statistics, 207
Receipt tax, qu. 282, 2705, 3934, 4423
Revision, 4409
Reciprocity with United States, 2707, 2708
Offer to negotiate, 3906
Redistribution, delay, 2400
Returned Soldiers Insurance bill, 4735
Returned soldiers, emigration, 691
Riordan Company, business tax, 4490
Rural credits, 645
St. John and Quebec railway bill, 3403
St. John immigration building, 1457, 1460, 1464, 1908
St. John river, sawdust pollution, 701
St. Lawrence river waterway, 663, 3427
St. Lawrence ship canal, 3339
Sales tax, qu. 281, 2704, 4409. *See also under this title,* French Treaty
Collections, qu. 938
Exemptions, qu. 491, qu. 708
Imports, 4411
International bridge, Niagara Falls, material, qu. 1257, qu. 1864
Jobber and retailer, 4411
Magazines and periodicals, 4416
M. (Mr. Stevens) for com. of inquiry, 919
Six per cent tax at source, 3938
Senate, elective, M. (Mr. Denis) 1369
Shale deposits, maritime provinces, 2513
Silk. *See also under this title,* Artificial silk; Customs Tariff items; French treaty
Industry in Canada, 2397
Prices, 2397-2400
Sinclair, Hon. J. E., reference, 3012
Soldier Settlement Board; estimates, 1910
Soldiers, vocational training, 686
Spain, trade with, 2397

Drayton, Hon. Sir Henry L.—*Con.*
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 4409. *See also under this title,* Sales tax
Steamship services, 4701
Tariff commission evidence, 2296
Tariff weapon, 3477. *See also* French Treaty
Taxation. *See also under this title,* Receipt tax; Sales tax
Direct results, qu. 281
Income tax, qu. 281, 2659, 2706
Telegraph and telephone lines, 4590
Three Rivers Harbour bill, 3963
Tinplate, 2400
Toronto
Canadian National railways office building, qu. 1994, 3642
Customs house, 3278
Harbour improvements, 4610
Union station, 4325, 4450
Viaduct, 4306, 4325, 4445, 4450
Trade Mark and Designs Act, 2293
Trade returns, incomplete, 2270, 2301
Treaties. *See also under this title,* French, Halibut, Italian
Negotiation of, expenses, 3989
Signing of, 4466
With France and Italy, 9. *See also under this title,* French; Italian
Trent canal improvements, 3647
Unemployment relief, 689
United States
National Reserve bank, 4407
Reciprocity. *See under this title,* Reciprocity
Tariff and emigration, 1092
Vancouver Creosoting Company, 3234
Van Koughnet, Mrs., 4726
War claims, adjustment, 2495, 2497, 2501
War medals, 1744
Welland canal construction, 3761
West Ukrainian republic, 657
Wheat shipments, Quebec, qu. 3820
Wines. *See also* French Treaty
Excise tax on, 3937
Woollen imports, 3469
Woollen industry, protection, 931
Wrangel island, ownership, 3948
Wrecking plant subsidies, 3334

Drayton-Acworth Commission, 4682
Hudson Bay railway, 1062

Dredges and Dredging. *See* Harbours and Rivers; Marine and Fisheries; Public Works

Drugs. *See also* Narcotic Drugs; Opium
Importation of. *See* Narcotic Drugs
Metagen, analysis of, qu. 1867
Scopolamin, 4647

Drummond, Mr. J. D. F. (West Middlesex)
Budget, 2973; tariff; marking of woollen goods; protection fundamentally wrong; congratulations to Finance Minister; budget, violation of election pledges, 2973; tariff issue from 1878 to 1896; appropriation of protective policy by Liberals; Mr. Euler's statement on political platforms; political honour in jeopardy; Prime Minister's pre-election promises conditions unchanged and grievances unredressed; Conservative party, violation of pledges; Mr. Meighen on agricultural implement duties, 2974; "ramparts of gold"; duty increased by increase of price; protection and home markets; agricultural implement industry; duty payment of $265.80 per employee, 2975; Canadian National railways hotel deficits; Progressive party a "menacing enemy"; reasons for agricultural organizations, 2976
Sales tax on Union Jack, 4514
Woollen industry, protection, M. 928, 2973

Drury Government, expenditure and debt, 2824

Dryden, Mr. W. A., trip to South America, qu. 384, qu. 1031, 3294, qu. 3704, 3705

Dry Docks
Esquimalt, 2671, 2682
Kingston, 4563
Vancouver and Victoria, 1002

Dry Dock Subsidies Act Amdt Bill
(Ninety per cent of subsidy payable when seventy-five per cent of work completed). Res 3583, 3979; 1r., 2r., com., 3979; 3r., 3981

Dual Citizenship. *See* Naturalization

Duff, Mr. William (Lunenburg)
Address, 108. The late Hon. Mr. Kennedy; necessity for economy, 108; amendments of Mr. Shaw and Mr. Hoey; the public debt, expenditure at Halifax and St. John, 109; Quebec and Toronto ports, expenditure; Pacific coast ports; naval expenditure during war, 110; Canadian Government Merchant Marine; immigration and emigration; railway freight rates; Crowsnest pass agreement, 111-112; maritime provinces suffering by reason of high freight rates; United States tariff; tariff on fish, 112; national expendi-

Duff, Mr. William—*Con.*
Address—*Con.*
ture, necessity for reduction in militia estimate, 113; loan to Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 113-114; Purchasing Commission; international boat race, 114; votes for agriculture; Hudson Bay railway, 115; Mr. Meighen and the tariff, 116
Agriculture, expenditure on, 115, 117
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4158
British Columbia
Fishing licenses, M. (Mr. Clark) 1542
Salmon canner's licenses, 1547
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bills
Coasting regulations, 4235
Distressed seamen, 3970
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, 111
Advances, 113, 3377, 3799
Competition with subsidized steamship services, 3396
Operating deficit, 3843
Sale of vessels, 3813
West Indies, trade, 3387, 3808
Fish and fisheries
French treaty, canned fish, 452
Sardine fishery, 2518
Tariff on fish, 2518
Trout fishing season, 1686
Grondines wharf, 960
Halibut fishery treaty, signing of, 858
Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia, 942
Hudson Bay railway, 115
M. (Mr. Knox) 1042
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4223-34, 4283, 4293
Lightkeepers' salaries, 3352
Margaree River Salmon Fisheries Association, 3369
Marine and Fisheries
Committee reports
First, 1307, 1384
Second, 1686, 1763
Third, 2983, 3084
Department
Deputy minister's salary, 3373
Salaries and contingencies, 3373
Naval service, 905
Royal Canadian Volunteer reserve, 2897
Royal Canadian navy, 905
Nova Scotia
Harbours and rivers, 942
Miners' strike, use of troops, 897
Secretary of State, estimates, 2392
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4242
Steamship services.
Canadian Government Merchant Marine. *See that head under this title*
Canada-West Indies-South America, 3387
Duff, Mr. William—*Con.*
Thornton, Sir Henry, director Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, 3845
Toronto island breakwater, 984
Trout-fishing season, 1686

Duke and Duchess of York, congratulations to, 2251
Acknowledgment of, 2338

Dumping Clause. *See* Customs and Excise

Dun, R. G. & Co., cost of living, 1812

Duncan, Mr. M. R. (North Grey)
Beckett, Matt C., qu. 283
Malone, Late Lieut-Col. W. P., qu. 206
P. C. 1053, qu. 516

Duncan, Mr. Walter, 1140

Dunning, Premier of Saskatchewan
Budget, 2872

Duties. *See* Customs

East, crisis in. *See* Near East Crisis

East Edmonton District
Res. on immigration, 81
United Farmers of Alberta, 107

East Templeton, Que., wharf, 955

Easter adjournment. *See* House of Commons

Eastern Galicia. *See* West Ukrainian Republic

Eastern Lands Development Company, 626, 1635

Eastern Situation. *See* Near East Crisis

Eaton, T. Company
Comparison of prices with Sears-Roebuck, Chicago, 2739, 2742

Economic Conditions, 1238, 1250, 1393. *See also* Agriculture, Agricultural Conditions; Banks and Banking; speeches on Address, and Budget
Canadian affected by European, 3003
Cost of living and, 1684, 1811-14. *See also that title*
Cycles of prosperity and depression, 1177
Economic group organizations, 3002
Gambling in staples of life, 3058
Immigration and, 1231. *See also that title*
Improvement, 3055
Effected by railways, 1566
Tariff, 3053
Wealth, production of, 1856
Western provinces, 1883. *See also that title*

Economic Conference. *See* Imperial Economic Conference

Economy. *See* Government; Immigration; Public Expenditure

Editorial Committee
Abolition, 1714
Cost, 1669
King's Printer, 1669
Members of, and staff, 1675
Publications, unnecessary duplication, 1714
Saving effected by, 1670
French publications, 1670
Translation and printing, 1489

Edmonton. *See also* East Edmonton
Board of Trade res. on coal duty, 1275
Grain elevator, 4716
Indian school, 2149, 2164-5
Institute of Mining and Metallurgy, 1268
Post Office, theft of $50,000 from, 1142
Soldier Settlement Board, insurance, 3506

Edmundston, N.B.
Bridge, 1014, 2342, 4589
Public building, 4613

Education. *See also* Schools; Universities
Capitalistic control of educational agencies, 2725
Cost of, 2732
Foreigners, opportunities, 1885
Indians. *See that title.*
International Scholarships, 878
Jurisdiction, 882, 1884-5
Opportunities, 2831
School lands. *See also* Dominion Lands
Schools closed on account of financial stringency, 1202
Technical Education Act, 1637

Eggs
Egg-grading plants. *See* Live Stock Acts
Freight rates, 1962
French treaty, export, 1978
Imports, qu. 617, 2959
From United States, 2708, 2821
Inspector, Yukon territory, qu. 2516
Prices, 1841, 1851, 1852

Egypt, British policy in, 4662

Eight Hour Day. *See* Labour

Elections. *See also* Dominion Elections; Proportional Representation
By-elections. *See also* House of Commons
Grenville, 4606
Handwriting on the wall, 2981

Elections—*Con.*
By-elections—*Con.*
Lanark, 157
Moose Jaw
Certificate of Registrar of Supreme Court, 515
Oleomargarine, 3526
Reported statement, Hon. Mr. Motherwell, 1686, 2774, 4683
North Essex, 2013, 2469, 4594, 4606
Fielding, Right Hon. Mr., alleged statement, 2013, 2245
Meighen, Right Hon. Mr.
Alleged statement, 670, 708, 2245
Visit to Belle River, 4594
Election of 1896, 3014
Election of 1921. *See also* Liberal Party
King, Right Hon. Mackenzie, speeches, 3047
Policy proclaimed but forgotten, 1426
Statements and prophecies, 1658
Violation of election pledges, 2973, 3189
Multi-member constituencies. *See* Proportional Representation
Ontario. *See also* Ontario
Issue in, 1420
Proportional representation. *See that title*
Revelstoke and Nelson, bribery, 2941

Elective Senate. *See* Senate, M. (Mr. Denis, Joliette)

Electoral Reforms. *See* Proportional Representation

Electric Lines, sale of. See Canadian National Railways

Electric Power. *See also* Hydro Electric; Lake of the Woods; St. Lawrence River Waterway; Water Powers
Exportation to United States, 1266
M. (Mr. Deslauriers) 658, withdrawn, 666
Export duty, 2828
Power development, St. Lawrence river. *See* St. Lawrence River Waterway; Welland Canal

Electricity
Electrical apparatus, import. *See* French Treaty
House heating by, 3425

Electrification. *See* Canadian National Railways; Railways

Elevators. *See this title under* Grain and Grain Trade

Elliott, Mr. Preston (Dundas)
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3523

Elliott, Mr. William (Waterloo)
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4539
Rural mail carriers, qu. 1259, 1783
Sales tax, 4422
Shire horses from Great Britain, 2207

Elmira-Souris railway, 129

Embargo on Cattle. *See* Live Stock, Cattle

Emigration. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget; Immigration
Doukhobors, 43
Emigration to the United States, 21, 67, 77, 628, 637, 1082, 1093, 1109, 1113, 1128, 1165, 1173, 1178, 1188, 1198, 1206, 1217, 1235, 1241, 1244, 1253, 1319, 1322, 1330, 1338, 1389, 1392, 1403, 1404, 1412, 1414, 1422, 1439, 1845, 1888, 1892, 2400, 2650, 2715, 2743, 2822, 2929, 2970, 3191, 4064. *See also* Taxation
American publications, effect on, 831
Canadians returning, 2743
Causes, 2747, 3004
Climate, 2747
Cost of living, 2790. *See also that title*
Economic conditions, 2727
Taxation, 1319, 2709, 2747
Unemployment and, 1657
Figures, 1917-22, 1093
Halifax, exodus from, 2400
Information bureau to ascertain reason for, 2932
Labouring people, 2727. *See also* Labour
Lumber camps from, to New England States, 1125
Montreal, from, 2216, 2790
Returned soldiers, 691
Sifton, Sir Clifford, 1188
Skilled workmen, 2823
Montreal, from, 2790
Tariff and, 2737. *See also* speeches on Budget
University graduates, 2732
Windsor, Canadians crossing border, 1431
Winnipeg, from, 1975
Winnipeg Free Press, statement, 2790
Young men, 2816
Mennonites, 43, 1239, 1341, 1884
Mexico, to, 1229

Empire Day Ajournment. *See* House of Commons, Adjournments

Empire Forestry Conference, 3410

Empire Settlement Scheme. *See* Immigration

Employers' Liability Compensation

Employment Service. *See* Labour

Enemy Alien Property. *See* Aliens

Enemy Aliens. *See this title under* Aliens

Engineering Standards. *See* Canadian Engineering

England. *See* Great Britain

English River. *See* Lake of the Woods

Equalization of Railway Rates. *See* Freight Rates

Eskimos, Trial of. *See* Justice

Espionage. *See* Labour; Royal Canadian Mounted Police

Esquimalt
Dry dock, 2671
Graving dock, 2682
Naval college, 1744
Navy yard, qu. 1634

Essex By-Election. *See* Elections, North Essex

Estevan Board of Trade, Hudson Bay railway, 1079

Estimates. *See also* Deputy Speaker; House of Commons; Interim Supply; Speaker; Supply
For departments, *see their titles*
Appropriations for railway subsidies, 4521
"Appropriations not required" 1656
Arrangement of, 1468
Canadian National railway expenditure, 4304
Civil government, form of, 610, 668, 780
Discussion
En bloc, 4554, 4558, 4612, 4587
Opportunity for, 4579, 4594, 4614, 4615
Expenditure provided for, 4554
Main, tabled, 331
Obligations
Maturing, 1753
To be incurred, 1753
One-sixth vote for 1923-4, 1482, 1538
Preparation, 2756, 3242
Supplementary
For 1923-4, 1359, 1659, 4536
Further supplementary, 4392, 4536
Lack of information, 4576, 4577
Time of presentation, 4554, 4577, 4594, 4601, 4703, 4420, 4422
Undiscussed items not appearing in official report, 3284

Euclid Hall. *See* Military Hospitals

Euler, Mr. William D. (North Waterloo)
Budget, 2852. Congratulations to Finance Minister; a unique record; criticism of budget; national viewpoint; Canada a hard country to govern; diversified interests make compromise necessary; Liberal tariff platform of 1919, 2852; little confidence in political platforms; artificial and natural silk industries; taxation of luxuries; speech of Mr. Forke; tariff stability; opinion of Mr. H. W. Wood, Alberta; dependence of industry upon agriculture, 2853; difficulties of manufacturers; free trade not possible; tariff for revenue and protection; effect upon consumer; amendment; free trade with England; British preference; reciprocity; charge that government has done nothing for the farmer; Crowsnest pass agreement 2854; claim of Progressives that they forced concession; the two old parties; "holier than thou" attitude of some members; allegation that parties take orders from big interests, 2855; no election contributions; leader of the Government; speech on budget, in 1921; moderate tariff; lack of markets; United States markets, competition of Canadian manufacturers in; United States tariff against Canadian goods, 2856; revenue; tariff reduction; taxation; Canadian farmer a free trader; United States farmer a protectionist; Wheat Board; free trade in raw materials; importance of tariff question magnified; income and luxury taxes, economy; Civil Service; taxation rescinded; system should be carefully worked out; stamp tax; receipt tax; irritating excise tax; cheque tax, 2858; difficulties of collection; public irritation and inconvenience; basic methods of taxation; tariff, income and turnover; sales tax; Canadian National railways; public ownership; revaluation, 2859
Budget speech, reference to, 3070
Buttons, importation, 2214
Canadian National railways
Fixed charges, qu. 708
Public ownership, 2859
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 373
Eastern Canada, conditions, 1222
Free trade, 2466, 2858

Euler, Mr. William D.—*Con.*
Immigration
Policy, 1220
Attitude of labour towards, 1224
Labour Gazette, 1627
Liberal platform of 1919, 2852, 3019
Repudiation of, 2994, 3019
Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill, 2201
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2190, 2444-67
Denaturalization, 2465
Judges, 2466
Nationality, dual, 2444, 2464
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3521
Political platforms, 2853, 2974, 2991
Reference to, 2852, 2974
Sales tax, raw materials, 4421
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 4421
Tariff and immigration, 1222
Western provinces, conditions in, 1221

Europe. *See also* Immigration
Agricultural products, inability to buy, 3004
Coal supplies, 1263
Conditions
Chaotic, 2748
Economic, 3003
Unsettled, 3052
Purchasing power, decrease, 1859
Southeastern, immigration from, 1195
Wheat prices, 3004

European War. *See* Pensions; War

Evans, Mr. John (Saskatoon)
Address in reply, 144. Agriculture the basis of national prosperity; tariff system, 144; anti-combine legislation; customs, valuation for duty, 145; the Tariff Act; protection on flour, 146; dissatisfaction with economic situation in West; British Columbia apples, handling of, 147; class legislation; embargo on cattle, 148; automobiles in Saskatchewan; Crowsnest pass agreement and freight rates, 149
Bank Act Amdt bill, 4046, 4137
Bounties, principle of, 3242
British preference, direct importation, 345
Budget, 3067. Trade issue; secession talk, 3067; abandonment of free trade by Liberal party; speech of Prime Minister; tariff stability; taxation, burden of; capital; theory and method; venerable protectionist arguments; prices of manufactured and agricultural products; British preference; Canadian ports; 3068; raisins and currants duty; artificial silk duty; copper

Evans, Mr. John—*Con.*
Budget.—*Con.*
bounty; sugar duty; permanent tariff commission; "scientific" tariff protection; class privilege; taxation, passing on; farm products and world conditions; United States farmers and Fordney tariff, 3069; Progressive party, criticism of; discrimination between city and rural dwellers; rural mail carriers remuneration; speech of Mr. Euler; concessions to manufacturers; old parties and big interests; Sir Richard Cartwright on protection; protection, money and moral cost of, 3070; political corruption; legalized robbery; Goldwin Smith; farming methods; paternalism; "Canada for the Canadians;" interest of common people in government, 3071; free trade England; tariff and deficit of Canadian Government Merchant Marine; exodus to other countries; British national debt decreasing, Canadian national debt increasing; bonussed industries; tariff inconsistencies; dumping clause; revenue; combines, 3072; taxation; co-operative purchasing and selling; cost of living; income tax; inheritance tax; luxuries, taxation of; economy; inopportune expenditures; Welland canal; "blind selfishness;" Hudson Bay railway, 3073; Canada hard country to govern; independence not vital; newspaper control; confidence destroyed; class privilege, 3074
Canada Grain Act, administration, 786
Canadian Pacific freight rates and dividends, 1134
Combines bill, 2533
Consumption of intoxicants, qu. 285
Copper bounty, 3069, 3242, 4371
Deportation of British soldier, 2254
Esquimalt navy yard, qu. 1634
Experimental farms, 4632
Export Act Amdt. bill, 4346
Free trade in raw materials, 2858
Freight rates, increase, 1134
Geodetic survey, 3245
Grain dockages and screenings, 786
Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia, 941
Hemp bounty bill, 4381, 4384
Homestead inspectors, 3252
Hudson Bay railway lands, qu, 2393
Immigration policy, 1133
Imperial Shipping Committee, qu. 3137
Income tax, 4501

Evans, Mr. John—*Con.*
Indians, 2145, 2147
Reserves, grain production, qu. 1139
Iron and steel bounties, 4381
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4293
Magazines and periodicals, M. (Mr. Hocken) 837, 841
Marketing of grain, M. (Mr. Millar) 295
Oleomargarine, import of materials, qu. 3505
Pulpwood, export of, 4346
Qu'Appelle-Battleford telegraph line, 1017
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 744
Raisins and dried currants, duty, 3069, 3476
Regina Photo Supply Company, sales tax, qu. 518
Rural mail carriers, remuneration, 3070, 3076
Shipping combines, 1134
Steamship service, Canada-West Indies, qu. 937
Telegraph and telephone lines, 1017, 2683
Topographical surveys, 3245
Woollen industry, 3461

Everett, Mr. Howard. *See* Immigration, Canada Colonization

Evidence in Marriage and Divorce Proceedings. *See* Criminal Code Admt. bill

Ewart, Mr. J. S., K.C., Canada's relations with Empire, 314, 1529

Examinations of Masters and Mates. *See* Marine

Exchange. *See also* Great Britain; Finance
Medium of. *See* Bank Act Amdt. bill
Rate, franc, value of, 2009
Unfavourable, 2912

Exchequer Court of Canada
Alien enemy property, 2499
Audette, Mr. Justice, 2502
Judgeship, 2499
War claims, competency to deal with. *See* War Claims

Excise Taxes. *See* Budget; Customs and Excise; Inland Revenue; Special War Revenue Act; Taxation

Excursion Tickets, qu. 1485

Executions, public. *See* Capital Punishment

Exemptions. *See* Civil Service; Income Tax; Taxation

Exhibitions. *See also* Agriculture; Live Stock; Trade
Agricultural fairs, horse-racing, 726, 750
Atlanta, 1465
Belgian, 496, 1467
British Empire, 463, 1454, 1873, 1910, 3949, 4704
Yukon mineral exhibit, qu. 3143
Brussels, 1467
Canadian, travelling in France, 811, 1457, 4711
Chicago, 1454, 1466
Fat Stock Show, 1398
Collection of samples for exhibits, 1468
Commercial, 1467
Des Moines, 1466
Estimates, 1454, 1465
Expenditure in Great Britain and United States, 1465-68
Great Britain, 1467
Horse-racing. *See* Race Track Betting
Immigration, 1454
Maple products, Beauceville, 1810
Royal Show, 1454
St. Petersburg, 1465
Seattle, 1467
Seed and field competitions, 599
Southern States in, 1465
Smith, Mr. Obed, 1467
Staff and salaries, 1455
Tampa, Florida, 1454, 1465
United States in, 1465

Exhibits. *See* Exhibitions

Exodus to United States. *See* Emigration

Expenditure. *See* Public Expenditure

Experimental Farms. *See* Agriculture

Explorations, Arctic, 3944. *See also* Arctic

Explosives. *See* Mines and Minerals

Export Duty. *See* Customs and Excise

Export Act Amdt. Bill (Pulpwood, prohibition, of export) Res. 4012, 4345; 1r., 4355; 2r., com., 4393; 3r., amdt. (Mr. Power), six months' hoist, 4397, neg. on div., 3r., 4397

Exporters' Association. *See* Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill

Exports. *See* Imports and Exports

Express Charges, 2876. *See also* Canadian National Railways; Canadian Pacific

Express Companies. *See* Canadian National Railways

External Affairs, Department of
Christie, Mr. Loring C., resignation, 3988
Employees and cost, 2970
Pope, Sir Joseph, salary, 3988, 4671
Salaries, 3987

Factory and Shop Acts of British Dominions, 1443

Fafard, Mr. J. Fernand (L'Islet)
Eggs, price of, 1852
Geodetic survey, expenditure, qu. 1634
L'Islet wharf, 969
Surveys in prairie provinces, qu. 1866
Topographical surveys, expenditure, qu. 1865

Failures. *See* Bankruptcy Act Amdt.

Fairs. *See* Exhibitions

False Creek Bridge, 3375, 4708

Fansher, Mr. B. W. (East Lambton)
Crude petroleum bounty, qu. 3262
Customs drawbacks, qu. 1484
Raw materials imported, manufactured, exported, qu. 1259, qu. 1864
Detroit river, traffic regulation, 3358
Oil Springs postmaster, qu. 518

Farm Implements. *See* Agricultural Implements

Farm Products. *See* Agriculture

Farmer, Mayor S. J., Winnipeg. *See* Lake of the Woods Regulation Bill

Farmers. *See also* Address; Agriculture; Bank Act Amdt. bill; Budget; Immigration; Taxation
Advice to, 2953
Allegation that government has done nothing for, 2854
Bank shareholders, qu. 1486, 2846
Bankruptcy Act Amdt., farmers, 3211
Banks, treatment by, 2929. *See also* Bank Act Amdt. bill
Burdens of, 2731
Canadian farmer, free-trader, United States protectionist, 2857
City man and, 2869
Comparison with other countries, 2791
Conditions. *See* Agriculture; Immigration
Debts, 1407, 1412, 2768
Earnings, 2813, 3023
Extravagance, 1888
Farmers' Bloc in United States, 2791
Farmers' movement, 2884
World wide, 2791
Farmers' party. *See* Progressive party
Hard times, 1859
Help for needy, 1404

Farmers—*Con.*
Horse-racing. *See* Race Track Betting
Immigration, 1419. *See also* Immigration
Improvident methods, 1423
Income tax and, qu. 1259, qu. 1486
Industries dependent on prosperity of, 2853
Labour. *See that title*
Manufacturers and, 2716
Market, lack of, 2856
National Farmers' Union of England, 2791
National Policy, 2917. *See also* speeches on Budget
Non-continuous employment, 1888
Organizations, 2815
Future of, 2792
Parliament, in, 2787
Profits, 2873
Pulpwood, export of, 4513. *See also* Export Act Amdt. bill
Purchasing power, 1408, 1851
Reciprocity and, 2924. *See also that title*
Tariff and, 2731, 2916, 3066. *See also* speeches on Budget
Taxes, 4224. *See also* Taxation
United Farmers of Ontario, 4608
Work, 1852

Farms
Abandoned, 67. *See also* Address; Immigration; Lands; School.
Credits. *See* Banks and Banking; Credits

Favoured Nation. *See* Treaties, French Treaty, Italian Treaty

Feathers and Ornaments. *See* Treaties, French Treaty

Federal and Provincial Jurisdiction. *See* Jurisdiction; Lake of the Woods Regulation Bill

Federal Printing Company, Labour Gazette, 1621

Federal Representation. *See* Redistribution

Federal Statutes, enforcement, 1142

Federation of Canadian Students. *See* Students

Feeding Stuffs. *See also* Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. Bill; Grain and Grain Trade
Adulteration, 600, 604
Conference of producers and handlers, 600-4
Control, 599
Milled, mixing with bran and shorts, 600
Screenings, 2039. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade, Elevators

Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. Bill
(Regulation of preparation and sale of milling by-products) Res., 4012, 4270, 4272; 1r., 2r., com., 4276; com., 4538; 3r., 4553

Fenian Raid. *See* Pensions

Fertilizers
Administration of Act, 601
Control, 599
Duty, 3486
Fish waste, manufacture into, 2946
Machinery for, 2645, 2734, 2946, 3486
Nitrate of soda, 2307

Feudal System. *See* Labour, Right to Organize

Fiats, Issuing of. *See* Petition of Right Act

Field Crops. *See* Agriculture

Fielding, Right Hon. W. S. (Minister of Finance)
Acknowledgment of congratulations on being called to Privy Council, 4743
Address in reply 89. Mr. Meighen on the tariff; valuation of goods for customs duties, 90; causes of increase in national debt, 91; railways, cost of taking over, 91-93; national ownership expensive; increase in obligations to United States, 93; loans and interest; money borrowed cheaper from United States, 94; late government's borrowings from United States; Mr. Meighen on sales tax, 94; amendments moved by Progressives; resolution of Liberals in 1921; downward revision of tariff, 96; French treaty, 97; wise expenditure true economy, 97-98; business of country cannot be carried on without increase in public debt, 98; amendments not acceptable to government, 99
Agricultural conditions, Great Britain, 1861
Annuities, old age, basis of computation, 1698
Artificial silk, duty. *See under this title* Customs Tariff Items
Auditor General
Office, salaries and contingencies, 3987, 4674
Report, 434
Unprovided items, 4003
Vacancy, 3987, 4355, 4513
Automobiles
Duty, 3075
Insurance 3147, 3977

Fielding, Right Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 1157, 1310, 4013, 4017, 4075, 4078-4131, 4133-4162
Extension of charters for one year, amdt. (Mr. Speakman) 4017
Government inspection, 1310
Mortgages or hypothecs, amdt. (Mr. Kellner) 4133
One vote for each share, 4085
Postponement, amdt. (Mr. Speakman) 4017
Senate amendments, 4508
Bank Act revision
Inquiry, 255, 496, 644, 858
Res. of Alberta legislature, 2084
Bank draft tax, 3928
Bank mergers, 4134, 4139
Banking and Commerce Com. changes, 2926
Beet sugar excise duty, 2644, 3229, 4393
Belle River harbour, 4597
Binder twine, duty and manufacture, 3231, 4388
Board of Audit Act, 4355, 4369, 4733
Bonds, interest rate and income tax, 4494
British and foreign news service, 4712
British preference, 3454. *See also under this title,* Budget
Direct importation by Canadian ports, 3454, 3895
Goods via Hong Kong and Suez canal, 3455
Increase in, 3488
Liberal convention of 1919, 454
Woollen industry, 3459, 3472
Budget
Date of
Announcement, 2469
Inquiry, 1163, 1483, 1740, 1869, 2128, 2254, 2347, 2469
Debate, precedence, 2694
Record established, 2852
Resolutions, changes, notice, 3046, 4163
Speech, 2640. Finances, income and expenditure over ordinary capital and special expenditure, 2640; advances to Canadian National Railways and Canadian Government Merchant Marine; public debt, addition to; expenditure and taxation; additions to debt diminishing; increase since 1914, 2641; estimate of revenue and expenditure for 1923-24; loans, tax reductions, 2642; sales tax, complexity of; imposition of six per cent tax at source; exemptions from, additions to list of, 2643; receipt tax; cheque tax; French Treaty; Canadian wines, duty on; French brandy, 2643; income tax;

Fielding, Right Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Budget.—*Con.*
cigarette duty; beet root sugar; raisins and dried currants; petroleum, 2644; iron and steel scrap; boots or other appliances for deformities; casual donations; machinery; hemp seed; machinery for conversion or fish waste; oil-drilling machinery; stumping machinery; malt flour; printing machinery; artificial silk; British preferential tariff; direct importation through Canadian ports; sugar duties; 2645 sugar, increase in price; speculation; reduction in duty; dumping clause; copper bounty on bars or rods, 2646; bounty on hemp; linen thread bounty; manila hemp bounty, 2647; petroleum bounty; forest conservation; pulpwood; prohibition of export, royal commission; tariff stability; finality, 2648; relations with United States; Fordney-McCumber tariff; offer of reciprocity; reduction of duties by order in council, 2649; the outlook; trade revival in United States; labour, unemployment; prospects of a return of prosperity, 2650; tariff resolutions, 2650
Supplementary statement, 3074. Appreciation of personal references; speech of Sir Henry Drayton; estimates; revenue, estimate of; tariff weapon in trade negotiations with foreign countries, 3074; France and United States; "no truck nor trade with the Yankees"; automobiles; potatoes; artificial silk duty, 3075; economy; expenditures suggested by Opposition; militia; naval service; bounties; Toronto harbour; St. Lawrence waterway; rural mail carriers; Progressive members and expenditure; Hudson Bay railway; civil service; public works, 3076; protectionist budget; tariff reductions; amendment; speech of leader of Opposition; budget, form of; brevity, 3077; "jacking-up" tariff; financial difficulty due to war and railways; responsibility for; budget, balancing of; new taxation; sales tax; public debt, additions to; reciprocity, offer to negotiate, 3078; possible United States view; reciprocity agreement of 1911; permanency, attitude of United States towards, 3079; position of Conservative party in 1911 and at present time; "no truck or

Fielding, Right Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Budget.—*Con.*
trade with the Yankees", authority for phase, 3080; letter of Mr. Fielding and Mr. Patterson to United States Secretary of State; clear-cut issue; Conservative party against trade with the United States; Liberal party stands for reciprocity; defeat of reciprocity agreement in 1911; sentiment towards question to-day, 3081; budget proposals; no new taxes; tariff reduction; British preference; sugar duty; Canadian ports; simplification of sales tax; reception of budget by country, 3082
Statements omitted, presented, 2926
Burrard Inlet bridge, 4709
Business of the House
Adjournment, hour of, 3208
Budget resolutions, proceeding with, 4163
M. anticipating matter appointed for consideration 3327
M. to increase taxation, 3934, 3936
Privilege—Mr. Clark, 1911
Proceeding, 3127
Questions
Answers to, 343
Framing of, 1386
Passed as orders for returns, 939
Resolutions, unusual to call for explanation, 3583
Returns, inquiries for, 2208, 2254
Cattle embargo correspondence, 4295
Rules, M. (Mr. Johnston) for Special Com., 857, 1300
Speaker's rulings, discussion of, 4076
Supply
Amendment to amendment, 1300
Calling of, 2295
Business profits tax
Arrears, 4491
Collections, 1157
Business Profits War Tax Act Amdt. bill, 4440, 4489
Canadian National railways
Advance, $13,099,493.34, 1752
Branch lines construction bill, 4304-37
Expenditure, appropriation by Parliament, 4337, 4398
Finance, 4329
Ocean ports, 1758
Paris offices, 3614
Securities bill, 4012, 4402, 4516, 4732
Expenditure to be voted by Parliament, amdt. (Mr. Meighen) 4527
Responsibility of government, 4696
Canadian Press, Limited, subsidy, 4729
Canadian team at Olympic games 4707

Fielding, Right Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Cattle embargo, correspondence, 4184, 4295
Cheque tax, 332, 2643, 3922, 3925, 3931, 4423
Cigarette duty, 2644, 3229, 4392
Civil Service
Bonus, 1811
Superannuation, 3402
Calder Act, 3266
Civil Service Superannuation and Retirement Act, 2926, 3146
Clair-Fort Kent bridge, 4590
Commercial union, 3909
Complimentary reference to, 2013
Concurrence, 4735
Interim supply, 1482
Confectionery and beverages, tax, 2644, 2656, 3046
Congratulations on being called to Privy Council, 4742
Consumer, taxation and, 4415
Copper bounty, 2646
Bill, 4369, 4370, 4374, amdt. (Mr. McMaster) 4370
Cory, Mr. W. W., deputy minister of Interior, salary, 4667
Credit and Industry, M. (Mr. Irvine) 644
Amdt. ref. to Banking and Commerce Com., 645
Criticisms of foreign budgets, 2804
Customs Tariff Act 1907 Amdt. bill, 2650, 3963, 4408
Customs Tariff items, 3895. *See also under this title,* Budget
Artificial silk, 2645, 3075, 3489
Drawback, 3502
Fabrics, 3492
Tops or waste 3896
Bisulphate of soda, 3480, 3895
Brass and copper scrap, 3483
Coal, anthracite and lignite, 3493, 3495
Composition and plated metals, 3483
Coverings for goods and machinery, 3501
Crude petroleum, 2648, 2644, 3481
Date when changes effective, 3504
Dehydrated sulphate of copper, 3480, 3895
Drawbacks
Artificial silk, 3502
Copper for electric wires, 3503
Hatters sweats, 3502
Machinery not made in Canada, 3503
Oil used in manufacture of manila rope, 3502
Dry red lead, etc. 3480
Fire-brick, 3481, 3896
Hemp seed, 2645, 3474
Liquorice paste, 3480
Machinery for manufacture of fish waste, 2645, 3486

Fielding, Right Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Customs Tariff—*Con.*
Printing and lithographing presses, 2645, 3486
Raisins and dried currants, 2644, 3474
Rolled iron and steel, 3484
Silk cloth woven in the gum, 3489
Spectacle and eyeglass frames, 3483
Staves of wood, 3487
Sticks or canes, 3501
Stumping machines, 2645, 3486
Velvets, velveteens, etc., 3488
Typewriters and parts, 3485
Well-drilling machinery, 3487
Deportation of British soldier, 2255
Deputy ministers, salary increases, 4667
Dominion observatories, expenditure, 3242
Dredging, government dredges, 4570
Dry Dock Subsidies Act Amdt. bill, 3583
Estimates. *See also under this title,* Supply
Civil government, form of, 612
Further supplementary, 1923-4, 3492
Main, tabled, 331
Obligations maturing, 1753
Preparation of, 3244
Supplementary, 1923-24
Tabled, 3492, 4536
Time of presentation, 4554
Time of presentation, 4420, 4597, 4601
Experimental farms, 486
Export Act Amdt. bill, 4012, 4345, 4393. *See also under this title,* Pulpwood
Fertilizers, duty, 3486
Finance Act 1914 Amdt. bill 255, 4405
Finance dept., charges of management, 3987
Forest protection and conservation, 2648. *See also under this title,* Export Act; Pulpwood
M. (Mr. Michaud) 824
France
Exports to, 1997
Fiscal policy of, 1991, 1995
Trade with, 1990, 1995, 1999
French treaty, 331, 436, 456, 1977, 1990, 2815
Brandy, 2302, 3478
Bronze powder 1998, 2016, 2270
Canned salmon and lobster, 453
Concessions to border states, 440, 2273
Consideration of
Inquiry, 1740
Postponed, 2128
Direct importation, 2303
Favoured nation, 448, 2271, 2398
Inconsistent laws, 2303
Luxuries, 446
Machinery and parts, 441
Modus vivendi of 1921, 2260
Sales tax and, 2279, 2280, 2299

Fielding, Right Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
French Treaty—*Con.*
Silks, 448, 2266, 2301, 2398
Tabled, 54
Unfair competition, 2300
United States
Preferential treatment 440, 442
Trade with France, 2277
Wines, 1997, 3937
French treaty bill, 2238, 2255-80, 2299-2304, 2347
M. for 2r., 1910, 1990-95
Grants for historical celebrations, 4705
Halibut fishery treaty, 734, 857
Halifax grain elevator, 4714
Hemp bounty, 2647
Bill, 3911, 3963, 4376, 4388
Housing, loans to provinces, 4704
Hudson Bay railway M. (Mr. Knox) 1079
Immigrants complaints of, 3598
Income tax, 1157, 2644
Agricultural forms, 4498
Exemption for children, 4503
M. (Mr. Archambault) 1384
Fines, qu. 2180
Income War Tax Act 1917 Amdt. bill, 4492
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 4360
Inland Revenue Act Amdt. 2655, 3229, 4392
Cigarettes, 3229
Insurance Act Amdt. 3045, 3147, 3977, 4357
Insurance branch, salaries, 3987
Interim supply bills. *See under this title,* Supply
Italian treaty, 331
Signature, 2403
Italian treaty bill, 2394-2404
Concessions to border states 2395
Consideration postponed 2304, 2347
Direct importation, 2401
Favoured nation treatment, 2398
Lapointe Mr., visit to Washington, 734, 857
League of Nations
Canada's contribution 3990
Canadian delegation, expenses, 3989
Legislation. *See also under this title,* Business of the House
Hasty, 1376
Indemnity, etc., 4674
Liberal platform of 1919, not bound by, 2994, 3020
Library, joint committee, 615
Linen yarn
Bounty, 2648
Duty 3897, 3899
Little Anse breakwater, Morrison claim, 4575
Lumber, sales tax, 4419
Lunenburg harbour, dredging, 4577

Fielding, Right Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Magazines and periodicals
M. (Mr. Hocken) 848
Sales tax, 4415, 4421
Malt flour, duty, 2645, 3480
Manila fibre bill, 2657, 3231, 4369
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, cattle embargo, 3317
Merchants' Bank. *See also under this title,* Bank Act Amdt.
Failure, 4155
Inquiry, expenses, 3990
Ministers and officials, travels, 343
National Gallery, 1019
Naturalization Act M. (Mr. Carroll) 1381
Nickle, shipments to Germany during war, 4372
North Essex election, 2013
Nova Scotia steel bounties, 4371
Oleomargarine
Discussion, 3327
Drawback on materials used, 3503
Further legislation, 2927
M. (Mr. Carroll) 1382, 3530, 3561
Sub-amdt. (Mr. Good) point of order, 3571
Orders in Council, repeal by statute, 3504
Parliamentary restaurant, com., 382
Penny Bank of Toronto, 1739, 2052
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3866, 4749
Pensions
Old age, inquiry, 733
Pension Board, Colonel Thompson, 4749
Senators, to, 1376
Petroleum Bounties bill, 2657, 3920, 3963, 4392
Postage stamps used for revenue purposes, 3927, 3938
Prince Edward Island, car ferry claim, 4676
Printing bureau, new building, 1737
Promissory notes, 3924
Proportional representation
Alternative vote, 389
M. (Mr. Good) 413
Public archives, bonus, 4707
Public buildings, new departmental, 1730
Public debt. *See also under this title,* Budget
Additions to, 2642, 3078
Maturing obligations, 3823
Statement, 2926
Public expenditure, 2641, 4422, 4554
Apportionment of, 4560
Public Service Retirement Act, 3323, 3402
Calder Act, 3977
Public Works estimates, 4554

Fielding, Right Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Publicity agent in London, Mr. Cranfield, 2927
Pulpwood prohibition of export, 2648, 4012, 4345, 4393
Royal commission, 2648, 4709
Quebec Savings Bank Act, 4183, 4392
Railway subsidies, 4304
Raisins and dried currants, duty, 2644
Proclamation by Governor in Council, 3474
Receipt tax, 2644, 3935, 4423
Revision of, 4409
Reciprocity with United States
"No truck or trade with the Yankees" 3075, 3080
Offer to negotiate, 2649, 3454, 3474, 3901, 3903, 3907
Permanency, 3079
Reciprocity agreement of 1911, 3079, 3905
Redistribution, Mr. W. M. Ivel, 733
Roof coverings, investigation, 4703
Royal commission on lake grain rates, 2927
Rules of the House. *See under this title,* Business of the House
Sales tax, 3078, 4181, 4409, 4419. *See also under this title,* Special War Revenue Act
Articles used by hospitals, 4432
Complexity of, 2643
Exemptions, 2643, 4431
Imports, 4409
M. (Mr. Stevens) for committee of inquiry, 919
Magazines and periodicals, 4415, 4421
Public libraries, 1871
Six per cent, imposition at source, 2643
Union Jack, 4515
Select standing committees, membership, 382, 615, 2252
Senate
Abolition of, 1376
M. (Mr. Denis, Joliette) 1375
Senators, pensions to, 1376
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4184
Special War Revenue Act 1915 Amdt. bill 2657, 4363, 4409
Cheque tax, 3922
Sales tax, 4181. *See also under this title,* Sales Tax
Six per cent tax at source, 3938
Wines, excise tax on, 3937
Sugar duties, 2645, 3082, 3479
Beet root sugar, 2644, 3229, 4393
Sunny Brae-Guysborough railway, 4320

Fielding, Right Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Supply. *See also under this title,* Business of the House; Estimates
Bills, 4735
Interim supply, one-sixth vote, 1482, 1538, 3705
Committee, notice, 179
Concurrence, 4732
Tariff. *See also under this item,* Budget speech; Customs Tariff items
Amendments of 1920 and 1921, 3020
Attitude on, 2838
Changes proposed, 2651, 3462, 3895
Commission, evidence, 2296
Resolutions, 2650, 3963
Stability and finality, 2648
Weapon, 3074, 3477
Thornton, Sir Henry, reported statement on immigration, 2795
Tomato plants, duty, 4433
Trade returns, incomplete, 2270
Treaties. *See also under this title,* French, Halibut, Italian
Negotiation of, expenses, 3989
Trade, 437
Union bank, position of, 4298
United States
National Reserve bank, 4407
Reciprocity. *See under this title,* Reciprocity
Trade with France, 1991, 1997. *See also under this title,* French Treaty
Vancouver Creosoting Company, 3233
Vimy Ridge memorial, 183, 811
War claims, Vickers company contract, 1746-7
War loans, delivery of dividend cheques, 1804
Ways and Means committee, 2640
West Ukrainian republic, 656
Wheat board legislation, 2928
Wines. *See also under this title,* French Treaty
Canadian, duty on, 2643
Tax on, 3937
Woollen industry, 447, 3459, 3472

Fiji Islands, trade with, 1848

Finance. *See also* Bank Act Amdt bill; Banks and Banking; Budget; Canadian National Railways; Credits; Loans; Public Debt; Public Expenditure
Amortization plan, 2930
Bonds
Guaranteeing. *See* Canadian National Railways
Interest rate and income tax, 4494
Tax-free, qu. 342, 2914

Finance—*Con.*
British debt to United States, 2878
Dollar reserve in Canada, 2879
Canadian National Railways, securities, approval, 4402. *See also that title*
Central gold reserve, qu. 1739
Complicated and confused, 2915
Credit control, 631. *See also* Credits
Department
Boville, Mr. T. C., service and retirement, qu. 3135
Commissioner of Taxation, salary, 3949
Deputy minister, salary increase, 4670
Estimates, 3987
Distress in West, 1890. *See also* speeches on Immigration
Dividends
Taxation of, 281
Watered stock, 2956
Dominion notes, circulation, qu. 1739
Farm loan bonds bought by farmers, 2770
Financial and class rule in politics, 2733
Financial conditions, analysis, 2984
Financial control of government, 2812
Industry and, 4053
Interest rate, 2812. *See also* Bank Act Amdt. bill
New York loans, 154, 155, 2963
Saskatchewan debentures, sale of, 2770
Securities, on which advances made to banks, 4405
Shares, issue of. *See* Companies Act Amdt. bill
World conditions, 2823, 2878

Finance Act 1914 Amdt. Bill, 255
(Advances to banks, bank payments in notes instead of gold or Dominion notes; export of gold, etc.) Res. 4249, 4405, 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 4408

Financial Post, statement as to labour shortage in lumber camps, 1125

Financial Situation, 2658. *See* speeches on Address; Bank Act Amdt bill; Budget; Immigration

Findlay, Mr. J. W. (South Bruce)
Budget, 2883. Long speeches; a budget Conservatives cannot find fault with; Liberal principles, 2883; tariff proposals; amendment; tariff reduction; disappointed hopes; farmers' movement; return to flesh-pots; member for Muskoka; disappointment with budget; 2884; Liberal platform of 1919, repudiation of, 2885

Finger Prints, offenders against Narcotic Drugs Act, 1136

Finland, immigration from, 1085

Finn, Mr. Robert E. (Halifax)
Canadian National railways, terminals, 4716
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 4678
Halifax grain elevator, 4715
Introduced, 3
Prince Edward Island car ferry terminals claim, 4678

Fire Brick. *See* Customs Tariff Items

Fire Prevention. *See* Forests and Forestry
Roof coverings, investigation, 4703

Fiscal Changes. *See* Budget

Fiset, Sir Eugene. *See* National Defence

Fish and Fisheries. *See also* Marine and Fisheries
Asiatics engaged in, 1453, 1540-1, 1555, 1899, 1900, 2443, 4484-5
Naturalization, 2461
Atlantic fisheries, inquiry into, 2983, 3084, 3365
Bait, purchase by American vessels, 3705
Behring sea, 4485
Bounties, report, 911
British Columbia, 3372
Fisheries Commission, 1453
Fishing licenses, 1540
Japanese fishermen, naturalization certificates, 1899, 2443
Canadian ports use of by United States fishermen, 2735, 2940, 3361, 3906, 4480
Canned and pickled fish, inspection, 3367, 3375
Canned lobster and salmon, French treaty, 452
Canned salmon shipped via Panama canal, 2519, 2615, 3275
Cold storage, 2056
Deep sea fisheries, conservation, 3364, 3365
Express rates, 3365
Fish
Cooking, 3366
Culture, 3367
Demand for, 3364
Inspection Act, enforcement, 3367
Preserved, 1984. *See also* French Treaty
Products, imports, 445, qu. 617
Fishery officers and guardians, 3361
Russel, Mr. James, qu. 1868
Fishery protection service, 3361
United States steamer captured by Malaspina, 2207

Fish and Fisheries—*Con.*
Fishing industry, difficulties and handicaps, 2945, 2972, 3002
Fishing interests and reciprocity, 3082
Fishing schooner race, 114, 115, 906
Fishways
Building fishways and clearing rivers, 3362
St. Andrew's dam, 1000
Salmon River, N.B., 3362
White Mud river, 3362
Found, Mr. W. A., Superintendent, 1548
Freight rates, 1953, 1964, 2946
French treaty, 1978, 2235
Halibut, 151
Close season, 4480
Northern Pacific Halibut Fisheries. *See that title*
Treaty, 857, 858, 4132, 4440, 4437, 4664, 4736
Approval of, 4455
Signing of, 734
Hudson Bay, 1064, 1073. *See also* Hudson Bay railway
International Fisheries Commission, 4480
Japanese fishermen, 1453, 1540-1, 1899, 1900, 2443, 4484, 4485
Japanese fisheries association, 1453
Licenses, reduction of 40 per cent, 1540-1
Lobster season, extension of, 2983, 3084
Machinery for conversion of fish offal into fertilizer, 2645, 2734, 2946, 3486
Margaree Salmon Fisheries Association, 2700, qu. 3262, 3367, 3371
Marine and Fisheries Committee
Reports presented
First, 1384
Second, 1686, 1763
Third, 2983
Markets, 2906
Miramichi smelt fishing, qu. 1974
Modus vivendi, 2906, 2940, 3361
Moving pictures, 3365
Norwegian fishermen, 1192
Orientals engaged in. *See under this title,* Asiatics; Japanese
Pacific coast, 2734
Pickled fish, inspection, 3367, 3375
Publicity, 3364
Reciprocity, 3906. *See also that title*
Rivers and streams, sawdust pollution, 701, 3362
Russel, Mr. James, employment, qu. 1868
Salmon canners' licenses, 1540. *See also* Fisheries Act Amdt. bill
Salmon fisheries, Fraser river, 4461
Sardine fishery, 2518
Smelt, regulations, qu. 1868, qu. 1974

Fish and Fisheries—*Con.*
Steveston Fishermen's Benovolent Society, 1900
Tariff on fish, 112-113
Treaty of 1818, 2906
Trout-fishing season, 1686
United States
Fishing vessels, licenses, 911
Markets, 2906
Modus vivendi. *See under this title,* Modus Vivendi
Tariff, 2734, 2940
Schooner, capture of, 2207

Fisher, Prof. Irving, purchasing power, 4666

Fisher, the late Hon. Sydney, 2057
Copyright Act, 2140

Fisheries Act 1914 Amdt. Bill (Salmon canners' licenses) 1r., 4009; 2r., com., 3r., 4207

Fisheries Commission. *See* British Columbia

Fisheries Protection Service. *See* Fish and Fisheries

Fishing Schooner Race, 114, 115, 906

Flags, Union Jack, sales tax, 4514

Flathead District highway, qu. 2085

Flavelle, Sir Joseph, 157, 1612

Flax. *See* Grain and Grain Trade; Linen

Fleming, Sir Sandford, port of Shippegan, 2938

Flexner, Dr., discovery of serum for spinal menengitis, 1287

Flour. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade,
Freight rates, 1914, 2127
French treaty, 1978
Malt flour, duty, 3480
Milling in bond, 2960
Ocean rates, 2127
Discrimination against Canadian, 1906 2761
Prices in Canada and Great Britain, 1906
Protection, 146-147
Reciprocity in, 2993
Shipments
Canadian and United States ports through, 1767
China, to, 1840
Transportation, earnings of railways, 2960

Fontaine, Mr. J. E. (Hull)
Budget, 2814. Congratulations to Finance Minister; public debt; war scandals; administration of Sir Wilfrid Laurier; progress and prosperity, 2814; Borden-Meighen administration; speculation and profiteering; origin of farmers and labour party; democratic policy of

Fontaine, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
present administration; agriculture, condition and encouragement of; French and Italian treaties; Australia, trade agreement with; Turkey, threatened war with; Canada's participation, 2815; financial conditions; economy; European affairs; Canadian policy; immigration policy; emigration to the United States; protection of Canadian labour; Georgian Bay canal; Civil Service Commission, unconstitutionality of; patronage, 2816; dismissals and appointments after 1911; classification; the Griffenhagens; old age pensions; amendment, Mr. Forke; western provinces, contribution of the East to development of; tariff and revenue, 2817
Civil Service Commission, 2816
Old age pensions, 2817

Food. *See* Agriculture; Consumer; Cost of Living; Prices

Food and Drugs Act
Administration, 697
Butter. *See* Dairy Industry Act Amdt. bill

Ford Car. *See* Automobiles

Ford, Henry, Automobile duty, 2908

Fordney-McCumber Tariff. *See* United States

Foreign Markets. *See* Trade; Treaties, French, Italian

Foreign Policy. *See* Imperial Conference; Near East Crisis

Foreign Vessels, registration. *See* Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill

Foreigners. *See also* Aliens; Immigration
Canadian citizenship, value of, 2911
Germans in Peace river district, 1184
Naturalization of. *See that title*

Forest Reserves and Parks Act. *See* Dominion Forests

Forests and Forestry. *See also* Export Act Amdt. bill; Natural Resources; Pulp and Paper; Timber
Aerial patrol, 1748
Alberta, 1778
British Columbia, 1776
Manitoba, 1778
Nova Scotia, 1778
Ontario and Quebec, 1776, 1778

Forests and Forestry—*Con.*
Aeroplanes used in protection work, 1776
Barnjum, Mr. Frank J. D., 821, 2948, 3412, 4348
Campbell, Mr. R. H., Superintendent of Forestry, retirement, 3410
Canadian Forestry Association, grant, 3409
Conservation, 2648, 2947, 2950, 4349. *See also* Export Act Amdt. bill
Development, 2744
Empire Forestry Conference, 3410
Forest fires, 816
Conscription of fire-fighters, 3409
Fires started to make employment, 3409
Relief, 4010
Forest products, exports of, 1776. *See also* Pulp and Paper; Timber
Forest protection, 1776, qu. 2205, 3415
M. (Mr. Michaud) 816
Georgia pine, importation, 3411
Insect pests and fungous diseases, 817, qu. 2178, qu. 2697, 3416
Moose mountain reserve, 3453
Spruce bud worm, 596, 2179
White pine blister rust, 595
Land, clearing by fire, 1185
Moose mountain forest reserve, 3453
Provincial ownership, jurisdiction and responsibility, 3416
Pulp, paper, forest products, export, 2750. *See also* Pulp and Paper; Timber
Reforestation, 3412, 4349
Reserves. *See also* Dominion Forest Reserves
Roads and bridges, 1014
Shelter belts, 459
Spanish River Pulp and Paper Company, aerial patrol, 1776
Tree-planting
Associations, 3415
Prairies, on, 3412
Turtle Mountain reserve, 3413

Forke, Mr. Robert (Brandon)
Address in reply, 34. Thanks to previous speakers for references to himself; congratulations to mover and seconder; resignation of Mr. Crerar as leader of Progressives, 34-35; Canada's position in relation to other countries; trek from country to city, 35; trade treaties; trade expansion 36; co-ordination of National Railways; new board of directors, Sir Henry Thornton, 36; lake freights inquiry; Crowsnest pass agreement, 36-37; immigration; natural resources, 37; farm labourers; tariff and taxation; revision of Bank Act; committee to inquire into agricultural problems, 38; causes of present agricultural depression, 38-39; bill to safeguard interests of consumers and producers; cattle embargo; economy in expenditure, 39; civil service reform, 39-40; redistribution; our national status, recommendations to government, 41

Forke, Mr. Robert—*Con.*
Address—*Con.*
Agriculture
Condition of, 1107, 1852
Co-operation, 1852
Expenditure, 3240
Alberta coal, 794
Bait, purchase by American vessels, 3705
Banff national park, power leases, 3939
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4044, 4097, 4100, 4107
Bank Act revision, inquiry, 858
Banking and Commerce Com., member of, 2639
Bankruptcy Act Amdt bill, 3213
Banting, Dr. F. G., 4438
Barnjum, Mr. Frank J. D., work of, 3412
Belle River harbour, 4606
Bounties, agriculture, 3240
British preference
Canadian ports, direct importation, 3456
Woollen goods, 3460, 3470
Budget
Reported statement on, 2946
Speech on, comment, 2853
Speech, 2711. Congratulations to Minister of Finance; budget disappointing; financial position of country; railway and shipping deficits, 2711; debt; increase in; economy; taxation a billion dollars a year; Britain's example to Canada; limit to tax-paying powers increasing cost of government, 2712; machinery of distribution; parasites between producer and consumer; tariff and tax changes; buying and selling; British preference; trade with Great Britain, 2713; best market for agricultural products, 2714; ocean freight rates; tariff and combines; natural resources; "stability of tariff" Liberal tariff policy; Moose Jaw election, 2714; handwriting on the wall; budget a disappointment to the West; exodus; agricultural and manufactured products, prices; Canada a dear country to live in; high cost of living; manufacturing industries, 2715; production, cost of; taxation of commodities; relations between farmer and manu-

Forke, Mr. Robert—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
facturer; agriculture, position of, 2716; potential wealth of the prairies; immigration, taxation and railway troubles; commercial rivalry; amendment, 2717
Canada Colonization Association. *See under this title,* Immigration
Canada Highways bill, 2340
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, advances, 3798, 3833
Canadian National railways
Appointments, 2472
Branch lines construction bill, 4192, 4338, 4399
Management, responsibility and powers, 3640
Minister's annual statement, 1617
Paris offices, 3646, 3672
Meighen, Right Hon. Mr., reference to, 3672, 3678
Toronto office building, 3641
Cattle boats, conditions, 2613
Cattle shipments to Great Britain, 3641
Vessel space, 1868
Cheque tax, amendment, 3934, 3935
Chilled meat, 463
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 361, 565
Civil Service Commission, salaries, 3986
Coasting regulations, suspension, 4236, 4290
Combines bill, 2579, 2618-36
Discussion, reservation of right, 2520
Copper bounty bill, 3240, 4376
Copyright Act Amdt. bill, 2145, 2346
Cost of living, 1813
Dairy Industry Act 1914 Amdt. bill, 4254
Deceased members, tribute to, 7
Deep sea fisheries, 3364
Depression in England, 1854
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 2386
Distribution, cost of, 1852
Dominion Lands Act Amdt. bill, homesteads, 3983
Duke and Duchess of York, congratulations on wedding, 2252
Economic conditions, wealth production, 1856
Eggs, price of, 1852
Emigration to the United States, 1109
Europe, reconstruction, 4654
Excise taxes, payment with postage stamps, 1820
Experimental farms, 463
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4549
Fielding, Right Hon. Mr.
Complimentary reference, 2013
Congratulations on being called to Imperial Privy Council, 4742

Forke, Mr. Robert—*Con.*
Fishways, 3363
Free trade, 3024
Freight rates
Crowsnest pass agreement, 1617, 1932
Concession forced by Progressives, explanation, 2971
Manitoba-Canadian Northern agreement, 1933
Railway rates, equalization, M. (Mr. Clark) 1932
French Treaty bill, 2012, 2261, 2267
Fuel supply, 794
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 332-3
Georgia pine, importation, 3411
Grondines wharf, 968
Halibut fishery treaty, 4466
Hayes, Mr. John J., dismissal of, 1693
Hudson Bay railway, M. (Mr. Knox) 1047
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1407, 1479
Letter not read by Prime Minister, 1333
Letter to Mr. M. A. Brown, 1333, 1336
Personal explanation, 1105
Detailed estimates, 1464, 1481
Empire settlement scheme, 1464
Hebridean immigrants, treatment of, 3593
Policy, 1105-1110
Imperial Conference, 4654
Indemnity of members, 4241
Indians
Condition of, 2147
Manitoba, 2125
Sioux, 2159, 2160
International boundaries, surveys, 3248
Lack of Confidence, M. (Mr. Irvine) 231
Lake Grain Rates, royal commission, 3507
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4222-32, 4285
Lake of the Woods regulation bill, 4178
Liberal policy, reversal of, 3007
Lightkeepers' salaries and allowances, 3353
Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill, 2201
Lunenburg dredging, 4577
Macphail, Miss, members and party funds 4238
Magazines and periodicals, M. (Mr. Hocken) 845
Merchants' bank, 4297
Moose Jaw by-election, 2714
Delay in return, 2295
Naturalization Acts Amdt. 2187, 2193, 2454
Winnipeg Free Press editorial, 2454
Near East Crisis, 40
Newspapers
Monopoly, 2580
Postage, 4534

Forke, Mr. Robert—*Con.*
Newspapers—*Con.*
Size of, 4534
North Essex by-election, 4606
Northern Pacific Halibut Fisheries Protection bill, 4483
Oleomargarine, inquiry as to legislation, 2519
M. (Mr. Carroll) 3524, 3526
Sub-amdt. (Mr. Good) point of order, 3572
Patents of Invention bill, 2066
Penitentiaries, 771
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3884, 4534
Postal appointments, 1800
Proportional representation, single transferable vote, 2181
Protection and world conditions, 2752
Public buildings, Manitoba, 4629
Public Works Act, tender and contract, 956
Redistribution, intention of government, 4250
References to, 11, 17, 18, 27, 55
Renovated butter, 4254
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 1150
Rural mail delivery, extension, 1790
Sales tax, 4431
Barley flour, 4431
M. (Mr. Stevens) for com. of inquiry, 920
Secretary of State, estimates, 2392
Seed grain advances, 3445
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4238-42
Shipping combine, 4223
Soldier settlement, 2027
Supplementary estimates, time of bringing down, 4555
Three Rivers harbour bill, 3968
Titles, honours and decorations, M. (Mr. Ladner) 1291
Trade barriers, 2214
Tree-planting on prairies, 3412
Union bank, position of, 4250, 4272
M. to adjourn House, 4296
Vimy Ridge monument, 182
War, Canada's participation in, 4655
War claims, 2496
West Ukrainian republic, 656
Woollen industry, protection, M. (Mr. Drummond) 934

Forrester, Mr. William (South Perth)
Linen yarn duty, 3897

Fort Churchill. *See* Hudson Bay railway

Fort Edward, Windsor, N.S., 3406

Fort Frances Pulp and Paper Company, 2573

Fort William
Elevators. *See* Grain and Grain Trade
Grain shipments, 1114
Harbour improvements, 2675, 4610

Fortier, Mr. H. A. (Labelle)
Budget, 2831. War sacrifices; Liberal party heir to burdensome estate; public debt; Canadian National railways; deficits; economy; improved financial situations; borrowings and interests payments; taxation, reduction of; tariff; downward revision; reciprocity, 2831; resources; British preference; introduction and further increase of; French and Italian treaties; friendly relations between France and Canada; Rodin's statue of France; gift of site for Vimy memorial; Canadian National railways, management; President and board, 2832; western settlement made possible by railway construction; British Columbia; Quebec; Transcontinental railway; development of Abitibi region; contribution of railways to development of country; immigration, 2833; land awaiting settlement; provincial land grants; emigration to the United States; natural increase of population; immigrants, recruiting and selecting; choice of location, 2834; repatriation; the future, 2835
British preference, 2832
Woollen goods, 3458
Canada Highways bill, 2341
Canadian National railways, branch lines, 4199
Civil Service Act M. (Mr. Power) 548
Export Act Amdt. bill, pulpwood, 4347
Immigration, 2833
Colonization in eastern provinces, 1134
Policy, 1134
Quebec into, 1104
Labelle country development, 4199
Lack of confidence, M. (Mr. Irvine) 235
Montford railway, 4199
Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. bill, 2119
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 3984
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3543
Patents of Invention bill, 2071, 2098
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4347
Ruling as chairman, 4293
Senate and House of Commons bill, 4244
Titles, honours and decorations, M. (Mr. Ladner) 1296

Fortin and Moffatt, Transcontinental railway claim, 3646

Foster, Mr. A. de Witt, qu. 1633

Foster, Right Hon. Sir George, Hudson Bay railway, 1061

Foster Homes. *See* Immigration, Child

Found, Mr. W. A., Superintendent of Fisheries, 1548

Fox-Breeding Industry, 588, 2763

France. *See also* Treaties, French Treaty
Agricultural products, 2247
Balance of trade, 2204, 2221
Canadian Commissioner General, 4001
Canadian travelling exhibition in, 811, 4711
Convention of commerce with. *See* Treaties, French Treaty
Devastated areas, reconstruction, 2012, 2219
Exports and imports, 1977, 1997, 2004, 2015, 2210, 2213, 2222
Fiscal policy of, 1991, 1995
Franc, value of, 2009
Franco-German relations, 4652
Friendly relations with, 2216
German reparations, 440. *See also* Germany
Immigration from, 1085, 1173
Imports from. *See* Imports and Exports; Treaties, French Treaty
League of Nations, Canada's contribution, 3992
Paris agency, 4001
Peace treaty and. *See* Germany, reparations
President of, letter from, Vimy Ridge memorial, 1538
Reciprocity treaty with Great Britain, 3050
Relations with, 2832
Rodin's statue, 2832
Ruhr, invasion of, 2748, 2822
Senate, constitution of, 1371
Silks, export to Canada, 2397
Surplus, 2823
Tariff against Canadian goods, 1999, 2015
Trade relations with, 1990, 1995, 2218
Trade treaties with, 437. *See also* Treaties, French Treaty
Termination of, 1999
Vimy Ridge, gift of memorial site, 1538, 2832. *See also* Vimy Ridge
War losses, 2215, 2256
Woollen industry, competition, 2958

Franchise. *See also* Dominion Elections
Amendment to Act, inquiry, 3223
Equality of citizenship between men and women, 3059
Hindu, 503, 4640. *See also that title*
Withholding of, 2456
Women, to, 408
Orientals to. See Immigration, Orientals; Naturalization

Fraser River
Fisheries. *See* British Columbia Fisheries
Improvements, 1003, 1006

Fraud, obtaining fiats by. *See* Petition of Right Bill

Fredericton experimental farm, 460, 471

Free Trade. *See also* Budget; Copper Bounty bill; Export Act Amdt. bill; Hemp Bounty bill
Advocacy of in western Canada, 2752
Agriculture, 1858
Binder twine, 4379
Difficulties in the way of, 3010
Effect of in different sections, 1246
Free list, goods on. *See* Budget; Customs; Reciprocity
Great Britain, 1858, 2721, 2752, 2777, 2854, 3012, 3050, 3059, 3847
Liberal party and, 3068
Necessities of life, 1230
No cure for Canada's ills, 2982
Not a practical question, 2745
Potatoes, 2820
Progressive party amd, 1196, 2818, 3030
Protection and, 2806, 2922
Pulpwood, prohibition of, 4349
Tariff stability, 2648
Tendency towards protection, 2822, 3009
Theory and practice, 3050
United States, 1113, 2737, 2746

Freight Cars. *See* Canadian National Railways

Freight Rates. *See also* Address; Budget; Canadian National Railways; Canals; Grain and Grain Trade; Hudson Bay Railway; Railway Commission; Railways; St. Lawrence River Waterways; Transportation
Adverse. *See* Immigration; Vancouver Harbour bill
Agriculture and, 1416, 1424
Alberta, discrimination against, 1957, 1958
Apples and vegetables, Nova Scotia to Montreal and Toronto, 626
British Columbia
Discrimination against, 1914
Equalization, 1911, 1914
Building materials, 1961, 3036
Brick and cement, 3017
Butter, 1961
Canada Steamship Lines, Limited. Sir Henry Thornton, 3845
Canadian National Railways. *See that title*
Canned goods and fish, 1915
Cattle export trade, 2127, 2963, 3040

Freight Rates—*Con.*
Cheese, 1961
Chemicals, 1920
Coal, 84, 795, 1264, 1272, 1278, 1280, 1964, 2828, 2875, 3199, 3200, 3621. *See also* Coal; Fuel Supply
Alberta, 1275, 1282, 3009
Excessive, 1345
Increase of 300 per cent, 1277
Maritime provinces, 1813
Red Deer Valley Coal Operators' Association, res. 1275
United States railways, 1266
Coasting regulations, suspension, 4290
Consumers and, 1958
Control of, 4226
Crowsnest pass agreement, 1617, 1620, 1912, 2741, 2836, 2852, 2854. *See also* Lake Grain Rates bill and *under this title,* Railway Rates, Equalization
Charge that Progressives had forced concession, 2854, 2875
Explanation by Mr. Forke, 2971
Discrimination in favour of Western Canada, 3239
Furniture manufacturers, 2855, 2875
Manufactured products, 2855
Railway receipts, decrease of, 3036
Restoration of rates, results, 1620
Saving absorbed by lake shipping companies, 2961
Discrimination, 130, 3195. *See under this title,* Railway Rates, Equalization; *see also* Railway Act Amdt.
Downward revision, 3195
Eggs, 1962
Emigration and, 1440
Equalization. *See also* Railway Act Amdt. bill *and under this title,* Railway Rates
Fish, 1953, 1964, 2946
Flour, 1914, 2127
Discrimination against Canadian, 1906, 2761
Freight classification, 1618, 2876
Grain, 260, 1914, 1960, 1965, 2854, 3194, 3680
St. Lawrence river channel, 3343
High, 2812
Highways and, 1619
Hudson Bay railway 1035, 3779
Immigration and, 1133, 1181
Increase of, 1134, 3190
Iron and steel, 1964
Lake and river, 3776
Fixing, 4284
Lower, demand for, 3024
Lumber, 1961, 2875
Pulpwood, ties and, 3036

Freight Rates—*Con.*
Manitoba, 1932
Canadian Northern agreement, 1939
Maritime provinces, 1963
Mountain scale, 1912
Operating costs and, 1761
Pacific standard tariff, 1914
Potatoes on, 137-138
Prairie scale, 1912, 1915
Railway and shipping, 1051, 1114, 1395, 4226. *See also under this title,* Shipping
Railway Commission
Appeal from, 1912
Hearing, 3190
Railway rates
Attorney General of British Columbia vs. C.P.R. 1916
Equalization of, 1400, 1437, 2868, 3191
British Columbia, terms of union, 1916
Canadian Northern and British Columbia, guarantee, 1917
Control of rates, 1917
Canadian Pacific railway construction of, 1916
Carvell, Hon. F. B., letter to Associated Boards of Trade, 1915
Construction, cost, 1918
Earnings, 1919
Grain, 1921
Long haul, 1920
M. (Mr. Clark) 1284, 1490, 1911, 1914
Ruling of Mr. Speaker, 1284, 1307
Oliver, Hon. John, 1915, 1952, 1955
Operation, cost, 1918
Railway Commission, judgment of June 30th, 1922, 1914
Traffic, density of, 1920
Railway transportation costs committee, evidence, 1919
Railways, qu. 625
Canadian National railways, 3621. *See also that title*
Saving by projected Winnipeg-St. Croix route, 2899
Reduction of, 1101, 1400, 2800, 2868, 3194
Rice, 1915
Shipping, 144, 171, qu. 206, 310, 1395, 4077. *See also* Lake Grain Rates
Agricultural conditions, Special Com. report, 2127
Armstrong bill, 4284, 4290
Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, Sir Henry Thornton, 3848
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, qu. 2613, 3806
Vessels, qu. 3262

Freight Rates—*Con.*
Shipping—*Con.*
Canadian Liner Committee, 2127
Cattle, shipment to Great Britain, 2127, 2963, 3040
Coasting regulations, suspension of, 494, 2959, 4231
Combine, 2578, 2581, 2583, 2667, 2828, 2954, 2960, 4223, 4226, 4277
Control of by Railway Commission, qu. 2611
Discrimination, 4290
Canadian ports, against, 2960
Dominion Marine Association, 2613
Flour, 2127
Freight and passenger, 2174
Grain, 2517, 2828, 4290
Great Lakes and St. Lawrence, 14, 36, 48, 52, 68, 206, 247, 302, qu. 2611
Increase of, 2960
Lake and ocean, 3763
Lake grain rates. *See that title*
Lake Grain Rates Commission, 1395, qu. 2611, qu. 2612, 2710, 3960
Personnel, 4231, 4234
Report, 2885, 4277
Legislation, 3265, 3507
Printing, 2927, 3045
Salaries and expenses, 4710
Live stock, 2133, 2758
New York pool, 3806
North Atlantic and U. K. Conference Eastbound, 2127, 2760
Ocean, 2127
Flour, Canadian, discrimination, 2761
Livestock rates, 2758. *See also* Livestock
Return cargoes, 2714
St. Lawrence river waterway, 3762
"Shipping barons", 2960
Standard Shipping Company, 1704, 4278
Steamship combines, 2667
Subsidized steamships, 2714, 4003. *See also* Steamship Services
Weekly Liner Committee, 2127
Welland canal, 3762
Wolvin, Mr. Roy, 1704
Wolvin, Messrs, 4285. *See also* Lake Grain Rates Bill
Textiles, 1964
Thornton, Sir Henry, 1915, 3848
Transfer charges, 2876
Transportation cost committee, 1944
United States, 2801
Waterways, 1619
Western Canada and, 1887

Freight Rates—*Con.*
Westward from prairie provinces, M. (Mr. Clark) 1158. *See also under this title,* Railway Rates, Equalization
Wheat, discrimination in favour of, 2946

French-Canadians
Bravery and courage, 165, 2935
Deputy Ministers, 1805
Repatriation, 1462
Settlement in New Ontario, 1401

French Language
Difficulties, 1341
Editorial Committee, elimination of French publications, 1670
Immigration officials, Quebec, qu. 4752
Insurance bill, French version, 3147
Magazines and periodicals, 842
References to, 166
Translation and printing, 1489
Bills, 4435

French River improvement work, qu. 620, 2682

French Treaty. *See this title under* Treaties

Frenette, Mr. George, postmaster, St. Jean d'Evangeliste, qu. 2698

Fruit. *See also* Cold Storage Act Amdt.; Treaties, French Treaty
Apples
Imports, qu. 617
New varieties, 2307
Banana trust, 2979
British Columbia, 104, 2763, 2942
Canadian Council of Horticulture, 2307
Combines, 2616
Competition from United States, 2977, 2980
Dehydration of, 4674
Dumping clause, 2988
Estimates, 598
Fiji islands, from, 1848
Foreign
Competition, 2979
Importation, 2979
Taxation of, 2979
Freight rates from Maritime provinces, 626
Fruit-growing industry
Annapolis valley, 104, 2763
British Columbia, 104, 2763, 2942
Depression, 3002
Niagara district, 104, 2225, 2763, 2765
Fruit union of the Okanagan, 2526
Grading. *See* Sale and Inspection of Fruit and Fruit Containers
Grape-growing industry, 2742. *See also* Treaties, French Treaty
Grapes, export, 2270

Fruit—*Con.*
Grape-growing—*Con.*
Price in Niagara district, 2225
Wine manufacture, 1977
Imports of dried and prepared fruit, 445
Insects and pests, 596
Inspection. *See* Sale and Inspection of Fruit
Marketing, 463
Mediterranean, importation, 1636
Pears, new varieties, 2307
Plums, new varieties, 2307
Pomology, experimental work in, 463
Pre-cooling plant, 464, 2056, 2765. *See also* Cold Storage Act Amdt. bill
Prunes and dried plums, 3474
Raisins, imports of, qu. 2699
Duty, 2657, 2718, 3474. *See also* Budget; Customs Tariff items
Sale and Inspection. *See that title*
Trees, new varieties, 2307

Fruit and Fruit Containers. *See* Sale and Inspection

Fuel Oil. *See also* Oil
California and Oklahoma, 1245
Importation of, 1245

Fuel Supply, 84, qu. 203. *See also* Coal; Freight Rates; Mines and Minerals; Natural Resources; Oil; Railways
Adams, Dr. Frank D., coal situation, 1265
Advisory Fuel Committee, 1278, 4691
Anthracite coal, embargo on, 4394
Bermingham, Mr., President Delaware and Lackawana Railway, evidence, 1279
Camsell, Dr. Charles, Deputy Minister of Mines, 1265
Canadian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy, 1268
Central heating plants, 3199
Coal. *See also that title*
Alberta
Freight rate on, 3009
Mines, 3424
Areas in Canada, 1344
Cost, 1700, 3198. *See also* Cost of Living
Duty, 3493
Embargo on United States, 1279
Freight rates, 2828, 2875
Imports, qu. 516, 2828
Production and, qu. 490
Offset by exports of electric energy, 1266
Mines, 2785
Canadian, 1247, 1344
Prices, 3198
Substitutes for, 3199
Welsh, 3199
Coking. *See also* Coal, Coke

Fuel Supply—*Con.*
Coking—*Con.*
Coke-ovens, establishment of, 788
Municipal plants, 3200
Dominion Fuel Board
Salaries and expenses, 3197
Statement of work and suggestions, 3199
Exploitation, 1344
Federal Advisory Fuel Committee, 1274, 3198
Freight rates, 1919, 2855, 2875, 3199, 3200
Fuel testing, 789, 3197
House construction, 3203
Hudson's Hope, possibilities, 3198, 3202, 4699
Industrial and scientific research, 788
Interstate Commerce Commission, investigation, 1279
Investigation, 3427
Lignite
Bienfait briquetting plant, 789, 2509, 2512, 3206
Lignite Utilization Board, 387, 2515
Mines and Minerals Committee
Suggested reference to 1271
Report, 4436, 443
M. (Mr. Church) for a national fuel policy, 1262
Amdt. (Mr. Carroll) for reference to Mines and Minerals Committee, 1271
Suggested amendment of, 1284
Oil shale deposits, 2513
Peat
Alfred peat plant, qu. 1487
Experiments, 790, 3199
Joint Peat Committee, 387
Public ownership and, 3200, 3205
Pulverized fuel 3199
Resources, 1264
Shortage, deaths of children from, 751, 1657
Sifton, Sir Clifford, on, 1265
Smith, Mr. George Otis, export of coal from United States 1265
Special committee, appointment of, qu. 617. *See also under this title,* Mines and Minerals
Steam, 789
Thornton, Sir Henry, evidence, 1919
Waters powers, 3203

Fundy. *See* Bay of Fundy

Fungus and Insect Diseases. *See* Insect Pests

Furness Withy Company, ocean rates, 2127

Furniture
Crowsnest pass agreement, 2855, 2875
French Treaty, 1982, 1989
House of Commons, qu. 1138

Furs
French treaty, 1981
Sales tax, 2742

Galicians. *See* Immigration

Gallipoli Peninsula. *See* Near East Crisis

Gambling. *See also* Criminal Code Amdt.; Race Track Gambling
Futures, in, 3058
Staples of life, in, 3058
Stock exchange, 3058

Game. *See* Dominion Lands and Parks

Gardens, absence from farm homes, 1423

Gaols. *See* Justice, Penitentiaries; Capital punishment at. *See that title*

Garbage Feeding. *See* Hog Cholera

Gardiner, Mr. Robert (Medicine Hat)
Agricultural conditions, 1903
Agricultural exports, 1904
Audibility of debate, 4580
Bacon, Canadian prices, 1905
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4095, 4096
Bank officials, as insurance agents, 4095
Belle River harbour, 4601
Business of the House
Bills, distribution, 4276
Bills not printed, 4185
M. that Committee rise, 4185
Business profits tax, arrears, 4491
Canada Colonization Association, 1878
Canada Highways bill, 2342
Canadian Forestry Association, grant, 3409
Canadian National Railways, branch lines, 4321
Coal leases, 3424
Copper bounty bill 3436
Cost of living, reduction, 1907
Deputy Postmaster General, appointment, 1806
Exhibitions, 1454
Experimental farms 470-486
Exports and imports, 1841
Farm credits, 1907
Farm mortgages 1841
Farmers, competition with world, 3236
Flour, price in Canada and Britain, 1906
Grain and grain trade
Adulteration of Canadian grain at United States ports, 3650
Grain commissioners, board of, 787
Grain samples for exhibitions, 1454, 1455
Grazing
Lands, southern Alberta, 3424

Gardiner, Mr. Robert—*Con.*
Grazing—*Con.*
Leases, 3426
Hanna-Medicine Hat branch line, 4321
Highways, Alberta, 2342
Hogs, grading, 590
Horses, market for, 590
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1878
Expenditure, 1908
Policy, 1903
Indemnity of members, 4237
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4205, 4276
Land valuation, 1878
Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill, 192-3
Lunenburg harbour, 4580
Mackenzie district, half-breed claims, 3409
Manitoba, agricultural conditions, 1906
Medicine Hat customs employees, qu. 3505
National parks
Banff, electric light plant, 3435
Water power leases, 3939
Natural resources of western provinces, 3424
Oil
Leases, 3423
Monitor district, 2514
Speculation in claims, 3423
Postal appointments, 1801, 1806
Postmasters, 1809
Railway mail service, 1801
Canadian National and Canadian Pacific railways, 1791
Saskatoon-Edmonton, 1790
Rural depopulation, 1906
Rural mail delivery, 1801
Seed inspection, weed seeds, 197
Seed Purchasing Commission, 601
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt bill, 4185, 4237-4246
Amdt. six months' hoist, neg. 4246
Settlers
Relief, 3448
Transportation facilities for, 2172
Soldier settlement, 2024
Land valuation, 1878
Salvage cases in Quebec, 2029
Steamship services, 2171, 2172
Inspection of, 2178
Stockyards, discrimination, 192
Stumping machines, duty, 3486
Tariff, agricultural conditions and, 1907
Tree-planting association, 3415
Water power leases, 3422
Western provinces, conditions in, 1903

Garland, Mr. E. J. (Bow River)
Advisory Fuel Committee, 4691
Agricultural conditions, 1201

Garland, Mr. E. J.—*Con.*
Alberta
Coal resources, 801, 1275, 4692
Insolvent farmers, 1202
Arctic expedition, new ship, 4702
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4069, 4078-4126
Business and powers of banks, amdt., agency, 4093, withdrawn, 4094
Interest rate, 4125
Bank mergers, 4237
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3211
Banks and banking
Pressure on farmers, 1202
Profits, 1209
Buffalo, slaughter of, 4702
Business of the House, private members' day, 1158
Cahill, Mr., speech on immigration, 1209
Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, war claims, qu. 3142
Canada-West Indies steamship service, 3378, 3383, 3809
Amdt. to reduce, 3395, neg. 3398
Trade agreement, 3392
Canadian Forestry Association, grant, 3414
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, advance, 3824, 3838
Canadian National railways
Advance of $1,550,000, 4694
Branch lines bill, 4308-22, 4694
Hanna-Warden-Loverna railway, qu. 4436
Canadian Pacific railway
Dividends, 1203
Net earnings, 1130
Canned salmon, shipment via Panama canal, 2519, 2615, 3275
Coal. *See also under this title,* Alberta
Alberta, shipment to Ontario, 1163
Bituminous, duty on, 1275
Combines bill, 2616
Commodity prices, increase in, 1084
Copper bounty bill, 3238, 3241
Credits, function, Mr. (Mr. Irvine) 647
Customs duty on goods shipped from one Canadian port to another, 2519, 2615, 3275
Dairy Industry Act 1914 Amdt. bill, 4253
Dominion Lands and Parks, salaries, 3251
Dredging, maritime provinces, 1011
Emigration to the United States, 1206
Employment service, director of, 1676
Esquimalt dry dock, 2673
Experimental farm buildings, 4630
Exports, agricultural machinery and farm products, 814
Farmers and bankruptcy, 3211
Farming equipment, 1088
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt bill, 4540

Garland, Mr. E. J.—*Con.*
Fish culture, 3371
Fishing schooner race, 115
Fuel and power resources, 801, 3427
Fuel supply, M. (Mr. Church) 1275
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 327
Government publications, distribution, 1715
Grain, Canadian, adulteration at United States ports, 3649, 3962
Hamilton public building, 4628
Hanna-Warden and Loverna-Warden branch lines, 4308, 4322, 4436
Harbours and rivers, 1001
Hector celebration, grant, 4705
M. to reduce, 4706
Historical celebrations, grants for, 4706
Homestead inspectors, 3251
Hoppe and Isenburg leases, cancellation, 3146
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1208
Agreement, signing of, 1976
Empire settlement scheme, 1204, 1205
Immigration, population, natural increase, 1871-1921, 1207
Literature, misrepresentations, 1203
National railways and, 1121
Policy, 1200
Sifton, Sir Clifford, statement, 1204
Steamship companies and, 1201
"The Unseen Hand," 1201
Total expenditure on, 1208
Indemnity of members, 4242
Indians
Blackfeet reserve, 2148
British Columbia, 2163
Chieftainship, 2148
Greater production, 2150
Prices charged to, qu. 3142
Interest, 4107, 4125
International boundary, survey and demarcation, 3248
Irrigation, surveys and inspections, 3430
Land leasing, 1101
Lightkeepers' salaries and allowances, 3352
Marine biological board, 3371
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, salary, 3352
National monument, Connaught place, Ottawa, 1021
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 3985
Northwest territories, new ship, 4702
Peguis, Saulteaux Indian chief, monument, 4704
Penitentiaries, 770
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3870
Pickled fish, inspection of, 3367
Plamondon, Alberta, dredging, 1013
Political patronage, 3347

Garland, Mr. E. J.—*Con.*
Port Colborne elevator, 4690
Prince Edward Island, car ferry claim, 4678
Printing bureau, 1710
Proportional representation, single transferable vote, 1660
Public buildings
Maritime provinces, 4614
Saskatchewan, 4629
Radiotelegraphy, 3374
Renovated butter, 4253
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 776
Royal Mail Packet Company's boats, 3390
St. Lawrence ship channel, 3341
Sackville public buildings, 4613
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4184, 4242
Deduction for non-attendance, 4242
Steamship services, 4702
Canada-West Indies, 3378, 3383, 3395, 3809
Subsidies, grants and bonuses, 3414
Toronto seed branch building, 4621
Water powers, development of, 3422
Welland canal, lumber imports for, qu, 1867
Western wheat crop and taxes, 1220
West Indies
Steamship service, 3378, 3383, 3395, 3809
Trade with, 3395

Garland, Mr. W. F. (Carleton)
Caraquet railway, purchase price, qu. 1258
Coal imports and production, qu. 490
Daylight saving, Ottawa, qu. 2612
Ottawa-Pembroke highway, qu. 2085
Soldier settlement, farms in Carleton county, qu. 1031

Gasoline. *See also* Oil
Price of, 2547
Short measure, 810

Gaspé Peninsula
Forest fires, relief, 4010
Natural resources, 1242
Railway facilities, 4186, 4197, 4307
Steamship services, 2176

Gauvreau, Mr. C. A. (Témiscouata)
Business of the House
Private members' day, 1159
Wednesday evening sittings, 1163, 1995, 2518
Canadian National railways
Intercolonial pensioners, passes, qu. 2418
Superannuation, qu. 2418
Civil service superannuation, qu. 940, 3266
Forest fires, relief, 4010
Labrador gold rush 1995, qu. 2696
Lightkeepers' salaries, 3351

Gauvreau, Mr. C. A.—*Con.*
Macphail, Miss, members and party funds, 4238
Printing, Joint Committee on, Reports
First, 1156
Second, 2252, 2295
Third, 3261, 3581
Fourth, 4009, 4436
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4238

Gélinas, Mr. J. N., postmaster, St. Barnabé Nord, 1830

Gendron, Mr R. M. (Wright)
Public Works paymaster, qu. 1257

General Election. *See* Elections, Election of 1921

Geneva, International Labour Conference, 1441, 1539. *See also* Labour

Genoa Conference
Tariffs
Economic warfare, 3053
Stability, 3053

Geodetic Survey
Expenditure, qu. 1634, 3073. *See also* Mines; Surveys
Investigation, etc., 3245

Geological Survey. *See also* Mines; Surveys
British Columbia, 2504
Estimates, 2504, 3197
Expenditure by provinces, 2508
New Brunswick, explorations in, 2504
Overlapping, 2508
Revenue, 2510

George, Little, deportation of, qu. 1704

George, Right Hon. David Lloyd. *See* Lloyd George

Georgetown wharf, 4587

Georgian Bay
Canal. *See* Canals
Ports, grain handling, qu. 620

Georgetown-Montague railway, 128

German, Mr. W. M. (Welland)
Civil Service Act 1919 Amdt bill (Seasonal or temporary employment) 666
Companies Act Amdt. bill, 435
French treaty, wines, 452, 2225
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2184
Redistribution, Welland county, 667
St. Lawrence river waterway, 3762
Water powers, 3784
Sales tax, 4414, 4427, 4431
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 4414
Welland canal construction, 3762, 3784

Germany. *See also* France
Canadian Pacific railway shares, 2496
Franco-German relations, 4652
Franco-Prussian War indemnity, 3070
Immigration from, 1094
Nickle, shipments to during war, 4371
Reichsrat, constitution of, 1372
Reparations, 2498, 4653, 440, 4053
Investigation by Hon. William Pugsley, qu. 4753. *See also* Pugsley
M. (Mr. Woodsworth) for withdrawal of of Canada's claims, 280, 311, 330, 332
Rhineland, cost of occupation, qu. 2696
Ruhr valley, occupation by France, 2748, 2822
War claims. *See also that title*
Investigation, qu. 1486, 2946
Wool-combing industry, 2866

Gervais, Mr. Théodore (Berthier)
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4243
Personal explanation, 4249

Gibeau, Mrs., postmistress, Morinville, 1028

Girl Guides, grant, 114, 3954

Girrard Bridge Company, charter, 1008

Gladstone, Right Hon. W. E., British tariff reduction 3050

Glanders. *See* Live Stock, Health of Animals

Gold. *See also* Mines and Minerals; Labrador
Export of prohibited 4249, 4405
Gold standard, 4249, 4405, 4666. *See also* Bank Act Amdt. bill

Golf Course, Jasper park, 3435

Good, Mr. W. C. (Brant)
Acland, Mr. F. A., 1675
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 1314, 4034, 4063, 4066, 4078-4103, 4141-59
Amdt., bank charters extended for one year, 4141, neg. on div. 4147
Charters, terms of, 1314
Montreal Standard, editorial, 4142
Point of order, 4055
Shareholders' audit, 4088
"Sincerity and integrity" 4067
Banking and Commerce Committee, proceedings, 4142
Banting, Dr. F. G. annuity, 4676
Bees, suppression of foul brood in, 4675

Good, Mr. W. C.—*Con.*
Board of Audit bill, 4369
British preference
Canadian ports direct importation, 3456
Manufacturing industries, and, 3472
Business of the House
Bills not distributed, 4104
Private members' day, 1160
Supply, M. to postpone, 3669
Cadet services, 883
Canadian National Railways bills
Branch lines construction, 4401
Securities, 4526
Capitalistic system and labour organizations, 2895
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 568
Civil Service patronage, 368
Class antagonism, prevention of, 1233
Combines bill, registrar, inquiry, 2624
Commercial union, 3906, 3911
Conversion loan, qu. 386
Co-operation, industrial relations, 2895
Copper bounty bill, 4374
Credit and industry, M. (Mr. Irvine) 645
Dairy Industry Act Amdt. bill, 4252, 4263, 4270
Dehydrated sulphate of copper, duty, 3480
Dehydration of fruits and vegetables, 4674
Deputy ministers' salaries, 4673
Estimates, method of discussion, 4614-6
Experimental farms
Buildings, 4630
Overlapping, 4633
Export Act Amdt. bill, pulpwood, 4396
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4272
Fertilizers, duty, 3487
Foreign relations, 4659
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 341
Health of animals, 4676
Hemp bounty, 3913, 4390
Hindu immigrants, franchise, 4660
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1118
Hindu, 1120
Policy, 1116-1120
Imperial Conference 4640-4666
Agenda, opportunity for discussion, 4660
Confidential matters, 4660
Preferential tariff, 4661
Imperial Economic Conference, 4659, 4666
Agenda, 4250
Interest rate, 4131
International questions, opportunity for discussion, 3998
Joint industrial councils, 1655

Good, Mr. W. C.—*Con.*
Labour
Cheap, 1118
Estimates, reduction in, 1643
Gazette, editor, 1671, 1675
Lack of Confidence, M. (Mr. Irvine) 220, 222
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4227
Land, vacant, taxation of, 1104, 1118
League of Nations, 3998
Linen yarn duty, 3900
Liquor exports and imports, 3704
Macphail, Miss, members and party funds, 4239
Manila fibre bounties, 4369
Merchants' bank, investigation, 4068, 4156
Money, purchasing power of, 4666
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll)
Sub-amdt. (Mr. Good) that legislation be submitted before end of session, 3567
Point of order, 3571
Petroleum bounty, 3916, 3918
Powell River Paper Company, 2895
Privilege, question of veracity, 2181
Proportional representation, 427
Lord Bryce, 391
M. for alternative vote in single-member constituencies, 388
Multi-member constituencies, M., 389
Protection and industries, 3472
Public debt, maturing obligations, 3822
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4396
Race-track betting, M., 494, 709, 764
Railways and canals dept., salaries, 3195
Raney, Hon. W. E., letter from, 2181
Reciprocity with United States, 3905
Offer to negotiate, 3908
Renovated butter, 4252, 4263, 4270
Rideau Hall expenditure, 4627
Rural mail carriers, names and addresses, 3144, 3264
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4239
Stationery, embossed, 1716
Tariff stability, 3054
Toronto
Casualty clearing station, 4621
Seed branch building, 4621, 4622
Typewriters and parts, duty, 3485
Unearned increment, appropriation by state, 1119
United States tariff, 1119
White, Mr. James, salary, 4667
Woollen goods, prices, 3463

Good roads. *See* Highways

Goods, Marking of. *See* Imports and Exports

Goodspeed, Mr. F. C., St. Croix harbour, 2900

Gordon, Mr. George N. *See* Deputy Speaker

Gordon, Sir Charles, director Bank of Montreal, 4022

Gosse-Millerd Canning Company, Vancouver, shipments, 2519, 2615

Gouin, Hon. Sir Lomer (Minister of Justice)
Admiralty Act Amdt. bill, 1080, 2051, 2204, 3318
Alien enemy property, claim against United States, 3823
Appeals from convictions for indictable offences bill, 4250
Attorney General of Ontario vs. Wholesale Grocers, decision, 2052
Bankruptcy Act
Administration, 780
M. (Mr. Casgrain) 1523
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 2252, 3085-3127, 3209-21
Farmer and, 3211
Senate amendments, 4201
Bonded liquor warehouses, 2404
Brenner, Meyer, release from penitentiary, 1975
British Columbia liquor law administration, 2423
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2284, 2404-16, 2419-23
Capital punishment, 769
Criminal Code Amdt. bills
Betting information, 1483, 2281
Opium joints, etc., 2281
Publication of evidence in marriage or divorce proceedings, 1971, 2053
Directorships, 4024
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 2355
Good, Mr., statement with regard to Hon. W. E. Raney, 2182
Guessing competitions, 733
Hoppe-Isenberg leases, 3128
Judges Act Amdt. bill, 3264, 3452, 3604
Justice
Administration of, Yukon territory, 705
Department, estimates, 705
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4230
Lake of the Woods Regulation Act repeal bill, 2885, 4163, 4179, 4185
Liquor, government control, 2406
Litigated matters, expenses, 779
Northwest Territories Act Amdt. bill, 180, 270
Senate amendments, 2050
Pecuniary claims convention, 779
Penitentiaries, 706
Estimates, 770

Gouin, Hon. Sir Lomer—*Con.*
Petition of Right Act Amdt. bill, 2639, 3127
Fiats, 3224
Race-track betting. *See also under this title,* Criminal Code Amdt. bills
M. (Mr. Good) 738, 743
Royal Canadian Mounted Police
Legal adviser, 778
M. (Mr. Woodsworth) for disbandment, 1147
Naturalization, 778
Pensions, 776
Reorganization, 776
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4236-48
Tariff stability, ref. to, 2819
Washington, visit of Canadian ministers to, 3823
Yukon Act Amdt. bill, 4247
Yukon territory, administration of justice, 705

Gould, Mr. O. R. (Assiniboia)
Accredited herd system, 587
Agricultural conditions in West, 1357
Agriculture, assistance to, 3237
Annual drill, 4636
Artificial silk duty, 3452
Australia, land settlement, 1389
Automobile accidents, 3958
Belle river harbour, 4610
Bienfait briquetting plant, 3206
British and foreign news service, 4713
Budget, 2951; congratulations to Finance Minister; last two budgets disappointing; Liberal promises and performances; tariff planks of 1896 and 1919; broken pledges, 2951; reciprocity; Liberal platform of 1919, duties upon implements of production; appeal to the West; speeches of the Minister of Agriculture; curtain lectures to Progressives, 2952; agricultural conditions; municipal taxation, non-payment; advice to farmers; more work and mixed farming; Canada a great exporting country; charge of extravagance unfounded; utterances of Mr. Motherwell, 2953; combines; lake freights; terminal elevators; Price, Waterhouse & Company report; elevator profits; income tax; unearned income, 2954; harbour facilities; free sites to elevator companies, Fort William; land speculators; stumping machines; tariff on implements of production and necessaries of life; amendment; special committee on the

Gould, Mr. O. R.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
tariff; tariff revision; permanent tariff commission to investigate industries, 2955; the "say-so" of tariff beneficiaries; watered stock, dividends; debt; direct taxation; government ownership, 2956; bounties; flax industry; hemp industry; special privileges; oleomargarine; protected industries; Progressive party and power, 2957
Business profits tax, 4489
Canada Grain Act, administration, 4710
Canadian National parks and historic sites, 3408
Canadian National Railways
Branch lines construction bill, 4198, 4325
Paris offices, 3679
Public ownership, 3679
Canadian National Safety League grant, 3953, 3958
Cheque tax, 3932
Chief Electoral Officer, salaries, 4001
Combines bill, 2627
Copper bounty bill, 3235, 3241, 4375
Dehydrated sulphate of copper, duty, 3480
Deputy ministers
Perquisites, 4669
Salaries, increase, 4669, 4673
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 2386
Dredging, Fort William and Port Arthur, 3341
Emigration to the United States, 1389
Esquimalt dry dock, 2673
Experimental farms, 468, 4632
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4271, 4273
Free trade, Progressive party and, 1196
Freight rates, Railway Commission, 1762
French treaty, 442
Fuel supply, 799
Grain and grain trade
Grain commissioners, salaries, 4710
Grain unsold, 273
Marketing of grain, M. (Mr. Millar) 296
Mixing of grain, 1388
Royal commission to inquire into, 1210
Wheat in farmers' hands, Saskatchewan, 1975
Harbours and rivers, Manitoba, 4589
Health of animals, 577, 587
Hector celebration, 4636
Hemp bounty bill, 4382
Hudson Bay railway, M. (Mr. Knox) 1079
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1357, 1878
Child, 1470

Gould, Mr. O. R.—*Con.*
Immigration—*Con.*
Policy, 1356, 1387
Publicity, special writers, 1874
Income tax, agricultural forms, 4498
Income War Tax Act 1917 Amdt. bill, 4498
Indians, agricultural production, 2162
Interest rates on land payments, 1088
Labour Gazette correspondents, 1627
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4235
Liberal platform of 1919, 2853
Linen yarn duty, 3900
Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill, 2201, 2203
Maritime provinces, public expenditure, 4586
Military hospitals, 673
Moose mountain
Forest reserve, insect pests, 3453
Indian reserve, qu. 706
Pleasure resort, 3408
Municipal taxation unpaid, 2768
Parliament buildings
Estimated and actual cost, 1725
Tower, 1722
Passports, issuing of, 4707
Peebles-Lampman branch railway, 4325
Petroleum bounty, 3920
Prices of binders and labour, 1886
Printing bureau, new building, 1738
Protection
Applications for, 3235
Granted without investigation, 3489
Public expenditure, apportionment of, 4559, 4560
Pugsley, Hon. William, appointment, 2503
Pugsley, and Meighen, Messrs., exchange of compliments, 2503
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4709
Purchasing Commission, 3951
Raisins and dried currants, duty, 3475
Reciprocity
Agreement of 1911, 2854
Agricultural implements, 3499
Boots and shoes, 3499
Coal, 3499
Riordan Pulp and Paper Company, business profits tax, 4491
St. John, N. B., visit to by members of parliament, 2503
St. Lawrence river waterway, 3788
School lands
Balance due on purchase price, 1389
Unpaid taxes, 4205
Seed inspection, 197-8
Shipping combine, 4235
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, salaries, 669
Steamship subsidies, 4004
Topographical survey, towers, 2512
Trade commissioners, 1840

Gould, Mr. O. R.—*Con.*
Tuberculosis in cattle, 587
Welland canal construction, 3788
Western provinces, conditons in, 1357, 1388

Government. *See also* Legislation
Appointment of supporters, 2710
Burdensome and costly, 2719
Business principles applied to, 2806
Canada a difficult country to govern, 2796, 2852, 3002, 3023, 3074
Capitalistic hold upon, 2726
Civil government, retrenchment, 2964
Commission, by, 428, 4037, 4039
Committees, by, 2979
Cost of, 1153, 2785, 2805, 2968, 3027
Increasing, 2712, 2756
"Cuckoo" 3451, 3510
Decentralization of, 66
Departments, increase in cost of, 2970
Difficulties of, 2796
Duplication and overlapping of services, 2805
Economy, 2816, 2823, 2825, 2831, 2842, 2921, 2950, 2959, 2963, 2969, 3043, 3073, 3076, 4236
Indemnity of members, 4236
New methods of, 2914
Public departments, consolidation, 3341
Taxation unaccompanied by, 2997
Financial control of, 2812
Group government, 1427
Senate and, 1378
Supply, amdts. to, 1299
Inconsistency, 2990
Invisible, 2812
Irresponsible, 2979
Offices, directory of, qu. 2085
Officials, travels of, qu. 283, qu. 343
Order in Council, by, 4354, 4487. *See also* Orders in Council
Policies, review of, 407,409
Resignation of. See Lack of Confidence Vote
Responsibility of, 2805
Retrenchment, 2805
Too much from Ottawa, 3434

Government Ownership. *See* Public Ownership

Government Printing. *See* Printing

Government Publications. *See also* Editorial Committee; Printing
Agricultural, 598, 1428
Distribution of, 1712, 3266
Fisheries, 3364
Interior department, 3443

Government Publications—*Con.*
Mines and Geological Survey, 3197
Printing, 811
Reduction in number and volume, 1671
Waste in, 1734
Waste paper sold, 1713
Judge Snider's report, 1714
Governor General
Address, acknowledgement of, 1256
Expenditure, 4627
Governor General's cars, repairs, 4691
Royal assent, 4755. *See also that title*
Speech on opening of Parliament, 2; travels in western Canada and Yukon; improvement in economic conditions; trade conventions with France and Italy; Canadian National Railways consolidation; Great Lakes shipping; anti-combines and trusts legislation; cattle embargo; abundant harvest; immigration publicity campaign; Bank Act revision; redistribution; Postal Conference; Vimy Ridge site, 2-3
Speech on prorogation, 4756
Vimy Ridge memorial, 2, 1631
Governor in Council, judicial or administrative power, 1912
Grading of Seeds. *See* Seed Inspection
Graham, Hon. George P. (Minister of National Defence; Minister of Railways and Canals from April 28, 1923.)
Address in reply, 54; The late Minister of Railways, 54; new members; Mr. Forke, 54-55; the railway problem, mileage of Canadian National railways; value of property; employees, 55; history of acquisition and amalgamation, 55-63; Canadian Northern, acquisition, 55-57; Grand Trunk Pacific, 58-59; Grand Trunk acquisition, 59-60; amalgamation under one board of directors, 60; formal transfer of Grand Trunk, 60-61; amalgamation of Canadian National and Grand Trunk, 61; purchase of rolling stock, 61; establishment of headquarters, 62-63
Advisory Fuel Committee, 1278, 4692
Agriculture estimates, form of, 610
Alaskan, wreck of, 3173
Ammunition, 884, 1740, 1741
Appointment as Minister of Railways and Canals, 2295
Atherley bridge, 3648
Baie St. Paul-St. Urbain railway, 4197
Belle river harbour, 4599, 4606
Bridges, international and interprovincial, 2342

Graham, Hon. George P.—*Con.*
British mails, delay in, 2694
Brockville rifle range, 889
Bruederheim branch line railway, 4316
Business of the House
Motions, anticipatory, 3327
Privilege, Mr. Clark, 1911
Questions
Involving lengthy answers, 622
Passed as orders for returns, 939, 4303
Placed on order paper without members' knowledge, 939
Unanswered, 4455
Supply, calling of, 2296
Cadet services, 877
Canada Highways Act Amdt. bill, 2253, 2338, 2469, 2470. *See also under this title,* Highways
Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, Sir Henry Thornton, 2983, 3208, 3845
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Advances, 3377, 3798, 3824, 3841
Deficits, 3816
Earnings and expenditure, 3399
Lease of freighters, 3848
Negotiation for sale of ships, 1976
Canadian National Railways, 55-63
Advances
$73,000,000, 1619, 3610, 3650
$13,099,493.34, 1764, 3376
$1,550,000, 4692
Statements of appropriation, 1922-23, 1923-24, 3789
Annual statement of minister, 1558
Audit staff, transfer from Moncton, 575
Balfour, Colonel, reported appointment, 2794
Branch lines construction bill, 3265, 3646, 4188, 4197, 4303-4344, 4397, 4694
Expenditure, appropriation of by Parliament, 4400
Finance, 4319, 4330
Rejection by Senate, 4695
Chicago, traffic originating at, 1760
Coal. *See also under this title,* Fuel
Bituminous, duty, 1278
Maccan and River Hebert mines, 1027.
Correspondence, inquiry for, 244
Dominion Express Company, contract, termination, 2473
Employees' pension, 288
Estimates, 1619
Opportunity to discuss, 3703
Expenditure, 4304
Express business and sale of electric lines bill, 2392, 2470, 2479
Radial railways, sale of, 2479, qu. 2612
Freight cars, interchange, 4697

Graham, Hon. George P.—*Con.*
Canadian National Railway—*Con.*
Express and electric lines—*Con.*
Freight rates, 1620. *See also under this title,* Freight Rates
Coal, on, 1278, 1280
Grand Trunk, 58-60
Gratuities to directors and officials, royal commission, 1665, 1976
Ocean ports, 1760
Providence, 1762
United States, 1762
Hanna, Mr. D. B., retirement of, 1666
Hudson Bay railway and, 1067
Insurance of mortgaged premises bill, 1635, 2048, 2105
Insurance, rates of, statement, 2106
Intercolonial, 1760
Pensions, 3196
Management
Non-interference with, 2472, 3670
Responsibility and powers, 3615, 3654
Maritime region, boundaries, 1754
Mileage, 55, 3197
Moncton and Buctouche railway, 3646
Ocean ports, 1760
Operating deficits, 3701
Paris offices, 3208, 3611, 3626, 3650, 3681, 3682, 4514
M. (Mr. Stevens) 3670
Pre-audit, 3701
Public ownership, 2475, 3670, 4198
Railway Commission and, 666
Regions, boundaries of, 1754
Retiring allowances to officials and directors, 1484
Robb, Mr., 2471
St. John station, 3646
St. John terminals, 2481, 4311
Securities bill, 4515
Thomas, Mr. A. J., appointment, 2794
Thornton, Sir Henry, 3670, 3675
Appointment
Agreement tabled, 574
Correspondence, 495
Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, 2983, 3208, 3845
Toronto
Approaches and terminals, 4198
Office building, 1664, 3629
Viaduct and union station, 4326, 4336, 4452
Toronto Suburban railways, sale of, qu. 2612
Transcontinental
Conditions and prospects, 3681
Fortin & Moffatt, claim, 3646
Quebec port and, 3681

Graham, Hon. George P.—*Con.*
Canadian National Railway—*Con.*
Transcontinental—*Con.*
Unification, 1666, 3196
Chinese immigration bill, 2332
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 550
Civil Service
Postmasters, appointments, 1823, 1827
Returned soldiers, 1773
Copper bounty bill, 4373
Credits, M. (Mr. Irvine) 645
Demers, Mr. Amedee, contract, 1977
Deputy ministers, French-speaking, 1807
Desbarats, Mr. G. J., 3342
Electric power, exportation, M. (Mr. Deslauriers) 665
Estimates, civil government, form of, 610, 668
Excise taxes, payment with postage stamps, 1818
Fiset, Sir Eugene, retirement, 3342
Forest preservation, 3416
Freight rates
Coal, 1278, 1280
Comparison, 1620
Crowsnest pass agreement, 1930
Equalization, 3192
Railway rates, M. (Mr. Clark) 1925
Fuel supply, 793
Advisory fuel committee, 1278, 4692
Interstate Commerce Commission, investigation, 1279
M. (Mr. Church) 1278
Gaspe peninsula, railway facilities, 4197
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 280
Governor General's cars, repairs, 4691
Grande Prairie railway, 4200
Grants to military and rifle associations, 889
Haileybury armoury and post office, 4616
Highways. *See also under this title,* Canada Highways Act
Bradford-Barrie, 2489
Canada Highways Commissioner, staff, 2489, 3173
Federal grant, 519
Hamilton-Brantford, 2492
Ontario, 2490
Statements
Summary of projects under agreement, 2491
Tabulated, 3174
Hudson Bay railway,
Canadian Air force, 1749
Construction vote, 4681
Dominion lands, sale of, 1068
Feasibility of route, 1068
M. (Mr. Knox) 1066

Graham, Hon. George P.—*Con.*
Hudson Bay railway—*Con.*
McArthur, J. D. & Co., refund, 4687, 4690
Port Nelson Terminal, 3647
Repair of second 118 miles, 1070, 4198
Turning first sod, 1069
Welland canal and, 1068, 3779
Work this year, 4310
Hydro electric power, radial railways, 2475
Immigration, Canadian National railways and Canada Colonization Association, 3633
Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island employees, pensions, 3196
Inverness railway, 4198
Isle Perrot bridge, 3646
Kent Northern railway, 4197
Lack of Confidence, M. (Mr. Irvine) 236
Lindsay arsenal, 883
Militia Pension Act Amdt. bill, 1740, 2053, 2086
Moncton-Buctouche railway, 3646, 4197
Murray Bay-Nairn Falls railway, 4197
National Defence
Ammunition, 884
England from, value and quantities, 1740
Quantity on hand, 1741
Annual training, 859
Cadet service, 877
Canadian Air Force, 1748
Camp Borden, 1749, 1775
Central repair shops, 1750
Equipment, 1778
Forestry protection work, 1776
Mail carrying, 1775
Operation, maintenance, repairs, 1774
Clothing and necessaries, 883
Department, salaries and contingencies, 901
Dominion arsenal, Quebec, 1740-4
Bonus to employees, 1751, 1772
Expenditure, 1744
Estimates, 859, 1740
Grants to rifle associations, 889
Military districts, reduction of, 868
Military properties, maintenance, 889
Militia expenditures, statement of, 1747
Officers retired, 890
Permanent force, 892
Schools of instruction, 900
Staff
Pay, 891
Reduction, 1773
Naval service, 902
Department of National Defence and, 3342
War claims, adustment of, Llandovery Castle, 1745
North Essex by-election, 4606

Graham, Hon. George P.—*Con.*
Nova Scotia miner's strike, use of troops, 868, 893
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3571
Pacaud, Mr. Lucien T., 1833
Paradis, Mr. T., claim, 4691
Petition of Right Act Amdt. bill, 3127
Postmaster General, absence through illness, 1816, 1826
Post Office
Department
Deputy postmaster general, appointment, 1805, 1807, 1826
Estimates, 1778, 1815
Excise taxes, payment in postage stamps, 1815
Printing, 1818, 1820
Revenue not attribuable to postal service, 1815, 1818, 1820
Salaries, 1780, 1794
Staff, reductions 1824
Hayes, Mr. John J., dismissal of, 1687
Letter carriers, bonus, 1784
Mail contractors, 3144
Mail service, 1778
Postal rates
Reduction of, 1780
Special delivery, 1873
Postmasters
Appointments held in suspension, 1832
Clementsport, 1797
Woodbridge, 1823
Railway mail service, 1783, 1786, 1801, 1805
Rural mail service
Anderson, Mr. C., 1823
Carriers, 1784, 3264
Compensation for loss, 1833
Legal holidays, 1804
Names and addresses, 3144
Routes, spur lines, 1826
Statistics of, 1801
Western provinces, 1802
Extension, 1790
Saskatoon, accommodation, 1785
Toronto
New building, 1780
Revenue, 1780
Prince Edward Island railway
Car ferry terminals claim, 4676
Pensions, 3196
Railway employees, death of, 3196
Public buildings
Ontario, 4615
Saskatchewan, 4629
Public ownership of railways, 3670, 4198
Radial railways, 2475
Toronto street railway, 2475

Graham, Hon. George P.—*Con.*
Public Works, expenditure, apportionment, 4578
Pugsley, Hon. William, appointment and salary, 3043
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 3417
Royal commission, 4709
Railway Commission, 3188
Annual report, 1659
Carvell, Hon. F. B., alleged statement of Mr. Motherwell, 3188
Constitution and work of, 3192
Railways and Canals
Bell, Major Graham A., 3195
Estimates, 1764, 3173, 3376, 3760
Salaries, 3195
Surveys and inspections, 3648
Returned soldiers, Civil Service, 1773
Rideau canal, 4691
Royal Canadian navy, 903. *See also under this title,* Naval Service
St. John and Quebec railway bill, 3403, 3145
St. Lawrence river waterway, 665
Agreement with United States, 3772
Provincial undertakings, 3782
St. Lawrence ship canal, 3647
Sunny Brae-Guysborough branch line, 4316
Thornton, Sir Henry. *See also under this title,* Canadian National Railways
Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, director, 2983, 3208, 3845
Reported statement on immigration, 2795
Toronto
Harbour improvements, 4578
Street railway, 2475
Union station, 4326, 4336, 4452
Viaduct, 4325, 4336, 4452
Trent canal improvements, 3647
Triplets, bonus for, inquiry, 3146
Troops, use of in labour troubles, 868, 893
Unrest, alleged in Western Canada, 4514
War claims adjustment, 900
War medals, 1744
Warlike stores, 900
Water powers, jurisdiction, 665
Welland canal construction, 3761, 3771, 3778
Hudson Bay railway and, 1068, 3779
Request for, 3073, 3772

Grain and Grain Trade. *See also* Address; Agriculture; Budget; Freight Rates; Lake Grain Rates
Additional outlets for, 53
Alberta production, 1435
Bankers and, 4048
Bank liens upon seed grain and crop, 4102
Barley flour, sales tax, 4431
Canada Grain Act
Administration, 781, 2035, 4709

Grain and Grain Trade—*Con.*
Canada Grain Act—*Con.*
Appeal, 781
Manitoba Court of Appeal, decision, 1210
Licenses, 2299
Litigation, 2045
Canadian National Railways, 3680. *See also that title*
Cargoes, loading of. *See* Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill
Cheque tax charged back to farmers, 3039
Comparative rates on, 78
Crop of 1922, 20
Dockages. *See under this title,* Elevators
Drought, effect on grain production, 3429
Elevators. *See also under this title,* Marketing
Commission, qu. 1867
Co-operative, 2043
Dockages, 782, qu. 1661, 2039, qu. 3141, qu. 3505, qu. 4300
Earnings, 2042
Edmonton, 4716
Facilities, 53. *See also* Vancouver Harbour bill
Fort William and Port Arthur, qu. 4132
Georgian Bay, qu. 620
Government, 2036, 3264
Grain Growers', 2675
Halifax, 4713, qu. 4751
Lethbridge, 4716
Montreal, qu. 385, qu. 1663, 1768, 1974, 3767
Short weight, complaint of, 2037
Multiplication of, 1400
Ontario, 2038, 4716, 4719
Overages, 494, 782, 2039
Port Arthur, qu. 4132. *See also under this title,* Terminals
Screenings, purchase of, qu. 2612, qu. 2697, qu. 3131
Port Colborne, qu. 1029, 4690
Public ownership, 2956
Quebec, 2903, 3768, 4233
St. Croix, 2903
Saskatchewan co-operative, 2779
Screenings, 782, qu. 1484, qu. 1633, qu 1661, qu. 1739, 2042, qu. 2613, qu. 2697, qu. 3131
Seed supplied by. *See* Seed Inspection
Terminal, 3821
Abuses. *See under this title,* Marketing
Fort William and Port Arthur
Dockages, screenings and scalpings, 782, qu. 1484, qu. 1739, 2254, 2867
Sale of, qu. 1633
Free sites, 2955
Maintenance, 810

Grain and Grain Trade—*Con.*
Elevators—*Con.*
Terminal—*Con.*
Montreal, 1768
Price, Waterhouse, report, 2954
Profits, 2954
Vancouver, 1057, qu. 1487. *See also* Vancouver Harbour bill
Addition to, qu. 517, qu. 621
Dockages, 782
Improvement, 2033
Weights, difference in, 2037
Warehousing, qu. 3141
Exports, 2748
Flax, weed seeds and, 4378
France, pre-war production, 2247
Freight cars, shortage of, 4697
Freight rates on, 1914, 3194. *See also* Freight Rates; Hudson Bay Railway; Vancouver Harbour bill; Welland canal
Shipping. *See* Lake Grain Rates bill, *and under this title,* Shipment
French treaty, 455, 2006. *See also* Treaties, French treaty
Gage case, 2592
Gambling in futures, 3058
Grain
Adulteration of Canadian at United States ports, 3649, 3764, 3961
Combine, 4048
Commission. *See under this title* Marketing
Loading at Canadian ports, 3974. *See also under this title,* Shipment
Mixing, 1388, 3764
New varieties, introduction, 483
Samples for exhibitions, 1454
Surveys, qu. 4131
Unsold, 273, 1975, 2748, 2773
Grain Act. *See under this title,* Canada Grain Act
Grain Commissioners, board of, 53, 2036
Commissioners, residence of, 787
Dockage and screenings, 782
Elevator screenings, inquiry into, 2254
Employees, etc., qu. 2207
Lake grain rates, 4218
Names, occupations, etc., qu. 2206
Personnel, 4221
Salaries, 4709
Grain Growers' Guide, Mr. Shaw, 987
Grain Inquiry Commission, 1763, 4710
Lawyers, employment of, 4710
Scott, Mr. D'Arcy, 4711
Handling of. *See* Vancouver Harbour bill
Hudson Bay railway 1032
India, wheat production, 1840

Grain and Grain Trade—*Con.*
Indian reserves, grain production, 1139, 2156
Injustice to western farmers, 1114
Inquiry into trade, etc. 48, 301. *See also under this title,* Marketing
Insect pests and fungous diseases, 2774
Inspection. *See under this title,* Marketing
Lake Grain rates. *See* Freight Rates, Shipping; Lake Grain Rates Bill
Royal commission on, report, 2885
Liverpool Corn Trade Association, shortages, 1764
London Corn Exchange, adulteration, 3649, 3961
Mandscheuri barley, introduction of, 483
Manitoba Court of Appeal, decision, 1210
Marketing, 53. *See also* Hudson Bay Railway; Markets
Costs, 68
M. (Mr. Millar) for commission of inquiry, 288 agreed to as amended, 311
Shipment and, 494
Markets, 1410
Grain unsold, 1975, 2748, 2773
Milling and baking tests, 463
Millfeeds. *See* Feeding Stuffs Act
Montreal
Grain shipments, qu. 1973, 1974
Shortages, 1764
Oats
Acreage and production, 2934
Price, 1388
Ocean freights. *See* Freight Rates, Shipping
Overages, 494, 782, 2039. *See also under this title,* Elevators
Overhead, 1400
Pooling, 1400
Prices. *See also* Immigration; Prices
Comparison with United States. *See under this title,* Marketing, M. (Mr. Millar)
Royal commission recommended, 1209
Sample market at Winnipeg, qu. 345, qu. 494
Screenings. *See under this title,* Elevators, *and also* Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill
Seed. *See* Seed Inspection
Seed grain advances, 3444, 3447
Amount outstanding, 3444
Municipal indebtedness for, 3446
Seed purchasing commission, qu. 279
Shipment, 1032, 2854, 4193, 4714. *See also* Lake Grain Rates bill *and under this title,* Wheat
Canadian and United States ports, 1756, 1767, 1768, 3764
Adulteration, 3649, 3764, 3961
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, qu. 3263, 3812

Grain and Grain Trade—*Con.*
Shipments—*Con.*
Canals, utilization of, 2808, 3763
Congestion, 3767
Quebec, 3768
Cost of, 2808, 2044
Discrimination against Canadian ports, 2960
Diversion to United States railways, 2898
Elevators. *See under this title,* Elevators
Facilities for, 730
Improvement of, 2745
Great Britain, to, qu. 1867
Halifax, from, qu. 1484
Hudson Bay railway, 4681. *See also that title*
Lake, 2959. *See also* Lake Grain Rates
Montreal, to, qu. 385
Pacific coast, 3769
Panama canal, 1921
Portland, St. John and Halifax, from, qu. 1484
Prince Rupert, 151-2
Royal commission on lake rates. *See* Freight Rates, Shipping
St. Lawrence river waterway, 3342, 3763
Shipping rates, 2517, 2613. *See also* Freight Rates
Vancouver, by, 257, 1057
Volume of, 2757
Welland canal, 3763
Wheat, Quebec, qu. 3820
Shortages
Complaints by British importers, 1764, 2037
Transportation, 19, 69, 77, 4222. *See also under this title,* Shipment
United Grain Growers, Calgary, 1408
Warehousing. *See under this title* Elevators
Western grain route, 69, 1924. *See also* Vancouver Harbour bill
Wheat
Bounty on, 1196
Bushels required to purchase agricultural implements, 1912, and 1922, 1408
Canada greatest wheat export country, 2780
Canada third in acreage and production, 2934
Central European competition, 2396
Exports, 2750, 2774, 2780, 2843, 3062. *See also* Imports and Exports
French treaty, 1978
Hard, 2873
Markets, 3068
Marquis III, introduction of, 483
Pool, 2526

Grain and Grain Trade—*Con.*
Wheat—*Con.*
Prices, 628, 1101, 1886, 3004. *See also that title*
Production, 68, 265, 1405, 4224
Reciprocity in, 2993
Rust, 595
Saskatchewan, in farmers' hands, 1975
Screenings as feed for lambs, 2867
United States tariff against, 2823. *See also* United States, Fordney-McCumber tariff
Wheat-growing as permanent operation, 1423
Wheat stem saw-fly, 2774
World competition, 2781
Wheat board, 409, 2548, 2592, 2836, 2857, 3235
Correspondence, 626
Legislation, extension of, 2696, 2740, 2927
Order in council, 2696, 3045
Proceedings under act of 1922, 1636
Profits, 3239
Progressive party and, 3030
Winnipeg sample market, qu. 345, qu. 494

Grain Board. *See* Wheat Board

Grain Commission. *See this title under* Grain and Grain Trade

Grain Growers' Guide reference to, Mr. Shaw, 987

Grain Inquiry Commission. *See* Grain and Grain Trade

Grand Jury System
Abolition of, 2695, 3272
Combines, 2585

Grand Manan, island of
Breakwaters, 945
Population, 2172
Steamship service, 2172

Grand River, Que. wharf, 958

Grand Trunk. *See this title under* Canadian National Railways

Grand Trunk Pacific. *See this title under* Canadian National Railways

Grant, Dr. W. L., Civil Service, 354, 523, 541, 558, 560
Letter to Dr. Roche, 355

Granville, Earl, Canadian Pacific Railway, 1916

Granville Island, taxation, qu. 1485

Grape-Growers. *See* Fruit; Treaties, French Treaty; Wines

Grapes. *See* Fruit

Grasshoppers. *See* Insect Pests

Gratuities. *See* Canadian National Railways, Grand Trunk

Grazing Leases. *See* Dominion lands; Interior

Great Britain. *See also* British Preference
Agricultural conditions, 1861, 2755
Agricultural labourer's strike, 2822
Agricultural products, markets for, 2869
Agricultural representative in, 3291, 4675
Agriculture and free trade, 1858
Ammunition received from, 1740
Baldwin, Right Hon. Stanley, budget, 2824
"British policy" 4652
British preference. *See that title*
Budgets of Chancellor of the Exchequer, 2984, 3001
Canada's relations with. *See* Canada's Participation in War; Imperial Conference; Near East Crisis; Treaties
Capital levy, 2722
Cattle
Embargo, 2871
Markets for, 208, 2871
Shipments to. *See* Live stock
Coal exports, 1263
Conditions in, 2748
Copyright legislation, 2140
Corn laws, abolition of, 1858, 3007
Anti-Corn law league, 1859
Bright, Mr. John, 3013
Peel, Sir Robert, 3050
Prosperity, return of, 3020
Dairy representative in, 3297
"Dangerous agitators from," 3033
Debt
Per capita, 2956
Reduction, 3072
United States to, 2879, 2918
War, 24, 2986
Deportation of Irish men and women, 3158
Depression in, 1854
Dumping ground, 2822
Empire Forestry Conference, 3410
Exchange, refund, 2641, 2658
Exhibitions, 1454, 1467. *See also that title*
Federation of British industries, 2726
Foreign policy, 165. *See also* Near East
Free trade, 2752, 2777, 2854, 3072, 3012. *See also under this title,* Corn Laws
Progress of movement, 3050
Rents, and, 1862
Grey, Earl, 1418
Halibut Fisheries Treaty and, 1308, 4457
House of Lords, constitution of, 1374
Immigration from, 1084, 1218. *See also* Immigration

Great Britain—*Con.*
Immigration—*Con.*
Prepaid passages, 2611
Imports and exports, 2928
Income tax. *See under this title,* Taxation
Industrial revolution, 2723
Liberty of the subject, 3158
National Farmers' union, 2791
National Labour party, policy, 2721
Naturalization. *See* Naturalization Act Amdt. bill
Near East crisis. *See that title*
Necessities of life, taxation, 2789
Parliament, history of. *See* Lack of Confidence
Postal rates, decrease of, 1779
Precedent, 2788
Protection, 2752
Proportional representation, 392
Railways, 1618
Reciprocity treaties with France, 3050
Rural depopulation in, 1854
Shipbuilding, 3072
Surplus, 2823
Taxation, 2796
Expenditure and reduction, 2749
Income tax, 2881, 2986
Exemptions for children, 1383
Reduction, 2913, 3072
Luxuries, 3069
Necessaries, 2754
Reduction of, 2712, 4493
Trade Mark and Designs Act, 2294
Trade with, 3072. *See also* British Preference
Unemployment in, 1205, 2754, 2822
War debt, 24, 2986. *See also under this title,* Debt
Woollen industry, competition, 2958

Great Lakes
Disarmament
Correspondence with United States, M. (Mr. Meighen), 244, 247, 494
Tabled, 1307
Diversion of waters, qu. 3821
Shipping rates on. *See* Freight Rates, Shipping; Lake Grain Rates
Subsidized Steamship services, suggested extension, 2175

Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Waterway. *See* St. Lawrence River Waterway

Great Lakes Transportation Company, lease of freighters to, 3848

Great War Veterans Association
MacNeil case. *See* Disallowance of Nova Scotia Statute

Great War Veterans Association—*Con.*
Oleomargarine, 3547
Pensions. *See that title*
Petition, 4535

Greece
Grecian loan, qu. 623, 2010

Greenway, the late Hon. Thomas, Hudson Bay railway, 1061

Grenville by-election, 4606

Grey, Earl, Canada and the Empire, 1418

Griffenhagen and Associates. *See* Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power)

Grimmer, Mr. R. W. (Charlotte)
Budget, 2898. British preference, increase of; Canadian ports; Canadian National Railways, 2898; railways and transportation; ports, development of; United States, railways, ports and commerce; Passamaquoddy bay, "greatest natural harbour on Atlantic coast; Canadian National Railways, ocean terminals; "Canadian export trade routed by United States ports; Senate committee's report; diversion of grain traffic; Winnipeg-St. Croix direct route; saving in transportation costs; Admiral Sir W. F. W. Owen, report, 2899; Commander Compbell, report; Captain Henry Mowat, report; Hon. Robert Rogers; examination of St. Croix harbour; Mr. E. C. Swan, report; Mr. F. C. Goodspeed, report; 2900; Messrs. Fillies, Kenney and Elliot, master mariners, reports; St. Stephen, industrial centre; advantages of St. Croix from railway point of view; Mr. D. F. Maxwell, statement of mileage, 2901; St. Croix as winter port; small cost of development; construction of railway across state of Maine, 2902; gradients; St. John Journal editorial, 2903
Canadian National Railways, 2898
Talbot, Mr. O., director, qu. 707, qu. 1031, qu. 1258
Harbours and rivers, New Brunswick, 945

Grisdale, Dr. J. H. *See also* Agriculture department
Cattle shipment, 3040
Salary, 610

Groceries. *See* Prices

Grondines wharf, 959

Grosse Isle. *See* Health, Quarantine

Grosses Roches, Que., wharf, 968

Group Government. *See* Government

Group Representation. *See* Proportional Representation

Guarantee. *See* Railways

Guessing Contests, qu. 733. *See also* Criminal Code Amdt. bill

Guthrie, Hon. Hugh (South Wellington)
Admiralty Act Amdt. bill, 2051
Ammunition, 884
Annuities branch, advertising, 1641
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3217
Bankruptcy Act, M. (Mr. Casgrain) 1500
Canadian National Institute for Blind, 693
Canadian National railways, Paris offices, 3633, 3693
Cold Storage Act Amdt bill, 2057
Copyright Act Amdt. bill, 2139, 2288
History of legislation, 2140
Le Droit D'Auteur, 2141
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 2382
Dominion Forest Reserves and Parks Act, 2060
Dominion Fuel Board, 3198
Dredging
Expenditure, 4590
Maritime provinces, 1009
Estimates, time of presentation, 4577
Field crop competitions, 603
French treaty, 2227
Advantages and disadvantages, 2238
Border states
Agreements with, 2231
Concessions to, 2402
Favoured nation treatment, 2232, 2234
Manufacturers and, 2236
Pianos and organs, 2237
Revenue loss through, 2235
Rubber, manufacturers of, 2237
Sewing machines, 2237
Summary of, 2232
Trade results, 2230
Treaty of 1907, 2229
Fruit industry, 598
Fuel supply, 797, 3198
Grand Manan, breakwaters, 945
Grondines wharf, 959
M. to reduce item, 963
Harbours and rivers
Expenditure, 949
Nova Scotia, 944, 4576
Ontario, 981

Guthrie, Hon. Hugh—*Con.*
Industrial Disputes Investigation bill, 2061
Irrigation Act Amdt. bill, 2139
Italian treaty bill, 2402
Labour
Employment Offices Co-ordination Act, 1630
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1627, 1629, 2061
Strikes, 1628
Troops, employment of, 893, 1627
Technical Education Act, 1638
Labour Gazette, correspondents, 1626
Lindsay arsenal, 883
Linen yarns, 3897, 3898
Lunenburg harbour dredging, 4576, 4591
Amdt. to reduce amount, 4577, neg. 4580
Marshall, Mr. Duncan
Appointment, 3314
Political partisanship, 3315
Militia Pension Act Amdt. bill, 2053
Murray Bay wharf, 973
National Defence
Annual training, 859
Arsenal, Quebec, bonus to employees, 1751
Estimates, 859
Nova Scotia strike, use of troops, 893, 1627
Pay of staff, 890
Permanent force, 892
Salaries and contingencies, 901
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2108, 2111, 2182
Ottawa-Hull bridge, 1015
Patents of Invention bill, 2069, 2074, 2078, 2080, 2130
Public Works
Dominon Archives, building, 1730
Dredging, 1009, 4590
Public Works Act, tender and contract, 956
Quebec riots, 893
Society of Chemical Industries, 2069
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment department, amalgamation, 3893
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment Act Amdt. bill, 3892
Soldier Settlement Board, Moss Mr. H. H. compensation, 2030
Supplementary estimates, lack of information, 4576, 4577
Trade and Commerce
Estimates, increase, 2033
Staff, 2031
War claims, adjustment of, 1745
Llandovery castle, sinking, 1746
Vickers Company contract, cancellation, 1746
War medals, 1743
Yarmouth harbour, dredging, 1011

Gypsum Lands. *See* Disallowance of Nova Scotia Statute

Hackland, Capt. J., Hudson Bay route, 1064

Haggard, Sir Rider, immigration, 1206

Hail Insurance. *See* Insurance

Haileybury, armoury and post office, 4615

Halbert, Mr. Robert H. (North Ontario)
Agricultural publications, 598
Crowsnest pass agreement, 2855
Eight-hour day, 1650
Farming, investment to start, 1415
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4275, 4538
Hog grading, 591
Immigration
Farm labourers, 1416
Policy, 1415
Tariff and, 1416
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3554
"Plutocrats and profiteers" 1417
Senate, elective or nominative, 1378
Toronto, expenditure on public buildings, 4621

Half Breed Claims. *See* Dominion Lands Act Amdt. bill; Mackenzie

Halibut Fishery Treaty. *See this title under* Treaties. *See also* Northern Pacific Halibut

Halifax
Camp Hill hospital, qu. 3506
Duties on goods shipped from Vancouver via Panama canal, 2519, 2615
Exodus from, 2400
Grain
Elevator, 4713, qu. 4751
Shipments from, qu. 1484
Immigration building, 4612
Importation through port of. *See* British Preference; Treaties, French, Italian
Naval college, 1744
Naval stores at, 110
Ocean terminals, qu. 4510, qu. 4713, 4751
Port, development of, 109
Quarantine station, 4612
Rockhead hospital, 4613

Halifax-Cape Breton steamship service, 2173

Halifax-Newfoundland steamship service, 2173

Halton County customs officials. *See* Customs and Excise

Hamilton
Harbour commissioners, qu. 912
Public building, 4628

Hammell, Mr. W. J. (Muskoka)
Automobile accidents, 3959
Bracebridge harbour, 4612
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4546
Muskoka harbour improvements, 4612
Redistribution committee, 1660
Reference to, 2884

Haney, Mr. M. J., purchase of steamer Murray Stewart, 3354

Hanging. *See* Capital Punishment

Hanna, Mr. D. B. *See also* Canadian National Railways
Director, Canada Steamship Lines, 3208
Dismissal of, 157
Insurance companies, interest in, 2050

Hanna-Medicine Hat branch line. *See* Canadian National Railways

Hansard. *See* House of Commons, Debates

Hanson, Mr. Richard B. (York-Sunbury)
Ammunition, 887
Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt bill, 2048
Annual drill, 859, 863
Arichat wharf, qu. 2180
Atlantic Fisheries Commission, inquiry, 3365
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4140
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3087-95
Blondin, Mr. C. E., Pierreville, dismissal, qu. 4511
Bonds, interest rate and income tax, 4494
Boudrot, Mr. Edward E., dismissal, qu. 2613
Bridges, New Brunswick, 2342
Business Profits War Tax Act Amdt. bill, 4489
Campbellton wharf, 945
Canada Highways bill, 2339
Canadian National Railways
Audit staff, Moncton, transfer, 574
Branch lines construction bill, 4186, 4189, 4309-22
Coal purchases, qu. 4303, qu. 4511, qu. 4752
Directors, board of, 60
Dominion Express Company, contract, 2473
Express and Electric lines bill, 2471
Fredericton bridge, 3645
Grand Trunk ties, tenders, qu. 3821
Insurance of mortgaged premises bill, 2048
Operating divisions, earnings and expenses, qu. 2298
Paris offices, 3638, 3683
Canadian ports, use by United States fishermen, 3361

Hanson, Mr. Richard B.—*Con.*
Capital punishment, 768
Caraquet and Gulf Shore railway, qu. 204
Carleton county, execution in, 778
Cheque tax, 3931
Chinese immigration bill, 2337
Civil Service
Bonus, 1811
Dismissals, 856
In 1922, 3324
Civil Service Act, violation of, 1794
Coal. *See also under this title,* Canadian National Railways
Cost of, 1813
Railway rates on, 1272, 1813
Congdon, Mr. F. T., K.C.
Administration of Yukon territory, 2299
Appointment as commissioner, qu. 3131
Deep sea fisheries, 3364
Descheneaux, Mr. P., lightkeeper, qu. 4512
Digby harbour, dredging, 4568
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 208, 2375, 2379
Dominion arsenals, 887
East Sandy Cove, 4571
Eastern Harbour, dredging, 4569
Edmundston public buildings, site, 4613
Fishways, 3362
Fuel supply, M. (Mr. Church) 1271
Geological survey, exploration, 2504
Gorman, Mr. L. F., salary, 3360
Grand Manan, breakwaters, 945
Harbours and rivers
New Brunswick, wharves transferred to Dominion, 946
Nova Scotia, 4562
Hayes, Mr., Canadian National Railways, 2471
Hazen, Sir Douglas, appointment, 2498
Highway bridges, international and interprovincial, 2342
Hudson Bay railway, 4310
Construction vote, 4683
Icebreaker Mikula, qu. 1384
Immigration
Child, 1471
Policy in New Brunswick, 1086
Income War Tax Act 1917 Amdt. bill, 4494, 4502
Indians, 2154
Agent at Perth, N. B., 2154
Intercolonial inclusion in Canadian National, 13
International bridges, 2342, 3647
Isle Perrot bridge, 3646
Joggins breakwater, 943
Kent Northern railway, 4189

Hanson, Mr. Richard B.—*Con.*
Labour
Employment bureaus, private, 1630
Labour Gazette, printing, 1712
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4232
La Societe des Artisans Canadiens Francais, 1027
Leblanc, Louis, qu. 285
Lighthouse and lightkeepers
Descheneau, Mr. P., qu. 4512
Maintenance and repairs, 3353, 3354
New lights, 3357
Salaries and allowances, 3352
Little Anse breakwater, Morrison claim, 4573
Magdalen islands wharves, 974
Mail contracts
Sporting mountain, qu. 707, 856
Trois Pistoles, Quebec, 4302
Margaree river salmon fisheries, 2700, qu. 3262, 3367, 3371
Marine agencies, 3351
Marine signal service, 3358
Maritime provinces coal, freight rates, 1813
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, 2615
Meteorological service, 3360
Miramichi smelt fisheries, 1974
Moncton and Buctouche railway, qu. 203, 3646
Morrison, Mr. D. W., 1489
Murray Bay wharf, 973
Murray Stewart, purchase, qu. 203, 3354, 3359
National monument, Connaught place, 1020
Naturalization Act Amdt. bill, 2186
Navigation, aids to, 3357
Nova Scotia, harbours and rivers, 941
Ontario government savings office, qu. 1488
Parliament buildings, 1727
Patents of Invention bill, 2072, 2087
Permanent force, 892
Pilotage
Administration of, 3358
Steamer Eureka, 1364
Port Greville breakwater, 944
Postmasters
Appointments and dismisals, 4534
Angouleme, qu. 3139
Chicoutimi-Saguenay, qu. 3138
Clementsport, N. S., qu. 1363, 1795, 1797, 4534
Frenette, Mr. George, St. Jean d'Evangeliste, qu. 2698
Herbertville, Que., qu. 3139
Labarre, Que., qu. 3138
Larouche, Que., qu. 3137
Pierreville, Que., qu. 4511
St. Bruno, Que., qu. 3140
St. Joseph d'Alma, qu. 3140

Hanson, Mr. Richard B.—*Con.*
Postmasters—*Con.*
St. Peter's, N.S., 1795
Morrison, Mr. D. W., qu. 1488, 1489
Sorel, qu. 1487
Tadoussac, qu. 3139
Post Office Act Amdt. bill, 4534
Post Office department, administration, 1817
Printing bureau, 1710
Public buildings
New Brunswick, 4613
Ontario, 4615
Pugsley, Hon. William, appointment, qu. 1486, 2498, 2504
Rimouski wharf, 977
Rural mail delivery, extension, 1802
Russell, Mr. James, qu. 1868
Ste. Anne des Monts pier, 979
St. John and Quebes railway, 4309
Sale and Inspection of Fruit bill 2105
Sales tax, exemption of hospital supplies, 4432
Senate, M. (Mr. Denis, Joliette) 1369
Smelt-fishing regulations, qu. 1868, 1974
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment bill, 3746
Soldiers Settlement Board, staff, 2020
Sunny Brae-Guysborough branch line, 4316
Telegraph lines
Chicoutimi county, qu. 3138
St. Charles-Peribonka, qu. 3262
Trueman, Mr. W. H., K.C., Winnipeg, appointment to Bench, 1868
Verrault, Mr. Gedeon, dismissal qu. 3140
War claims, 2498
Wharfage tolls, 975
Wrangel island, ownership, 3360

Harbours. *See* Ports; St. Lawrence River Waterway. For individual harbours, *See* Harbours and Rivers
Advances to. *See* Montreal, Quebec, Three Rivers, Vancouver, Harbour Commission bills

Harbours and Rivers, 993, 4554. *See also* Public Works, Dredging
Alberta, 1001, 4589
British Columbia, 2671
Canoe wharf, 1005
Esquimalt dry dock, 2671
Fraser river improvements, 1003-07
Generally, 1002
North Vancouver dry dock, 1002
Port Renfrew, 1008
Salmon arm, 1006
Vancouver. *See also that title*
Stanley Park, 1008
Victoria. *See that title*

Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
Day labour, 950, 956
Expenditure, 83, 947
Generally, 1009
Manitoba, 993, 4589
Red River, 1000
St. Andrew's dam, 1000
Selkirk, 1000
Wanipigow (Hole river), 1000
New Brunswick, 945, 4587
Campbellton, 945
Cummings Cove, 945
Generally, 946
Grand Manan, 945
Head Harbour, 2900
Passamaquoddy bay, 2899
Portage river, 950
St. Andrew's, 2899
St. Croix, 2899
St. John. *See that title*
Salmon river fishways, 3362
Wharves transferred to Dominion government, 946
Nova Scotia, 941, 4554, 4635
Abbott's harbour, 4563
Advocate, 4560
Annapolis Royal, 941
Arichat, qu. 2180
Bass River, 4563
Battery Point, 4563
Black Point, 941
Broad Cove marsh, 4564
Burlington Centre, 4564
Canada Creek, 4564
Canso, 941
Cape St. Mary, 941
Cariboo Island, 4564, 4567
Chapel Cove, 941
Cheverie wharf, 4567
Chimney Corner, 941
Culloden, 4567
Dartmouth, 4568
D'Escousse, 4568
Digby, 942
Dredging, 4568
East Sandy Cove, 4570
Eastern Harbour, 4569
Ecum Secum, 4571
Five Islands, 4571
Fruid's Point, 4571
Generally, 942
Gillis Point, 4571
Grand Narrows, 4572
Half Island Cove, 4572
Halifax. *See that title*
Hampton, 4572
Haulover, 943
Inverness, 4572

Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
Nova Scotia—*Con.*
Joggins, 943
Judique, 943
Leitche's Creek, 943
Little Anse, claim of Mr. T. D. Morrison, 4722, 4572
Little Harbour, 4575
Livingstone's Cove, 4576
Lockeport, 943
Lunenburg, 4576
Dredging, amdt. (Mr. Guthrie) to reduce item, 4577, neg. 4580
Malagash, dredging, 4580
Margaree, 4581
Margaretville, 4581
Meteghan, 4581
North Ingonish, 4582
North Sydney, 4582
Nyanza wharf, 4582
Ostrea Lake, 943
Parrsboro, 4583
Pembroke, 4584
Pictou, 4584
Beach light, 4583
Piper's Cove, 4583
Point Aconi, 4583
Port Beckerton, 4583
Port Greville, 944, 4583
Port Lorne, 4584
Portugese Cove 4584
Riverport, 4584
Round Hill, 4584
Sandford, 4584
Scotch Cove, 4584
Scott's Bay, 4584
Shaw Bay, 4585
Shelburne, 4585
Sheet Harbour West, 4585
Sheguindah wharf, 2690
Ship Harbour, 4586
Smith's Cove, 4585
Sonora wharf, 4585
South Lake, 4585
Summerville, 4586
Windsor, 4586
Yarmouth, 944
Ontario, 2690, 4588, 4594
Bayfield, 981
Belle River, 4594, 4638
M. (Mr. Meighen) to reduce, 4600, neg. 4610
Belleville harbour commissioners, dismissal, qu. 490
Big Bay Point, 981
Blind River, 981
Bracebridge, 4612
Chatham, 982

Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
Ontario—*Con.*
Cloud Bay, 982
Cobourg, 981
Fort William, 2675, 4610
French river improvement works, qu. 620
Generally, 982
Grassmere, 4612
Jackson's Point, 4589
Kincardine, 982
Little Current, 982
Meaford, 983
Midland, 983
Owen Sound, 2690
Port Arthur, 2675, 4610
Port Burwell, 983
Port Elgin breakwater, 2690
Port Maitland, 4589
Rondeau, 983
Southampton, 984
Toronto, 2678. *See also that title*
Prince Edward Island, 945
Beach Point, 4586
Georgetown wharf, 4587
Quebec
Bryant's Landing, 950
Cap de la Madeleine, 950
Chicoutimi, 950
Contrecoeur, 950, 1008
Cross Point, 955
Descente des Femmes, 955
East Templeton, 955
Generally, 968
Grand River, 958
Grondines wharf, 959
M. (Mr. Guthrie) to reduce item, 963
Grosses Roches, 968
La Malbaie, 968
Lanoraie, 969
Lavaltrie, 969
L'Islet, 969
Matane, 970
Montreal. *See that title.*
New Carlisle, 973
Peribonka, 973
Piche Point, 973
Pointe a Elie, Magdalen islands, 974
Point au Pic, Murray Bay, 973
Pointe aux Trembles, 974
Pointe Shea (Amherst) 977
Quebec harbour. *See that title*
Repentigny, 977
Rimouski, 977
Claim of Messrs. Raymond and Talbot, 4588
Riviere du Lievre, 978
Roberval, 978
St. Alexis, 980

Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
Quebec—*Con.*
Ste. Anne des Monts, 979
St. Charles, 980
St. Jean d'Orleans, 980
St. Michel de Bellechasse, 980
St. Omer, 980
Ste. Petronille, 4588
Three Rivers, 3399, 3963. *See also that title*
Ville Marie, 981
Saskatchewan, 1001, 4589
Wharfage tolls, 975
Wharves, revenue, 976
Winter ports, 2902

Harington, Sir Charles. *See* Near East Crisis

Harness, duty on, 3048

Harris, Mr. Joseph H. (East York)
Agricultural instruction grant, 608
Agriculture department, salaries, 611
Alderson claim, hog cholera, 582-3
Budget, 2804. Congratulations to Finance Minister; Bank Act revision; tariff; former criticism of minister; irritating taxation; sales tax; increase passed on to consumer; application to foreign and domestic goods, 2804; encouraging the middlemen; dilemma of the Minister of the Interior; free trade and protection; cost of civil government; balanced budget; Civil Service salaries; duplication and overlapping of services; retrenchment; ship of state drifting; Liberal party near rocks of destruction; immigration policy, 2805; government on business principles; tariff stability, protection and free trade; indigenous industries; wood production; reciprocity with United States; a begging request; parliamentary speeches; brevity, 2806; shipment of cattle to British markets; Transcontinental railway; Winnipeg-Quebec route; shipping facilities; Canadian Government Merchant Marine boats for cattle trade; St. Lawrence river waterway, parliamentary discussion of, 2807; talk of secession in western provinces; breezes blowing in the mulberry trees; national and imperial unity, 2808
Canadian National Railways
Bank accounts, qu. 205
Directors, inspection trip, qu. 489
Special train, qu. 489
Experimental farms, 467, 472

Harris, Mr. Joseph H.—*Con.*
Feed inspection, 602
Harbours and rivers, Ontario, 4589
Health of animals, 582
Hog cholera, 582
Jackson's Point wharf, 4589
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, Stornoway, 2181
Montreal harbour commissioners, advances, qu. 812
Pugsley, Hon. William, appointment, qu. 4753
Retired farmers, income, 1118
Stewart, Mr. James, qu. 205
Toronto viaduct, qu. 517
Trade commissioners, 1840

Hatfield, Mr. Paul L. (Yarmouth and Clare)
Public Works Act, tender and contract, 958

Hatters Bands, etc. *See* Customs Tariff Items

Haulover, N.S., wharf, 943

Hawkesbury, government revenue and salaries, qu. 2205

Hayes, Mr. John J., dismissal from Calgary post office, 1687, 1868

Hazelton telegraph line, 150

Hazen, Sir Douglas
Appointment under Inquiries Act, 2498
Hudson Bay railway, 1061

Health. *See also* Housing; Immigration; Indians; Tuberculosis
Advancement of, 2827
Children, mortality of, 1179
Dairy products and disease germs, 3299
Death rate, 1197
Department of
Estimates, 697, 2170
Food and Drugs Act, administration, 697
Honey and Maple Products Act, administration, 697
Housing Act, administration, 2171
Institutions for sailors, 2167
Legal adviser, 777
Maple products, 1810
Marine hospitals, 2167
Opium and Narcotic Drugs Act, administration, 697
Pollution of boundary waters, 700
Proprietary or patent medicines, 700
Quarantine, 702
Grosse Isle, number of vessels calling, 2168
Halifax building, 4612
St. John, Partridge island, 1021, 4613
Tracadie lazaretto, 4613

Health—*Con.*
Department of—*Con.*
Salaries and contingencies, 2170
Sick mariners' dues, 2167-8
Dominion Council of Health, women members, 3649
Medical research, standardizing and testing laboratories, 703
Immigration, medical inspection, 702
Oleomargarine and, 3558
Pharmaceutical preparations, country of origin, qu. 3261
Venereal diseases, 705

Health of Animals. *See* Animal Contagious Diseases; Live stock

Healy, Mr. A. F. (North Essex)
Belle River harbour, 4594, 4608
Canadian Press Limited, 2555, 2630, qu. 3703
Franchises, granting of, 4728
Combines bill, 2555, 2621, 2630
Registrar, appointment of, 2630
Introduction, 1135
Newspaper combines, 2630
North Essex election, visit of Mr. Meighen to Belle River, 4594

Hearst Publications. *See* Magazines and Periodicals, M. (Mr. Hocken)

Hebert River coal district. *See* Coal

Hebridean Immigrants. *See* Immigration

Hector Celebration, grant to Scottish Pioneer Association, 4636, 4705

Helium, discoveries
Macallum, Dr., 4439
McLennan, Professor by, 703

Hemp
Belfast, 3032
Bounty, 2647, 2659, 2704, 2709, 2778, 2823, 2827, 2957, 2958, 2964, 3018, 3031, 3911, 3963
Binder twine, 2780
Extension of time, 3911
Duty, 3017
Industry, establishment of, 3031
Seed, for agricultural purposes, 3474
Free entry of, 2645, 2651

Hemp Bounty Bill
Res. 3911, 3914, 3963; lr., 3963; 2r., com., 4376; 3r., 4391
Advances to be repayable, amdt. (Mr. McMaster) 4376, neg. 4391

Henderson, Right Hon. Arthur, class rule in politics, 2733

Herbertville, Que., postmaster, dismissal, qu. 3139

Herschell Island, Eskimos, trial. *See* North West Territories Act Amdt.

Hides, imports, qu. 617

High Commissioner in London
Empire settlement board, agreement, 1476
Grain shortage, complaint of British importers, 1764
Imperial Shipping Committee, qu. 3137
Office building, 4629
Pacaud, Mr. L. T., representative on Pacific Cable board, 1832
Relief of distressed Canadians abroad, 1456

Highland Battalions. *See* Hector Celebration

Highways. *See also* Canada Highways Act Amdt. bill
Alberta, 2342
Appropriations under act of 1919, 2338
Banff-Windermere, 3437, 3584
Bradford-Barrie, 2489
British Columbia, 2941, 3186
Unemployment, 3032
British Columbia-Washington state, 2941
Buckhorn lock roadway, 4691
Canada Highways Commission, 2489
Campbell, Mr. A. W., C.E., 3173
Staff, 3173
Canboro-Dunville-Welland-Allanburg, qu. 1139
Cariboo road, 3032
Cost per mile, 2491, 3176
Depot Harbour roadway, 4691
Dundas street, qu. 708
Effect on railway traffic, 1619
Estimates, 2489, 3173
Federal contribution to, 2489
Grants
Federal inquiry, 519, qu. 623
Ontario, to, qu. 620
Hamilton-Brantford, qu. 624, 2492
Hamilton-Queenston, qu. 813
Hope-Princeton, 2342
Indian reserves, passing through, 2153
International, 2941
Bridges, 2342
Isle Perrot bridge, 3646
Jasper Park, 3435
Lachute-Arundel, 4313
Manitoba, 3184
Meaford-Clarksburg, 4565
Millbrook reserve, 2124
Montreal-Hull, 2341
Montreal-Mont Laurier, 2341, 4313
New Brunswick, 3182

Highways—*Con.*
Nova Scotia, 3183
Ontario, 3177
Grant, qu. 620
Projected, 624
Ottawa-Pembroke, qu. 2085
Pacific highway, 2341
Prince Edward Island, 3184
Quebec, 3180
St. Margaret's Bay road, qu. 3135
Saskatchewan, 3185
Statements
Cost per mile, 3176
Summary of projects under agreement, 2491
Types of roads, 3174
Toronto-London, qu. 708
Waterton lakes, qu. 2085
Yukon, 3943

Hindus. *See also* Immigration, Oriental
Immigrants, franchise, 503, 4077, 4640-53

Hirtle, Carrie L., schooner, qu. 3323

Historic Sites. *See* Canadian National Parks and Historic Sites; Canadian National Parks and Reservations bill; Monuments and Memorials

Hoboes, products of unemployment, 1194

Hocken, Mr. H. C. (West Toronto)
Annuities, old age, 1697
Banff-Windermere highway, opening, 3584
Belle River harbour, 4597
British mail, delay in, 2639, 2695
Business, difficulties of, 1419
Canadian National Railways
Branch lines construction bill, 4190
Paris offices, 3279
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 529
Combines bill, 2522
Co-operative associations, 1419
Deputy ministers, salaries, 4558
Dominion Canners, Limited, 1420
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4274
Fuel supply, 794
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth), 335
Hamilton harbour commissioners qu. 912
Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia, 4563
Hemp bounty, 3911
Hudson Bay railway, 4192
Immigration
Hebridean immigrants, 3590
Policy, 1418
International Joint Commission, 3427
Kitchener local improvements, 1022
Labour, hours, 1842

Hocken, Mr. H. C.—*Con.*
Magazines and periodicals
Canadian, encouragement of, M., 826, 855
Sales tax, 4415, 4421
Marvale, wreck of, 3333
Midland post office, qu. 623
Montreal harbour commission, qu. 1137
National Monument, Connaught place, 1021
Navigation, aids to, 3333
Newspaper combines, 2522
Paper, prices in Canada and United States, 829
Peat experiments, 794
"Plutocrats and profiteers," 1418
Post Office department
Appointments and retirements, 1826
Ross, Mr. George, retirement, 1825
Progressive party and tariff, 1421
Proportional representation, 388
Public ownership of railways, 4190
Public Works department, patronage, 946
Quebec harbour commissioners, qu. 1136
Radio direction finding, qu. 3820
St. John harbour commissioners, qu. 911
St. Lawrence river waterway, 2780
Sales tax, 4414
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 4414
Tariff
Immigration and, 1418
Reduction of, 1421
Toronto
Customs house, 3279
Harbour improvements, 2679
Seed branch building, 4624
Union station, 4444
Viaduct, 4444
Vancouver harbour bill, 264
Vancouver harbour commissioners, qu. 912
Welland canal construction, 3780

Hodgins, Mr. A. L. (East Middlesex)
Cold Storage Act Amdt. bill, 186
Dryden and Marshall, Messrs., trip to South America, qu. 1031
House of Commons furniture, purchase of, qu. 1138

Hoey, Mr. R. A. (Springfield)
Address in reply, 63. No reference in speech to tariff revision, 63; rapid deflation in price of foodstuffs; market for surplus farm products; Canadian agriculturist to-day feeding Europe, 64; Canadian representation in the United States; foreign policy bound up in that of United States; conference of provincial representatives on revenue; amendment, 65

Hoey, Mr. R. A.—*Con.*
Assiniboine river, damage by floods, 999
Authors' Association of Canada, copyright, 3155
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4038
Bank robberies, 776
Binder twine, prices, 4377
Brandon, damage by floods, 999
Cadet services, 877
Canada Grain Act, administration, 781
Canadian grain, adulteration of, 3961
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 565
Civil Service, exempted positions, 367
Copper bounty bill, 3235
Copyright Act Amdt. bill, 3155
Dominion Elections Act amdt. 1027
Experimental farms, 462
Farm homes, 1215
Grand jury system, abolition of, 3271
Hemp bounty, 3912, 4377
Hopkins, Mr., and reciprocity, 3010
Hudson Bay railway, 461
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1215
Policy, 1213
Story of an immigrant's struggle and success, 1216
Inheritance tax, 2803
Institutionalism, over, 1214
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4225, 4227
Lake Grain Rates Commission, 4710
Lake of the Woods regulation bill, 4175
League of Nations, 142
Manitoba
Agricultural economic conditions, 1213
Institutions and services in excess of present need, 1214
National monument, Connaught place, Ottawa, 1021
Proportional representation, 406, 418, 424
Reciprocity with the United States, 2854, 3905
Rural credits, 4039
Settlement schemes, 1089
Shipping combine, prosecution of, 4077, 4227
Taxation commission, 4039
Wanipigow dam, 1000
Western provinces, conditions, 1213

Hogs. *See* Livestock

Holland
Butter, competition, 2863
Economic organization, 1857
Immigration, from, 1085, 1095, 3591
Imports and exports, 1977

Home Building. *See* Building; Housing

Homesteads. *See* Dominion Lands Act

Honey and Maple Products Act, administration, 697, 1810

Hong Kong, goods imported via Suez canal and, 3454

Honorary Advisory Council. *See* Research

Honours. *See* Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner)

Hooper, Mr. Ronald, Labour Gazette, 1625-6

Hoover, Mr. Herbert, Europe and coal supply, 1263

Hopkins, Mr. E. N. (Moose Jaw)
Budget, 2980. First speech in House of Commons; limited vision of new members; Canada's destiny; Moose Jaw district; selection of wheat by millers; high tariff bears unduly on the West, 2980; interests of the East and West; recapitalization and adjustment of debts; sharing of war burdens, 2981
Introduction, 2417
Moose Jaw income tax office, qu. 2699
Reciprocity, attitude towards, 3010

Hoppe and Isenberg Leases. *See also* Dominion Lands Act (Coal Leases); Petition of Right Act Amdt. bill
Cancellation of, 3146, 3222
Fiat, issue of, 4442
Investigation into, 3128

Horse Power. *See* Electric Power; Water Power

Horse-Racing. *See* Race Track Betting
Information. *See* Criminal Code Amdt. bills

Horses. *See* Live stock

Horticulture. *See also* Fruit; Insect Pests
Canadian Council of, 2307
Garden and grass seeds, purity of, 601
Gardens, absence from farm homes, 1423
Nursery stock, 1990
Pomology, experimental work in, 463
Seed testing. *See* that title

Hospitals. *See also* Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment; Health
Camp Hill hospital, Halifax, qu. 3506
Marine, 701, 2167
Military, 669
Closed, 669
Brant House, Burlington, 4075
Euclid House, Toronto, 4075

Hospitals—*Con.*
Military—*Con.*
Nursing hospitals, 686
Repairs and improvements, 4629
Staffs, 675
Sydenham, qu. 386, 626
Transients, treatment of, 673
Sales tax, 4432
Soldiers, maintenance cost, qu. 812
Standardization, 2934
X-Ray plates, coverings, duty, 3501

Hotel Scribe, purchase of. *See* Canadian National Railways

Hotels. *See* Canadian National Railways

Hours. *See* Civil Service; Labour

House of Commons. *See also.* Deputy Speaker; Speaker
Acoustics, 1721, 2446. *See also under this title,* Audibility of debates
Members, speaking, to occupy central position, 1721
Adjournments
Ascension day, 2518
Ash Wednesday, 254
Easter, 1162, 1483
Eleven o'clock, 1360
Empire day, 2795, 2983
Hour of, 3208, 3261
King's birthday, 3323
To await action of Senate on bill, 4754
To discuss matter of urgent public importance
British Columbia fishing licenses, M., (Mr. Clark), 1540
Hebridean immigrants, M. (Mr. Speakman) 3584
Powell River Paper Company, M. (Mr. Neill) 2886
Union Bank, M. (Mr. Forke) 4296
Twelve, midnight, 4672
Amendments. *See under this title,* Motions
Audibility of debates, 645, 976, 2446, 3327, 4572, 4580, 4593
Baker, the late Colonel G. H., M.P., memorial, 435, 730, 1256, 1991
Bills
Alterations in, 3325, 3451
Not printed, proceeding with, 3968, 3974, 3976, 4185
Preparation and form of, 4007
Principle discussed on second reading, 3091
Private, suspension of rules, posting, 4248
Third reading by consent, 4141
Business of the House, 179, 250

House of Commons—*Con.*
Business of the House—*Con.*
Amdt. to amdt.
Mr. Crerar, session of 1922, 1300
Right of party not official opposition to move, 1299-1307
Budget debate, precedence, 2694
For to-morrow, 3750
Government orders to have precedence Monday and Wednesday, 1158
Legislation
Distribution between Senate and House of Commons, 4007
Pending, qu. 2517, 2795, 3265
Announcement, 3452
Inquiry, qu. 2612
Post Office estimates in absence of minister, 1314
Private members' days, 1158
Progress of, 2469
Supply. *See also under this title,* Supply
Calling on Mondays and Tuesdays, 2295
Relevancy, 4720
By-elections, 99. *See also* Elections and, *under this title,* Vacancies
Grenville, 4606
Moose Jaw, return, delay, 2295
North Essex, 4594
Chamber
Acoustics. *See under this title,* Acoustics;
Conversation, 4528, 4572
Lighting, 1728
Closure, 1301, qu. 1867, 3667, 4598
Canadian Government Merchant Marine vote, 4598
Committees, For proceedings and reports, *See titles* of the several committees
Expenses of, 2691
Reports
Inquiry, qu. 2612
Not debatable in advance of presentation, 1906
Right to consider questions not referred to, 3266
Select Standing, 3, 199
Changes in membership, 382, 486, 435, 615, 811, 857
Special, cost of, 2979
Contingencies, 2691
Debate
Audibility of. *See under this title,* Acoustics; Audibility
Speeches
Brevity, 2806
Length of, 2883
Debates, Official Report of
Abolition, 1734
Committee, 202

House of Commons—*Con.*
Debates, Official Report of—*Con.*
Distribution, 1715
Estimates, 2691
Insertion of documents not read, 1830, 3174
Pages missing from bound copy, 887, 1081
Questions passed as orders for returns, 939
Revised edition, inquiry, 122
Undiscussed items in supply, 1638, 3284, 3292
Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms, 3
Divisions
Address in reply
Amendment (Mr. Hoey) neg. 178
Amdt. to amdt. (Mr. Shaw) neg. 177
Bank Act Amdt. bill
Bank charters, extension, amdt. (Mr. Good) 4141, neg. 4147
Interest, maximum rate, amdt. (Mr. Shaw) 4148, neg. 4148
Interest, maximum rate, amdt. (Mr. Coote) 4149, neg. 4149
Merchants' Bank investigation, amdt. (Mr. Bird) 4150, neg. 4161
Officers, right of association, amdt. (Mr. Woodsworth) 4161, neg. 4161
Budget
Amdt. (Mr. Forke) neg. 3082
M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. of Ways and Means agreed to, 3084
Canadian National Railways bill (Branch lines) amdt. (Mr. Meighen) to 3r., neg. 4401
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) for repeal; amdt. (Mr. Hughes) for Special Com. agreed to, 571
Combines bill, M. (Mr. Mackenzie King) for 2r., agreed to, 2609
Copyright Act Amdt. bill, M. (Mr. Robb) for concurrence in amdt. agreed to, 2292
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, amdt. (Sir Henry Drayton) to supply neg. 2391
Export Act Amdt. bill (Pulpwood) amdt. (Mr. Power) six months hoist, neg. 4397
French Treaty bill, M. (Mr. Fielding) for 2r., agreed to, 2250-51
Lack of Confidence vote, M. (Mr. Irvine) neg. 243
Lake of the Woods Regulation bill M. (Sir Lomer Gouin) for 2r., agreed to, 4180
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) to permit manufacture, importation and sale
Amdt. (Mr. Kay) to remove suspension of prohibition, agreed to, 3581

House of Commons—*Con.*
Divisions—*Con.*
Oleomargarine—*Con.*
Sub-amdt. (Mr. Good) that government submit legislation before prorogation, neg. 3580
Proportional representation, M. (Mr. Good) neg. 434
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) neg. 766
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) for disbandment of, neg. 1152
Titles, Honours and Decorations, M. (Mr. Ladner) neg. 1299
Documents, distribution of, 1712
Estimates, 2691. *See also that title;* Supply
Discussion
En bloc 4554, 4558, 4587, 4612
Opportunity for, 4579, 4594, 4614-15
Furniture, purchase of, qu. 1138
Hansard. *See under this title,* Debates, Official Report of
House of Commons Act Amdt. *See* Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt.
Indemnity of members, 4674. *See also* Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill
Proposed reduction 2915, 2967, 3043
M. (Mr. Leader) 1153
Senate and House of Commons Act, proposed changes, 4007, 4008. *See also that title*
Internal Economy Commission, 3
Joint Committee of both Houses on matters of common interest, 4007. *See also* Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt.
Appointment, 2794
Message from Senate, 2611
Report, 3887
Language, unparliamentary. *See* Deputy Speaker; Speaker
Law, the late Bowman B., tablet, 1020
Leaders, latitude allowed, 3401
Legislation. *See under this title,* Business of the House
Letters
Quotation from by private member, 4599
Signature withheld, 4599
Library of Parliament, salaries, 2691
Members
Alleged reflection on, 4237
Attendance, 4007, 4008, 4236. *See also* Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt.
Coaching each other, 405
Deceased, 10, 102, 166
Blackadder, Dr. Edward, 4-8, 102

House of Commons—*Con.*
Members—*Con.*
Deceased—*Con.*
Kennedy, Hon. W. C., 4-8, 10, 102, 166, 281
Lafortune, Mr. D. A., 4-8, 281
Stewart, Hon. J. A., 4-8, 435
Indemnity of. *See under this title,* Indemnity
Labour, reference to by Sir James Lougheed, 3033
New, election and introduction of
Benoit, Mr. A. J., 3
Descoteaux, Mr. J. F., 2837
Finn, Mr. R. E., 3
Healy, Mr. A. F., 1135
Hopkins, Mr. E. N., 2417
Preston, Mr. R. F., 3
Rheaume, Mr. J. F., 3
Roberge, Mr. Eusebe, 3
Robichaud Mr. J. G., 3
Party funds, and, 4237
Relationship with constituents, 3021
Sessional attendance. *See* Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill
Stenographers, qu. 518
Votes, 4237
Motions. *See also* Deputy Speaker; Speaker
Amendment to amendment
Proposed change in rules, 856, 1299
Right of party not official opposition to move, 1300
Precedence, 3451
To keep place on order paper pending Speaker's ruling, 1285
Orders for returns. *See under this title,* Returns
Orders of the day. *See* Deputy Speaker; Speaker
Pairs. *See under this title,* Divisions
Parliamentary counsel, Dairy Act Amdt. bill, 3325, 3449
Privilege
Bancroft, Mr.—Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner), 1308
Béland, Hon. Mr.—Reported statement of Mr. Meighen in North Essex election, 708
Carroll, Mr.—Com. on Agriculture and Colonization, 3266
Clark, Mr.—Equalization of railway rates, 1910
Coote, Mr.—Correction of newspaper report, 2519
Good, Mr.—Question of veracity, 2181
Irvine, Mr.—Hebridean immigrants, 3649
Martell, Mr.—Civil Service Committee report, 4363
Shaw, Mr.—Grain Growers' Guide, 987

House of Commons—*Con.*
Privilege—*Con.*
Sutherland, Mr.—Redistribution Committee, 1660
Questions
Answers and, 1385
Inquiry as to, 940
Lengthy, 939
Passed as orders for returns, 938, 940, 1139, 1385, 4303
Placed on order paper without member's knowledge, 939
Unanswered, 4455
Representation. *See* Redistribution
Restaurant, expenditure, 2692
Returns
Alleged incomplete, 1307
Inquiry for, 1212, 1636, 2208, 2254, 2394, 2640, 3324, 3508, 3962, 4184, 4295, 4513
Tabled, 3399
Rules
Closure, 1301, qu. 1867, 3667, 4598
Special committee to consider, M. (Mr. Johnston) 856, 1299
Suspension of, private bills, 4248
Wednesday, hour of meeting, Rule 2, 1
17C, Thursdays and Fridays, 2640
Senate and, Joint Committee. *See* Senate
Sergeant-at-Arms, estimates, 2691
Session
Economy in length of, 132, 133
Waste of time in, 143, 144
Sittings. *See also under this title,* Adjournments
All night, 4672
Late, 4599
Midnight, 4579, 4672
Mornings, 4132, 4249
Saturday, 2694, 3452, 4132
Wednesday, 99
Change in hour of meeting, 1
Evening, 1163, 1995, 2518, 2694
Speaker's rulings. *See also* Speaker
Discussion of, 4013, 4076
Speeches. *See under this title,* Debate
Staff
Members' stenographers, qu. 518
Organization, 4592
Salaries, 2691
Translators, Arsenault, Mr. H. P., 2691
Supply
M. to postpone proposed resolution, 3667
Voting in, 4610, 4611
Vacancies. *See also under this title,* By-elections
Cape Breton North and Victoria, 1763, 2469
Moose Jaw, 615
Nicolet, 2178

House of Commons—*Con.*
Votes and proceedings, questions passed as orders for returns, 939

House of Lords, constitution of, 1378

Housing. *See also* Building; Labour; Returned Soldiers
Assistance for, 2987
Building trades and, 1812
Farm homes, 1178, 1215
Farm labourers' dwellings, 1215, 1240, 1406
Harvesters, 2822
Housing Act, administration, 2171
Legislation, inquiry, qu. 2517, 2518
Loans to provinces, 4558, 4603, 4704

Howat, Mr. Alexander, detention at border, 2296, 2393, 2347, 2419, 2469, 3155

Hudson, Mr. A. B. (South Winnipeg)
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4082
Budget, 3060. Congratulations to Finance Minister; reciprocity with United States; sugar duties, reduction in; tariff stability; review of fiscal system; national policy and its results; comparison of imports 1879 and 1923, 3060; new inventions, standards and wants; imports increasing in spite of high tariff; United States, Fordney tariff; iron ore and smelting industry; Canada not a self-contained country; imports must be paid for by exports; products of farm, sea and forest; manufactured products, export of, 3061; United States market; free admission of boots and shoes and farm implements; Canadian manufacturers, after 40 years protection not able to compete; folly to encourage new industries by artificial means; new duties and bounties; sectionalism; solidarity of the West; tariff and unjust tax; wheat production; producers get no benefit from tariff; Liberal platform of 1919; no hope of tariff planks being carried out; vote against government tariff proposals, 3062
Manitoba Court of Appeal decision, grain trade, 1211
Rules, 1301. M. (Mr. Johnston) for special com. on
Tariff proposals, vote against, 3062, 3084

Hudson Bay
Fort Prince of Wales, preservation, 1041
Resources. *See* Hudson Bay railway

Hudson Bay Company
Claim to Rocky Mountain park, qu. 2418
Navigation of Hudson bay and strait. *See* Hudson Bay railway

Hudson Bay Railway. *See also* Canadian National Railways, branch lines; Vancouver Harbour bill; Welland Canal
Agricultural resources. *See under this title,* Resources
Appropriation of land for, 1053, 1068, 1074, 1353, qu. 2393
Canadian air force, 1748
Climatic conditions, 1072
Coal, transportation of, 1055, 1073, 1283
Cochrane, Hon. Frank, statement by, 1071
Commercial feasibility. *See under this title,* Feasibility
Commission to inquire and investigate, 3005
Comparative distances, 1034, 1070
Competition with Canadian National Railways, 1041, 1050, 1056, 1058, 1067, 1973-4
Construction, 4680
Correspondence, 208
Discontinuance of, 1062, 2747
Deficit, operating, 1560
Drayton-Acworth commission, 1062, 1761, 4682
Expenditure, 1033, 3073, 3076, 4192, 4198. *See also* Welland canal construction
Public and, 3005
Experiments, 461
Feasibility, 1033-70, 1749, 2878, 2939, 3005
Anderson, Captain, 1038, 1042, 1044, 1057, 1064
Bartlett, Capt, 1047
Bell, Dr., report, 1052
Bernier, Capt., testimony, 1072
Chisby, Capt., report, 1052
Crean, Mr. Frank J. C., report, 1060
Foster, Right Hon. Sir George, 1072
Gordon report, 1038
Hackland, Capt. J., statement, 1064
Investigation by Canadian air service, 1749-50
Kennedy, Capt. William, report, 1052
Low. Mr. A. P., report, 1072
MeKenna, Mr. J. A. J. report, 1063
Manitoba legislature, com., report, 1052
Pritchard, Capt. William, report, 1052
Reid, Capt John, 1046
Test of, 1069
Tyrrell, Mr. J. W. report, 1072
Wakeham report, 1038
Finance, 1053
Dominion lands, appropriation for, 1053, 1068, 1074, 1353, qu. 2393
Lash, late Mr. Z. A., 1053
Oliver, Hon. Frank, statement, 1053
Fishery resources. *See under this title,* Resources
Fort Churchill terminal. *See under this title,* Terminals

Hudson Bay Railway—*Con.*
Foster, Right Hon. Sir George, 1061, 1072
Freight rates, 3779. *See also that title*
Graham, Hon. George P., statement in 1916, 1071
Grain, transportation and marketing, 1032-80, 4681. *See also that title*
Greenway, the late Hon. Thomas, 1061
Hazen, Sir Douglas, 1061
History and condition of, 1040, 1076
Hydro-electric power, 1065
James Bay railway, 1036, 1049
Lake of the Woods Regulation bill, 4170
Land sold for qu. 283. *See also under this title,* Finance
Laurier, Sir Wilfrid
Announcement of project at Niagara Falls, 1047
Statement, 1066, 1071
London Times 1059
Macdonald, Hon. E. M., 1062
McArthur J. D. & Co. claim, 4686
Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur, letter to Melfort Journal, 1062
Military aspect of, 1057
Monthly Trade Review, London, editorial, 1036
M. (Mr. Knox) for consideration of Senate report, 1032; agreed to "on division," 1080
Motherwell Hon. Mr., reported statement at Moose Jaw, 1686, 2774, 4683
Obstacles to success of, 2939
Policy, 2878
Port Nelson. *See under this title,* Terminals
Postponement of, 2951
Press statement as to cost—correction, 2296
Priority of undertaking, 1073, 1079
Progressive party and, 3030
Rail removals qu. 203
Reclamation of land in Manitoba and Saskatchewan, 1065
Repair, 1070. 3647, 4198, 4680
Resources Hudson bay and region, 1039, 1064, 1072
Agricultural, 1065
Crean Mr. Frank J. C., report, 1060
Fishery, 1064, 1073
Lower, Mr. A. R. M. report, 1065
Melville, Mr. C. D. report, 1061
Sifton, Sir Clifford announcement of project at Brandon, 1047
Surveys and gradings, 4310
Terminals, 1071
Bartlett, Captain, 1063
Fort Churchill, 1039, 1013, 1063
Hazen Sir Douglas, statement, 1063

Hudson Bay Railway—*Con.*
Terminals—*Con.*
Port Nelson, 1032, 1037, 1039, 1043, 1063, 1069, 3647
Dredging, 1012
Reid, Hon. J. D. statement, 1063
Thornton, Sir Henry, 4683
Turgeon, Hon. Senator, 1071
Trips through Hudson strait to Port Nelson, qu. 4011
Utility of, 1076
Waterpowers, 1065
Welland canal and, 1054, 1068, 3779. *See also that title.*
West, interest in scheme, 1035
Work this year, 4310

Hudson Bay Route, feasibility of. *See* Hudson Bay railway

Hudson's Hope, coal possibilities, 3198, 3202, 4699

Hughes, Mr. J. J. (King's P.E.I.)
Address in reply 123. Financial question; social and industrial unrest, 123; transportation and the railway problem, 126; contrast between government railways and Canadian Pacific, 127; Prince Edward Island railway, 128; decrease in population of Prince Edward Island, 129; representation of Prince Edward Island on government commissions, 130; discrimination in freight rates, potato-growing; immigration; the eight-hour day, 131; hours of railway station agents, 132
Budget, 2919; Multiplicity of counsel; mild criticism of budget from opposition benches, 2919; taxation and debt; responsibility for; increase of expenditure by Conservative administration; civil service dismissals and appointments; war prices; 50 per cent of war expenditure wasted or stolen, 2920; Liberals associated with late government; purchase of medical supplies through middleman; Conservatives preach economy but propose no specific reduction, 2921; reciprocity with United States; offer by Sir John Macdonald; election campaign of 1891; statement of Mr. Blaine; protection and free trade; balance of trade; imports and exports, 2922; international trade, profit and loss; artificial trade barriers; trade commissioners and subsidized steamship services; war blockade; selling without buying 2923; defeat of reciprocity in 1911; world-wide free trade not attainable; high tariff unprofitable; revenue necessities; farmers and reciprocity, 2924; legislation in advance of public sentiment; Liberal platform of 1919; progressive opposition, amendment, 2925

Hughes, Mr. J. J.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 531
Amdt. to refer to special committee, 534
Labour, right to organize, 2893
Morning and Saturday sittings, 4132
Powell River Paper Company, 2893
Proportional representation, 419, 423

Humphrey, Mr. L. W. (West Kootenay)
Budget, 2940. Congratulations to Finance Minister; western provinces, lack of knowledge of; British Columbia, resources, 2940; Asiatic immigration; highways; electors of Revelstoke and Nelson; Mr. McQuarrie's charge of bribery, 2941; Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill; immigration; fruit-growing industry; returned soldiers, treatment of; discontent; Canadian Legion, Victoria, B.C. resolution; administration of Pension Act, 2942; Board of Pension Commissioners; Royal Canadian Mounted Police, withdrawal from Nelson; telegram of Nelson Board of Trade; professional agitators; copper bounty, 2943; Trail smelter; opening of copper rod mill; optimistic feeling in British Columbia; tariff; amendment, 2944
Canadian National Railways, legislation, qu. 4300
Canadian National Safety League, 3958
Chinese immigration bill, 2327-37
Copper bounty bill, 3241, 4373
Freight rates, equalization of railway rates, M. (Mr. Clark) 1970
Hindu franchise, 4658
Housing
Administration of act, 2171
Loans to provinces, 4704
Imperial Conference, 4658
Kootenay flats, reclamation, 3431
Labour, right to organize, 2895
Ore-testing, Ottawa plant, 2505, 2511
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3282, 4748
Pensions, 2942
Appeal boards, 697

Humphrey, Mr. L. W.—*Con.*
Pensions—*Con.*
Royal commission
Interim report, 2167
Recommendations, 2394
Powell River Paper Company, 2895
Returned Soldiers' Insurance bill, 4734

Hungary, immigration from, 1094

Hunter, Mr. J. B. *See* Public Works Department

Husband's Brother, Marriage with. *See* Deceased, Marriage

Huskisson, William, tariff reduction in Great Britain, 3050

Hydro Electric Power. *See also* Electrification; St. Lawrence River Waterway; Water Powers
Beck, Sir Adam, Morrisburg dam, 1270
Development in Ontario, 1270
Electric railways, 2475
Municipalities, 2475
Pointe Fortune, qu. 1974
Power exported to the United States, 1266
Quebec and New England Hydro Company, qu. 1974
Whitney, Sir James, 1266

Hydro Electric Power Commission of Ontario, 3782
Public ownership, 3056
Radial railways, 2476
St. Lawrence water power development, 2682
Toronto Suburban railway, qu. 280, 2181, 3324

Hydrographic Survey. *See* Marine and Fisheries

Ice and Icebreakers. *See also* Marine and Fisheries; Vessels
Bay of Fundy, 2615
Cabot strait, obstruction in, 2614
Mikula, qu. 1384
Murray Stewart, purchase of, 3354

Iceland, immigration from, 1096

Illicit Liquor Traffic. *See* Liquor

Illustration Farms. *See* Agriculture

Immigration, 2784, 3060, 3066. *See also* Address; Bank Act Amdt Bill; Budget; Labour, Unemployment; Naturalization
Advertising, 43, 81, 1084, 1085, 1103, 1180, 1218, 1318, 1873

Immigration—*Con.*
Agents
Appointment of, 1188
Biden, Miss, 1099
Bowder, Mr. W. R., representation of New Brunswick in Great Britain, 1086, 1198
European, 1876
Gardiner, Mr., 1099
Ingram, Mr., 2664
Lemont, Mr. Arthur, 1085, 1135, 1243
May, Mr., 2663
Murphy, Mr. representative in Scotland, 1095, 1879
Pattullo, Mr., 1096
Railways acting as, 1191
Agriculturists of, 37-38, 1881. *See also under this title,* Farmers
Alien enemies, restriction of, 1128, 2428, 2667
Alleged campaign against, 332
Appointments, 3252. *See also under this title,* Agents
Army officers, 1432
Artisans, shopkeepers, town dwellers, 1204
Asiatic. *See under this title,* Oriental
Assimilation, 1346
Assistance to settlers, 1242
Assisted passages, 1096, 1132
Great Britain, from, 1100
Immigrants family or friends, advance, 1100
Loans for passages, 1475-8
Banks and, 4042. *See also* Bank Act Amdt.
Barnado Boys' home, 1099, 1470
Beatty, Mr. E. W. and, 1337-8
Belgium from, 1096, 1173
Black, Mr. W. J., deputy minister, visit to England, 668, 1096, 1473, 1476, qu. 1633, 2084
Boundary inspection, 1875
Bracken, Premier, statement, 1123
British, 20, 43, 1084, 1105, 1218, 1339, 1346, 2929
Preference for Australia and New Zealand, 2932
British Columbia into, 1096, 1112, 2942
Co-operation with, 1097
Oriental, 1217. *See also under this title,* Oriental
Buildings
Halifax, 4612
St. John, 1457, 1464
"Canada an immigration sieve," 628, 647
Canada Colonization Association, 51, 71, 1089, 1118, 1133, 1175, 1178, 1180, 1191, 1208, 1215, 1237, 1240, 1315, 1352, 1357, 1396, 1391, 1399, 1425, 1428, 1437, 1439, 1479, 3637

Immigration—*Con.*
Canada Colonization Association—*Con.*
Advances, qu. 517, 1479
Advertising, 1318
Agreement, 1879, 3036
Signing of, 1976
Terms, 1102
Amery, Colonel, 1328
Brown, Mr. M. A., 1102-3, 1172, 1328
Letters from Messrs. Meighen and Forke, 1333
Budget expenses, 1877
Calder, Hon. Senator, voluntary colonizing agency, 1333
Canadian Manufacturers' Association, contribution, 1164
Canadian National Railways, 3324
Canadian Pacific Railway, and, 3324
Commission, 1877
Community clubs, 1183
Crawford and Kurdydyk, Messrs., letters, 1396
Creelman, Mr. George, manager, eastern Canada, 1172
Dennis, Col. J. S., statement of, 1324
Everett, Mr. Edward, manager, 1092, 1103, 1172
Forke, Mr. Robert, director, 1407
Letter to Mr. Brown, 1333
Statement by, 1105
Grant, 1877
Hebridean immigrants, 3585
History of organization, 1102
Imperial government, financial support, 1429
Land, sales of, 1316, 1431, 1877
Commission of ten per cent, 1102
Interest rate, 1877
Selection and purchase, 1091
Luse Land Company, 1103
McRae, General, 1324
Meighen, Right Hon. Mr., letter to Mr. Brown, 1333
Minister's statement, 1320
North Atlantic Trading Company, 1092
Officers and directors, 1327
Proposals, memo of, 1877
Published statement of objects, 1180
Railway contributions, 3400, 3633
Reorganization, 3324, 3400
Salvation army, 1093
Soldier Settlement supervisors, services of, 1090, 1877
Speculation in unimproved land, 1118
Subscriptions, 1877
Subsidy of $10,000 per month, 1092
Willison, Sir John, 1172, 1182, 1323, 1328, 1429

Immigration—*Con.*
Canada Colonization Association—*Con.*
Willison, Sir John—*Con.*
Letter to directors, 1431
Retirement from presidency, 1164, 1332, 1431
Telegram, 1325, 1331
Withdrawal of financial support, 1208
Canadian born, 3032
Canadian citizenship, value of, 2911
Canadian Council of Immigration, 1876
Central, southern and eastern European, 1346, 1883
Child, 1099, 1227, 1243, 1342, 1469, 1472, 1475
Agencies, grants to, 1469, 1470
Barnardo, Dr., 1099, 1470
Bilbrough-Wallace, Mrs., 1470
Cardinal Manning, 1470
Catholic Emigration Association, 1470
Cossar, Dr. George C., 1471
Inspection, 1874
Marchmont Homes, 1470
Middlemore, Sir J. T., 1470
National Children's home and orphanage, 1470
Oriental, 1445. *See also* Chinese Immigration bill
Quarrier, Mr. William, 1470
Rye, Miss 1470
Salvation army, 1470
Smart, Mr. Bogue, 1469
Statistics as to 1470
Chinese. *See under this title,* Oriental
Colonization, 1178, 1333
Eastern provinces, 1134
Societies, 1876
Commonwealth Club of California, 1195
Competition and, 1418, 1426
Conference with railway and shipping companies, 1193
Conservative administration under, 1335-6
Co-ordination of activities, 2800
Co-operation, 1255
Cost of, 1439
Crerar, Hon. T. A., statement, 1123
"Dangerous agitators from British Isles", 3033
Denmark, from, 1096
Department. *See* Immigration and Colonization
Deportation, 1875
British soldier, alleged inhuman treatment, 2254
Deserters from ships, 2435
Discrimination between native-born and immigrant, 2732
Distribution of, 1198

Immigration—*Con.*
Domestic servants, 1099, 1115, 1166, 1189, 1200, 1243, 1474, 1475-6, 1477, 1876
Doukhobors, 1176
Settlement and migration, 1340
Drift to cities, 1165-1171, 1342
Economic conditions and, 1231
Emigration, *See that title*
Empire settlement scheme, 288, 1096, 1111, 1120, 1127, 1132, 1175, 1205, 1237, 1328, 1480
Canada's non-co-operation, 1096
Canada's participation, 667
Grant
Agreement, 1461, 1464, 1469
Division of, 1475
European, 1085, 1094, 1170, 1340, 1346, 2748
Agencies, 1876
Assimilation of, 2749
Northern European, 1227, 1249
Southeastern European, 1195
Exhibitions, 1454
Expenditure, 1908, 2969
Contingencies and general expenses, 1873
M. (Mr. Murdock) to reduce, 1908
Total, 1208
Farm labourers, 1100, 1115, 1166, 1174, 1187, 1188, 1190, 1200, 1358, 1416, 1475
Farmers, of, 1115, 1188, 1189, 1421
Farmers' Advocate, 1186
Financial assistance to settlers, 1098. *See also under this title,* Assisted Passages
Follow-up policy, 1181
Foster homes for children. *See under this title,* Child
Fowler, Senator, statement by, 3032
France, 1173
German and Hungarian immigrants, 1094
Growth of West due to, 1881-2
Hebridean, 2950, 3037, 3252, 3584, 4706
Canada Colonization Association, 3585
Macdonnell, Rev. Father, 3585
Settlement in valley of Red Deer, 3252
Treatment of, M. (Mr. Speakman) to discuss etc., 3584, withdrawn, 3603
"Hidden Hand," the, 1167, 1193, 1201
Hindu, 498, 1120-8. *See also that title*
Franchise, 503, 4077, 4640, 4655
Iceland, from, 1096
Immigrant's struggle and success, 1216, 1399
Immigrants, rejected, qu. 706, qu. 1992
Imperial government, and, 1328
Increase of, 3055
Indian army officers, 1096
Intending immigrants to make application. *See* Immigration Act Amdt. bill
International Labour Conference, 1631
Isle of Man, address by Mr. F. W. Kerr, 2949
Jacobs, Mr., speech at Winnipeg, 1429

Immigration—*Con.*
Japanese. *See under this title,* Oriental
King, Mackenzie, Mr., speech at Stouffville, 1430
Labour. *See also that title*
Attitude of, 1167, 1176, 1186, 1193, 1196, 1241, 1337, 1892-3
Competition with, 2816
Employers and, 1193, 1194
Howat and Meyerscough, detention. *See* Howat; Labour
Restriction of, 1104
Land, 1091, 1102. *See also* Dominion Lands
Adjoining railways, 1893
For American immigrants, 1093, 1101
Sales, appraisal, 1316, 1431, 1877
Settlement, 2834
Larkin, Mr. James, detention at border, 1163, 1212, 1309, 3156. *See also* Howat
Literature, 1097-8, 1226, 1239, 1389, 1414, 1428, 1433. *See also under this title* Advertising; Propaganda; Publicity
Misreprensentations, 1203
Lloyd, Bishop, reported statement, 1117, 2844
Loans for passages. *See also under this title,* Assisted Passages
Overseas settlement board, 1469, 1481
Location of immigrants, 2834
London Times
Advertisement, South Africa, 1180
Statement of, 1124
Lougheed, Sir James, statement by, 3032
"Man with the sheepskin coat", 1204
Maritime provinces to, 1086, 1131, 1198, 1236
Ignoring of, 2950
Mechanics from the Clyde, 1204
Medical inspection, 702, 1875
Mennonites, 1176, 1229, 1341, 1884
Moore, Mr. Tom, 1170
National Trust Company, statement of president, 1122
Naturalization, 2196. *See also that title*
Netherlands, 1095, 3591
New Zealand Immigration Act, 497
Nomination system, 1360, 1475-8
Non-English speaking immigrants, 1216
Norway and Sweden from, 1191
Officers in Great Britain, 1879. *See also under this title* Agents
Ontario, into, 1096-98, 1428, 1475
Child immigration and foster homes, 1099
Domestic servants, 1099
London office, 1428
Northern, into, 1097, 1320
Oriental, 1117, 1247, 1307, 1346, 1443, 1900, 2941, 3037. *See also* Imperial Conference
Bill respecting, 4441

Immigration—*Con.*
Oriental—*Con.*
Bishop of New Westminster, on, 504
Chinese, 499, 1443, 1448, 4641. *See also* Chinese Immigration bill
Admission, statistics, 1921-22, 1445
Assimilation, 2321
Children, 1445, 1452, 2484
Education of, 1896
Consul General for China, propaganda, 1896
Estimates, 1443
Exclusion, 2313
Fingerprints, 502
Head tax, 1445
Evasion of, 2309
Indentured labour, 2330
Japanese and, 1117
Liberal platform of 1919, 1652
Merchants, 2309
Definition of, 2329
Students and, 1445, 2308, 2310
New Westminster Retail Merchants Association, 2319
Rainbow Shingle Mills, strike, 2319
Registration, 502, 1445, 1447, 1452
Regulations, 1445
Religious organizations, representations from, 2310
Roosevelt, the late Theodore, statement, 2320
Sailors, 2333
Schools, 2326
Silverton, B.C., public meeting, res. 2338
Tong wars, 2337
Tsur, Hon. Chilien, 1896
United States, 2313
Victoria retail merchants, 2316
Wives, 2484
Women, 2310, 2318
Competition of labouring classes, 1287
Disallowance of British Columbia legislation, 1161
Estimates, 1441, 1443
Exclusion of, 2869
United States, from, 1194
Hindu, 498, 1120, 1128. *See also* Hindus, Franchise
Franchise, 503, 4077
Sastri, Right Hon. V. Srinivasa
Letter from Prime Minister, 4665
Visit to Canada, 4641
Japanese, 1450, 1894, 4641. *See also* Immigration Act Amdt. bill
Birth rate, 1898
British Columbia, menace to, 1900
Canadian Japanese Association, pamphlet, 1894
Citizenship, 2442

Immigration—*Con.*
Oriental—*Con.*
Japanese—*Con.*
Consul General at Ottawa, pamphlet, 1894
Correspondence with Mr. McQuarrie, 1894
Direct, 1448
Escape from immigration sheds, Vancouver, 1447
"Gentlemen's agreement" 512. *See also under this title,* Lemieux agreement
Japanese freighter with stowaways, 859, 1448, 1451, 1454
Japanese organizations in United States, 2444
Lemieux agreement, 1894
Modification, 1447
Limitation of, 1449
Merchants, 1452
Nationality, 2443
Naturalization, 2442
Negotiations with Japanese government, 2328, 4441
North American Commission of American Legion, pamphlet, 1898
Petition of W. J. Bartlett and others, 2837, 4075
Irregular, Speaker's ruling, 2885
Propaganda in United States, 1896
Race equality, 1896
Restriction of emigration by Japanese government, 2328
Rights as British Subjects, 1899
Root-Takahjira "gentleman's agreement" 512
Supposed special privilege to land holders, 1450
Merchants, definition of, 1452. *See also under this title,* Chinese
Naturalization, 1453
Ormsby-Gore, Mr. W. G. on Canadian policy, 1111
Overcharging, Quebec, 3324
Overseas Settlement Board, 1099, 1469
Agreement, 1476. *See also under this title,* Empire Settlement Scheme
Passage. *See* Assisted Passages
Paternalism, 1133
Permission to intending immigrants. *See* Immigration Act Amdt.
Poland, 1204
Policy, 19, 29, 42, 1095, 1120-30, 1213, 1315, 1386, 1443, 1461, 2774, 2805, 2816, 2833, 2844, 2869, 2874, 2911, 2949, 3036
British dominions, 1882
Comment of London Times on, 1111
Laurier, Sir Wilfrid, 1177

Immigration—*Con.*
Population. *See also that title.*
Loss of, 3018
Not increased by, 1195
Prepaid passages, agreement with Imperial government, 2611. *See also under this title,* Assisted Passages
Prices of agricultural and manufactured products, 1407. *See also* Prices
Printing, 1873
Private enterprise, 1414
Progressive members, attitude of, 2774
Propaganda, 1192, 1389. *See also under this title,* Advertising; Literature; Publicity
Embracing all Canada, 1098
Oriental, 1894-6-8
Prosperity and depression, 1177
Provinces
Co-operation of, 1085
Other than western, discrimination against, 1097
Provincial governments and, 1327
Publicity, 1873. *See also under this title,* Advertising; Literature; Propaganda
Advertisements, cost of, qu. 518
Committee, 1871
Special writers, 1874
"Public charge" 3155
Qualifications of immigrant, 1882
Quebec, into, 1104, 1198
Railways acting as agents, 1191
Recruiting, 2834
Repatriation, 1085, 1188, 1198, 1876, 2834
French Canadians in United States, 1462
Restriction of, 1169, 1174, 1186, 1233. *See also under this title,* Oriental
Orders in council, 1128
Russia, 1340, 2845
St. John immigration building, 1464, 1908
Agreement with C.P.R., 1458
Salvation army, 1093, 1430, 1876
Saskatchewan
Domestic servants, 1099
Mennonites, 1229
Scandinavia, 1216
Scotland from, 1095, 1876
Scottish Aid Society, 1876
Selection, 1098, 1108, 1219, 1254
Settlement in colonies, 1100
Settlements far removed from railways, 3431
Shaw, Lord, statement in Winnipeg, 2833
Shipping Federation of Montreal, protest, 2435
Sifton, Sir Clifford
Importation fo British workmen, 1186
Policy, 1204, 1881-83

Immigration—*Con.*
Smart, Mr. Bogue, child immigration, 1469
Soldier Settlement board, 1126, 1255. *See also under this title,* Canada Colonization Association
Extension of system to immigrants, 1128
Supervisory agents, 1179
Speeches
Adverse effect of, 1423
"Blue ruin," 3037
Standards of living, 1127
Statistics, 3036, 3055
1881-1922, 1094
1914-1921, 1111
1920-22, 1105
Steamship companies, bonuses to, 1109, 1462
Stornoway immigrants, 3037. *See also under this title* Hebridean
Supplies, Quebec, 496
Alleged overcharging, 3324
Sweden and Holland, from, 1095, 3591
Switzerland, 3591
Tariff and, 1133. *See also* speeches on Budget
Taxation and, 1121, 1319, 2791. *See also* speeches on Budget
Thirty-two year payment plan, 1317
Thornton, Sir Henry, 1167 2795, 2844
Trade
Effect upon, 1122
Relations with oriental countries, 507
Ukrainians, 1341, 1396, 1883
Unemployment relief, 1679, 2730
Union Nationale Francais, 1877
United Farmers of Alberta, res. 81
United Farmers of Ontario, res. 1191
United States. *See also that title*
Agencies, 1875
From, 43, 1105, 1113, 1243
Unskilled labourers, 2822
Vancouver immigration sheds, 1896
Vessel crews, 2670, 3981. *See also* Japanese
Walker, Sir Edmund, 1343
War years, during, 20
Western Canada, 1086, 1347
Attitude of, 107, 1086-92, 1129
Western Canada Colonization Association. *See under this title,* Canada Colonization
Women's immigration division, 1876

Immigration Act Amendment Bills. *See also* Chinese Immigration bill
1. Permission to intending immigrants (Mr. Neill) 1r., 74; order for 2r. stands, 497, 857

Immigration Act Amendment Bills—*Con.*
2. Alien enemies; fines, shipmasters reporting desertions (Mr. Stewart, Argenteuil) 1r., 2204; 2r., com., 2428; com., 2668; 3r., 2671; Senate amdts., 3981
Sections and subjects discussed
British subject, 2429
Canadian citizen, definition, 2429
Canadian domicile, 2429
Deportation, 2429, 3981
Conspirators, 2428
Without trial, 2433
Deposit as security for return of deserters, 2435
Discharging crew without examination, 2435
Enemy aliens, 2428, 2667
Repeal of 1919 legislation, 2428
Undesirable classes, 2428, 2668
Aliens, 2428, 2667
Assassination, 2669
Vessel crews, 2670, 3981

Immigration and Colonization department
Chief Controller, 2308
Chinese immigration, salaries, 1443
Deputy Minister, Mr. W. J. Black
Appointment, 2664
Visit to Europe, 668, 1096, 1473, 1476, qu. 1633, 2084
Estimates, 1082-1135, 1163, 1213, 1315, 1386, 1443, 1464, 1873, 1909
Contingencies and general expenses, 1873
M. (Mr. Murdock) to reduce, 1908
Statement of expenditure, 1480
George, Little, deportation, qu. 3704
Lee, Miss Barbara, dismissal, qu. 385, qu. 2393
Little, Mr. W. R., employment, qu. 3144, qu. 4302
Minister
Reported statement, Sir Henry Thornton, as to, 2795, 2844
Statement of, 1082
Outside service, salaries, 1082, 1106, 1163, 1213, 1315, 1386
Quebec employees, qu. 4752
Burne, Mr. Joseph, qu. 3141
Transfers, qu. 3141
Salaries and contingencies, 1909
Amdt. (Mr. Spencer) to reduce, 1441, neg. 1441
Staff transfers, qu. 2517
Travelling expenses of inspectors, 1874

Imperial Conference
Agenda, 1686
Discussion of, 4638
Opportunity for, 3059, 3223, 3453, 4250

Imperial Conference—*Con.*
Agenda—*Con.*
Inquiry, 1976
Tabled, 1991
British North America Act, right to amend, 4660
Canada's status, 4664
Canadian autonomy, 4651
Canadian representative in United States, 3085, 4664
Commitments, 3059, 3223
Conferences of 1917 and 1921
Cattle embargo, 26
Smuts, General, 72
Confidential matters, 4660
Constitutional questions, 4660, 4661
Discussion, forecast of, 3453. *See also under this title,* Agenda
Egyptian policy, 4662
Embargo on breeding cattle, 3291
Expenses of delegation, 4638
Foreign relations, 4659
Hindu immigrants, franchise, 508, 4077, 4640
Imperial Federation, 4661
Imperialism, 4655, 4656
Militarism, 4652
Naval Service, 4654
Policy, 3453
Preferential tariff, 4661. *See also* British Preference
Publicity, 4665
Purchasing power of money, 4666
Reparations, 4653
Report inadequate, 4662
Representation of Canada, 1686
Resolution of Mr. Mackenzie King in 1921, 1535
Singapore naval base, qu. 3506, 3822
Treaty of Versailles, modification of, 4653
War, Canada's participation, 4655

Imperial Economic Conference, 4666
Agenda, 1686
Discussion of, 4638, 4666
Opportunity for, 3453, 4250
Inquiry, 1976
Tabled 1991
Expenses of delegation, 4638, 4666
Representation of Canada, 1686

Imperial Federation, British labour party and, 4651

Imperial Oil Company. *See also* Oil; Petroleum bounties
Gasoline, price of, 2547

Imperial Relations. *See* Canada's Participation in War; Imperial Conference; Near East Crisis; Treaties

Imperial Shipping Committee, qu. 3137

Imperial Veterans of Canada, petition, 4536

Imperialism. *See* Imperial Conference

Implements. *See* Agricultural Implements

Importation of Liquor. *See* Canada Temperance Act; Liquor

Imported Goods, marking of. *See* Customs and Excise

Imports and Exports, 2401. *See also* Agriculture; British Preference; Budget; Customs and Excise; Reciprocity; Trade; Treaties, French, Italian
- Agricultural products, 445, 1390
- Balance of trade, 2922
- Beans, 2981
- Binder twine, 2965
- Coal, 1226. *See also* Coal
- Comparison of 1897 and 1923, 3060
- Direct. *See this title under* British Preference; Treaties, French Treaty
- Exports
  - Agricultural machinery, qu. 814
  - Agricultural products, qu. 814
  - Butter. *See* Dairying Industry
  - Canada's best customer, 1838
  - Cattle to United States, 1410, 2910
  - Cheese. *See* Dairying Industry
  - Electric power, 658. *See also that title*
  - Export trade, 1838
  - France to, 1977, 2213. *See also under* Treaties, French Treaty
  - Gold, 4249
  - Grain. *See* Grain and Grain Trade
  - Newsprint. *See* Pulp and Paper
  - Potatoes, qu. 621. *See also that title*
  - Products of farm, sea and forest, 3061
  - Pulpwood. *See* Export Act Amdt.; Pulp and Paper
  - Settlers' effects, 20-21
  - Wheat 2774, 3062. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade
    - Great Britain, to, qu. 1867
- Fishery products, 445
- France, 2210, 2230. *See also* Treaties, French Treaty
- Grain, 2748. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade
- Great Britain, 2928. *See also* British Preference
- Home markets, 2869
- Imports
  - Agricultural products, qu. 617, 1246, 2917, 2958
    - United States, from, 2708

Imports and Exports—*Con.*
- Imports—*Con.*
  - Animals and animal products, 445
  - Butter, 2821
  - Canned vegetables, 445
  - Coal, qu. 490, qu. 516, 2828. *See also that title*
  - Direct, 2898
  - Duty collected, 2838. *See also* Customs and Excise
  - Eggs from United States, 2708, 2821
  - Farm produce, 1426
  - France, from, 1977
  - Fresh and dried fruits, 445
  - Marking, 931
  - Panama canal, via, 1921
  - Potatoes, 2820
  - Raisins, qu. 2699
  - Sales tax on, 4409
  - Silks, 445
    - France, from, 2397. *See also* Treaties, French
  - Tobacco, qu. 1258
  - United States from, 2820. *See also that title*
- Increased, 2936, 3055
- United States, 2929. *See also that title*

Income Tax. *See this title under* Taxation

Income War Tax Act 1917 Amdt. Bill (Chief occupation; interest on borrowed capital; deductions for expenses; incomes of consuls and consuls-general; penalty against employer; appeals; taxes; prior lien; indebtedness to taxpayer; distress in default of payment; pension exemptions). Res. 4440, 4491; 1r., 4502; 2r., com., 4504; 3r., 4508
- Sections and subjects discussed:
  - Act to come into force, 4508
  - Certificate of default to be registered as judgment, 4506
  - Collection of tax from third party, 4506
  - Decision of minister, notice of dissatisfaction with, 4505
  - Income from chief occupation, 4504
  - Taxes to be a lien, 4505

Indebtedness. *See* Bank Act Amdt.; Budget; Finance; Loan; Public Debt

Indemnity of Members. *See* House of Commons; Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill

Independent Commissions. *See* Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power)

India
Automobiles, export to, 508
Canadian trade commissioner in, 1840
Grain production, 1840
Hindu franchise, 4077. *See also* Imperial Conference; Hindus
Immigration of army officers from, 1096

Indian Affairs department. *See this title under* Indians

Indians
Agents
Burke, Mr. J. Garry, 2151
Local, 2146
Perth, New Brunswick, 2154
Wootten, Mr., 2154
British Columbia, 2152, 2163
Chieftainship, 2148
Condition of, 2125, 2145
Education, 2164
Brandon, 2147
Edmonton school, 2149, 2164, 2165
Elkhorn school, 2147
Kamloops, 2146, 2152
Morley reserve, 2150
Oblate Fathers, 2145
Red Deer school, 2164
Residential schools, 2164
St. Albert school, 2149
Sarcee reserve boarding school, 2145
White Bear reserve, 2162
Farming, 2156
Fishing, grazing and wood permits, qu. 706
General, 2163
Great Slave lake and Mackenzie districts, 2145
Hospitals, medical attendance, 2145, 2160
Hunting grounds, 2146
Indian Affairs, department
O'Connor, Mr. P. J., qu. 2085
Estimates, 2124, 2145, 2165, 4702
Salaries and contingencies, 2165
Live stock, 2162
Manitoba, 2145-7
Medical service, doctors, 2145, 2160
New Brunswick, 2124, 2153
North West territories, 2145-7
Nova Scotia, 2124, 4702
Ontario and Quebec, 2124 2146
Peguis, Saulteaux chief, monument, 4704
Potlatching, gaol sentence for, 2163
Preservation of, 2151-52
Prices charged to, qu. 3142
Rations, 2148
Relief, 2125
Reserves, 2124
Blackfeet, 2148
Prices charged, qu. 3142

Indians—*Con.*
Reserves—*Con.*
Blood, 2159
Carleton, 2162
Caughnawaga, expulsion of half-breeds, 2163
File Hills, 2145
Grain production on, 1139, 2156
Greater production, 2150, 2155, 2156, 2162
Highways passing through, 2153
Kitsilano, 383
Land, lease of, 2150
Moose Mountain, qu. 706
Muscowequan, 2156
Nipissing, 1307
Perth, N. B., 2154
St. Peter's, 2153
St. Pie, fencing, 2154
St. Regis, 2163
Sarcee, 2125, 2145
Six Nations, 1307, 2148
Tobique, timber cutting, 2154, 2155
Turtle Mountain, 3413
White Bear, 2162
Saskatchewan, 2145-7
Sioux, 2160
Round Plain band, 2162
Starving, 2125
Statement by minister, 2145
Titles, extinguishment of, 3398. *See* Dominion Lands Act bill
Tuberculosis, 2152
Western Canada, 2145

Indictable Offences. *See* Criminal Code

Indirect Taxation. *See* Taxation

Industrial and Scientific Research. *See* Research

Industrial Councils, Joint. *See* Labour

Industrial Designs. *See* Trade Mark and Designs Act

Industrial Disputes. *See* Labour

Industrial Disputes Investigation Act Amdt. Bill
(Application for boards; pending proceedings) 1r., 1361; 2r., com., 2061; 3r., 2063; Senate amdts., 4357, 4592
Sections and subjects discussed:
Industrial towns, 2889
Judges on conciliation boards, 4358

Industrial Problems, credit and. *See* Credits

Industrial towns, 2886, 2889, 2891

Industries. *See also* Address; Budget; Labour; Textiles; Trade
Agricultural prosperity and, 2962
Annual production, statement, 2720
Basic
Adequate protection 2822
Assistance to, 3238. *See also* Bounties
Wool-combing, qu. 1973. *See also* Wool
Bonused, 3072
Capital diverted from by income tax, 2914
Conservation of, 2820
Control of bank directors, 4022, 4023
Democracy in, 2727
Encouragement of, 2958
By artificial means, 3062
Farmers and, 2853
French treaty, effect on, *See* French Treaty
Indigenous, 2779, 2806
Industrial centralization, 2850
Industrial conditions, 636, 3002. *See also* speeches on Address, Budget
Industrial revolution, 2723
Industrial towns, 2886, 2889, 2891
Closed town system, 2888
Industry and finance, 4053
Investigation of by tariff commission, 2955
Joint control of, 1654
Key, 2752
Labour costs, 2876
Lack of in western provinces, 4047
Manufactured products
Exports, 3061
Value of, 2934
Manufacturing
Costs, 1409, 2720
Labour organizations and, 1857
Overhead, 2928
Production and distribution, 3029
Establishment in West, 1405
New, assistance to, 2780
Prices of agricultural and industrial products, 1403. *See also* Prices
Primary, relief, 2718
Protected, 2798, 2957
Raw materials, free trade in, 2858
St. Stephen, N.B., 2901
Salaries, average, 2720
Small industries, disappearance of, 2850
Tariff and, 3024
Wages, average, 2720
Watered stock, dividends on, 2956
Western Canada, 1889
Wood-working, 2806

Inflation and Deflation. *See* Finance; Money; Prices

Ingram, Mr., appointment. *See* Immigration

Inheritance Tax. *See* Taxation

Inland Revenue. *See also* Customs and Excise
Illicit stills, remission of fines, 2299
Postage stamps, used for, 3938. *See also* Post Office

Inland Revenue Act Amdt. Bills
1. Excise duties changed; cigarette duties
Res. 2655, 3229; 1r., 3242; 2r., com., 4392; 3r., 4393
2. Certificate of analyst; deodorizing or clarifying denatured alcohol; home-grown tobacco
Res. 3749; 1r., 4131; 2r., com., 4207; 3r., 4208; Senate amendments, 4528
3. Certificate of analyst, etc., order discharged, 3969

Insect Pests, 595. *See also* Agriculture; Forests and Forestry
Alfalfa weevil, 596
Apple sucker, 596
Browntail moth, 596
Cereal rust, 595
Codling moth, 597
Cornborer, 595
Cut worms, 4632
Grasshoppers, 595, 3447
Gypsy moth, 596
Nursery stock, 596
Potato diseases, 595
Satin moth, 596
Spruce bud worm, 596
White pine blister, 595

Inside Service. *See* Civil Service

Insolvent Cases. *See* Bankruptcy Act

Inspection of Seeds. *See* Seeds

Inspection of Fruit and Fruit Containers. *See* Sale and Inspection

Institutionalism, excess of, 1214, 1400, 1890. *See also* Hoey; Immigration; Speakman

Insulin Treatment, discovery. *See* Banting, Dr.

Insurance. *See also* Canadian National Railways; Returned Soldiers
Agents, bank officials acting as, 4093, 4094
Bank loans, security, 4094
Canadian National Railways. *See that title*
Combinations, 2591
Fire, soldier settlers, 496
Grain cargoes, 3764, 4219, 4223
Hail, 2769, 4095, 4509
Hail Insurance Commission of Saskatchewan 2770

Insurance—*Con.*
Hanna, Mr. D. B., director, 2050
Insurance branch
Annuities, old age, 1697
Salaries and contingencies, 3987
Live Stock condemnation, qu. 1972, 2699. *See also* Live Stock
Mitchell, Mr. A. J., director, 2050
Mutual companies, 4095-7
Roof coverings, 4703
Soldier Settlement Board, Edmonton, 3506
Soldiers. *See* Returned Soldiers Insurance bill

Insurance Act 1917 Amdt. Bill
(Duplication of returns; automobile insurance; correction of French version)
1r., 3045; 2r., com., 3147; com., 3977, 4357; 3r., 4357
Sections and subsections discussed:
Accidents to persons or property, 3978
Application, 3148
Automobile insurance:
Conditions of license for, 3147, 3977
No liability:
If driver under age limit or intoxicated, 3978
Unless stated in policy, 3978
Exceptions to insurability, 3148
French version amended, 3147
Misrepresentation, 3147
Returns of British or foreign unlicensed insurance, 3147

Intercolonial Railway. *See this title under* Canadian National Railways

Intercontinental Transports Limited, ocean freight rates, 2127

Interest. *See* Banks; Credits; Finance; speeches on Budget

Interim Supply. *See also* Estimates; Supply
Concurrence, 1482, 1538

Interim Supply Bills. *See* Appropriation Acts

Interior, Department of. *See also* Geological Survey
Astrophysics
Dominion Astrophysical observatory, Victoria, 3242
Expenditure, 3243
Campbell, Mr. R. H., retirement, 3410
Cory, Mr. W. W., deputy minister, salary, 4667
Dominion observatories, 3242

Interior—*Con.*
Dominion lands and parks, 3406
Canadian National Parks and historic sites, 3938
Contingencies, 3408
Engraving maps, printing reports, 3443
Estimates, 1908, 3242, 3406, 4702
Grazing inspectors, appointment, 3252
Grazing leases, Alberta, revenue, qu. 2515
Irrigation, surveys and inspection, 3428
Mines branch, 2970
Officials, 1108
Ordnance lands, salaries and expenses, 3443
Reclamation of Dominion lands. *See* Dominion Lands; Reclamation
Salaries and contingencies, 1098, 3949
Seed grain advances, 3444
Settlers' relief, 3447
Topographical surveys, 3244
Water powers, surveys, investigations, 3420

Interlocking Directorates. *See* Bank Act Amdt. bill

Internal Economy Commission. *See* House of Commons

International Boundaries
Survey and demarcation, 3246

International Court of Justice, 3994

International Fisheries Commission. *See* Fish and Fisheries

International Harvester Company, 4376

International Institute of Agriculture, 599
Wheat production, 2780

International Joint Commission. *See also* Lake of the Woods; St. Lawrence River Waterway
Lake of the Woods water powers, 3425
Pollution of boundary waters, 700, 3362
St. Lawrence river waterway, aerial survey, 1776, 3762, 3427
Welland canal, 3762

International Labour Conference. *See* Labour

International Law, violation of. *See* Germany, Reparations

International Operation of Railways. *See under* Canadian National Railways, United States lines

International Postal Conference, 4529

International Questions, opportunity for discussion, 3993, 3998

International Relations. *See* Imperial Conference; League of Nations; Treaties, Halibut Fishery
Commercial rivalry and industrial war, 2717

International Waters. *See* Lake of the Woods; St. Lawrence

Interprovincial Trade. *See* Trade

Interstate Commerce Commission. *See* United States

Intoxicating Liquor. *See* Liquor

Inventions. *See* Patents of Invention

Inverness pier, 4572

Investigations. *See* Combines Bill

Ireland
Proportional representation, 395
Senate, constitution of, 1371

Iron and Steel. *See also* Customs Tariff Items; Mines and Minerals
Bounties, 4371, 4381
British industrial development, 3847
Coast Range Steel Company, assistance, 2508
Duties and drawbacks, qu. 1994
Freight rates, 1964
French treaty, 1985, 1988
Iron and steel scrap duty, 2645, 2653, 3034, 3484
Iron ore and smelting industry, 3061
Ore-production and smelting, 3061
Rolled iron and steel
Hoops, bars, etc., duty, 3484
Milling cutters, for, 2653, 3484
Steel-workers strike, 287. *See also* Labour, Strikes
United States, production, 2751

Iron Ores. *See* Mines and Minerals

Irrigation. *See also* Dominion Lands, Reclamation
Alberta, 1436
Brooks demonstration farm, 3429
British Columbia, 457
Central Alberta irrigation scheme, 3428
Drought effect on grain production, 3429
Expenditure, 2969
Lethbridge irrigation district, 3429
Macleod irrigation district, 3429
Northern Saskatchewan, 3430
Surveys and inspections, 3428
United irrigation projects, Cardston, 3429
William Pearce irrigation project, 3430

Irrigation Act Amdt. Bill
(Mining rights of lease holders)
1r., 1992; 2r., com., 2138; 3r., 2204

Irvine, Mr. William (Calgary East)
Audibility of debate, 645
Bank Act Amdt bill, 4037, 4049, 4082, 4118
M. that chairman leave chair, 4125
Shareholders' audit, 4089
Bank mergers, 4137
Banking system, 634
Cadet services, 880
Calgary
Post office building, 1024
Unemployment relief, 1682
Canada-West Indies steamship service, 3378, 3387, 3397
Canadian National Railways, Paris offices, 3650, 3662
Canadian National Safety League grant, 3958
Capital punishment bill, 180, 487
Opportunity for consideration, 1810
Children, mortality of, 1179
Civil Service
Bonus, 1811
Commission, exemptions from jurisdiction, 914
Examinations, 366
Credit and industry, M. 626, 645, 650
Criminal Code Amdt., capital punishment bill, 180, 487, 1810
Customs and excise seizures, qu. 620
Dredging, 1012
Duff, Mr., amendment to Address, 117
Economic conditions, cycles of prosperity and depression, 1177
Emigration to the United States, 1178
Employers' liablity compensation, 692
Farm homes, building loans, 1178
Fielding, Right Hon. Mr., congratulations, 4743
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 333
Hayes, Mr. John J., dismissal, 1687, 1868
Immigration
Attitude of labour towards, 1176, 1177
Hebridean immigrants, treatment, 3600
Policy, 1176-80
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1706-7
Senate amendments, 4362
Interest rate, 4107, 4116
Joint Peat Committee, 387
Labour department
Capitalistic, 1674
Staff, reduction, 1672

Irvine, Mr. William—*Con.*
Labour
Representation in House, 3556
Right to organize, 2888
Lack of confidence vote, M., 208, 239-243
Land, taxation of, 1178
Lignite Utilization board, 387
Mail contractors, names, 3144
Marshall, Mr. Duncan
Appointment and qualifications, 3311, 3295
Redistribution, 3313
Two Ministers of Agriculture, 3313
Money, origin and function, 633
National gallery, 1020
National monument, Connaught place, 1021, 2688
Nova Scotia strike, troops employed, 495
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3555
Ottawa-Hull bridge, 1016
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3854, 4750
Postal appointments, 1801
Powell River Paper Company, 2888
Privilege—Hebridean immigrants, 3649
Proportional representation, 405
M. (Mr. Good) 414
Public buildings, Maritime provinces, 1022
Returned soldiers, unemployment relief, 1679
Scientific and industrial research, qu. 731
Secession—reported statement of Hon. W. F. Roberts, 3145
Single tax, 1178
Soldier Settlement board, 1179
Steamship services, 3378, 3387, 3397
Unemployment, 628
Federal and provincial responsibility, 1678
Relief, 690, 1679
Vetcraft shops, 695
Western conditions, cause of, 1890

Isenberg Leases. *See* Hoppe and Isenberg

Isle Perrot bridge, 3646

Italian Treaty. *See this title under* Treaties

Italy
Senate, constitution of, 1372
Tariff. *See also* Treaties, Italian Treaty
Trade, 2395
Treaty with. *See* Treaties
Wool-combing, 2866

Ivel, Mr. W. M. *See* Redistribution

Jackson, Professor, price chart, 1403

Jacobs, Mr. S. W. (George Etienne Cartier)
American fishing schooner Siloam, capture, 2207

Jacobs, Mr. S. W.—*Con.*
Arsenals, Quebec and Lindsay, 2165
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4050, 4052, 4056
Point of order, 4055
Bankruptcy Act M. (Mr. Casgrain) 1493, 1515
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3086-3108 3211-21
Belle River harbour, 4596
Binder twine, duty, removal of, 4387
Board of Audit bill, 4357
Business of the House
Private members' day, 1160
Saturday sittings, 3452
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2408 2413
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 3832
Canadian National Railways
Audit staff, transfer from Moncton, 575
Branch lines construction bill, 4335
Paris offices, 4514
Canadian representative in United States, 3085
Cattle embargo, reported statement of Mr. Duncan Marshall, 2614
Civil Service Act. M. (Mr. Power) 547
Combines bill, 2628
Criminal Code Amdt. bill (Registration of ownership) 615
Deputy minister of Immigration, 668
English and French-speaking people, 1341
Halibut fishery treaty, 1309
Hindu immigrants, franchise, 514, 4077, 4640
Immigration
Alleged campaign against, 332
Assimilation, 1117
Canada Colonization Association, 1164
President, 1092
Exodus to United States, 1165
Farm labour and domestic servants, 1165
Germany and Hungary, from, 1094
Labour, attitude towards, 1167
Medical inspection, 702
Policy, 1163-71
Restriction of, 1169
Shipping Federation of Montreal, protest, 2435
Immigration Act Amdt. bill, 514, 2428-35
Legislation of 1919, 243-32
Ships' crews, 2435, 2670
Undesirable classes, 2669
Imperial Conference, 4640-4661
Indians
Caughnawaga reserves, expulsion of half-breeds, 2163
Edmonton school, 2165

Jacobs, Mr. S. W.—*Con.*
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act Amdt. bill, 4359, 4361
King George and race-track betting, 728
Labour Gazette, printing, 1624
Meighen, Right Hon. Mr., alleged statement in North Essex, 670
Money, purchasing power of, 1167
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2189 2195, 2438, 2461
British system, 2438
Judical and executive authority, 2462
Limited naturalization, 2461
Nationality, dual, 2463
Secretary of State, administration, 2461
Opium and Narcotic Drugs, 700
Printing, outside Bureau, cost of, qu. 3131
Public Works Act, tender and contract, 957
Railway Act Amdt. bill (return tickets) 615
Receipt tax, 4425
Roumanian and Greek loans, qu. 623
Sales tax
Book or account, 4434
Licensed manufacturer, 4421
Speech at Winnipeg, 1429
Standard of living, 1168
Thetford Mines strike, 2207
Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner) 1295
Unemployment, 1168

James Bay Railway, 1036, 1049, 1402
Coal, transportation of, 1073

Japan
Bean-growing industry, 2982
British-Japanese relations, 2470
Canadian naturalization, 2442, 2461, 2467
Competition from, 2861
Expatriation from, 2443
French treaty, 3035
Immigration. *See also that title*
Restriction by Japanese government, 2328
Imports and exports, 1978, 2255
Japanese consul general
Immigration, 1447, 1894
Pamphlet, 2443
Japanese fishermen, 4484. *See also* British Columbia
Japanese organizations in United States, 2444
Military service, 2443
Mizusawa, Mr. Kosaku, alleged intervview, 1899
Nationality, 2442
Negotiations with, 4441
Rights of foreigners in, 1895
Silks, 2397
Trade concessions to. *See* Treaties, French Treaty

Japan—*Con.*
Trade with, 2214, 2234. *See also* Treaties, French Treaty
Trade treaty with, 1449, 2399
Wool-combing, 2866

Japanese. *See also* British Columbia; Fish and Fisheries; Immigration

Japanese Fisheries Association, 1453

Jelliff, Mr. L. H. (Lethbridge)
Accredited herds, 586
Agricultural credit system, 1438
Alberta
Grain production, 1435
Irrigation, 1436
Live stock, 1435
Southern, conditions in, 1435
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4113
Canadian National parks and historic sites, 3438
Cost of living, burdensome to farmers, 1437
Edmonton elevator, 4716
Freight rates, equalization of, 1437
Grain dockage and screenings, 786
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1437
Policy, 1435
Interest rate, 4113
Irrigation, surveys and inspection, 3429
Lethbridge elevator, 4716
Marketing of grain, M. (Mr. Millar) 300
Oil prospecting and development, 780
Petroleum bounties, 780
Public buildings, rents, 1025
St. Lawrence ship channel, 3339
Sales tax, M. (Mr. Stevens) 927
Timber wolves, 597
Tourist traffic, Southern Alberta, 3438

Jobbers
Sales tax and. *See* Special War Revenue Act Amdt. bill

Joggins, N. S., breakwater, 943

Johansen, Mr. F., assistant zoologist, 3360

Johnson, Mr. R. M. (Moose Jaw)
Certificate of registrar of Supreme Court, 515
Sales tax collections, qu. 285
Status of, inquiry, 202

Johnston, Mr. J. Fred (Last Mountain)
Agriculture, weed menace, 1887
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4097
British preference
Increase in, 2243
Percentage of duties to general rate, 2777

Johnston, Mr. J. Fred—*Con.*
Business of the House
Amdt. right of party not official opposition to move, 1300
Private members' day, 1159
Rules, amendment of, M. for special com. 856, 1299, 1300, 1306-7
Canadian National Railways
Branch lines construction bill, 4307
Grand Trunk, gratuities to directors and officials, 1666
Civil Service Act, special committee, names, 2417
Crowsnest pass agreement, statement that Progressives had forced concession, 2855
Dunblane-Aylesbury branch line, 4308
French treaty bill, 2242
Income tax, revenue, 3027
McMaster, Mr., statement of position, 3030
Nova Scotia secession resolution, 2243
Reciprocity with United States, 2243
Redistribution, 4740
Opportunity for discussion, 4593
Special committee report, 4740
Royal commission on lake rates, report, printing, 2927
Rules, M. for committee, 856, 1299, 1306-7
Seed grain advances, 3447
War claims, 2495
Waterous-Swift Current branch line, 4308
Wheat Board
Legislation, request to extend, 2927
Proceeding under Act of 1922, 1636
Yorkton-Willowbrook branch line, 4308

Joint Industrial Councils. *See* Labour

Joint Peat Committee. *See* Fuel

Jolly Roger, the, 2787

Jones, Mr. George B. (Royal)
Cooke, Mr. Leonard, qu. 2179
St. John river wharves, qu. 1488
St. Margaret's bay road, qu. 3135
Stuart, Mr. John Cameron, qu. 2179

Joynson-Hicks, Sir William, unemployment in Great Britain, 1205

Judges. *See also* Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill; Judges Act Amdt. bill; Naturalization Act Amdt. bill
Admiralty. *See* Admiralty Act Amdt.
Appointments, 3349
County court, naturalization certificates. *See* Naturalization
Industrial disputes conciliation boards, 4358
McKenzie, Hon. D. D., appointment to Bench, 1763, 1810
Naturalization. *See that title*

Judges—*Con.*
Ontario and Quebec courts. *See* Judges Act
Pensions, qu. 492, 1154
Doherty, Right Hon. C. J., qu. 1029, 1154
Political commissions, 3604
Retirement fund, qu. 1362
Salaries
Pensions and, 1154. *See also* Judges Act
Total payments, qu. 491
Trueman, Mr. W. H., K. C., Winnipeg, appointment, 1868
York county, 3607

Judges Act Amdt. Bill
(Salaries; Circuit Court judges)
Res. 3264, 3452, 3603; 1r., 3608; 2r., com., 3609; 3r., 3610
Sections and subjects discussed:
Additional $1,000 to judge of Circuit Court, 3610
Arbitrators or assessors under Railway or public act, 3609
Judges, Supreme Court of Ontario, 3609

Judique, N.S. wharf, 943

Jugo-Slavia, Italian treaty and, 2396

Jurisdiction. *See also* British North America Act; Labour, Unemployment; Lake of the Woods; Provincial Rights
Bankruptcy Act, 3095
Combines. *See that title*
Disallowance of provincial statutes
British Columbia, Chinese immigration, 1161, 1261, 1453
Nova Scotia, 208, 249, 3097, 4678
Drainage, 3256
Education, 882, 1884
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1646
Labour, 1442, 1646, 1650, 1618, 2894
Lake freight rates, 4227-31
St. Lawrence river waterway, 665
Unemployment, 1657, 1678
Water powers, 3421

Jurors, not British subjects. *See* Northwest Territories Act

Jury. *See* Grand Jury

Justice
Administration of, Yukon territory, 705
Appeals from convictions for indictable offences bill, 4250
Capital punishment, 768. *See also* Criminal Code
Department
Correspondence—Mr. F. T. Congdon, K.C., 2299
Employees, number and cost, 2970

Justice—*Con.*
Department—*Con.*
Deputy minister
Opinions
Liquor legislation, 2408
Naturalization, 2440
Wholesale Grocers' case, 2521
Salary, 4671
Estimates, 705, 768, 4667
International Labour Conference, 1442
Salaries and contingencies, 780, 4667
Solicitor General, retirement of, 1763, 1764, 1810, 2710
White, Mr. James, salary, 4667
Dominion statutes, revision, 779
Executive clemency, correspondence, 1975
Litigated matters, expenses, 779
Minister of, absence, 4514
Parole, release on, 1975
Pecuniary claims convention, 780
Penitentiaries, 706, 768
Capital punishment, execution of sentence, 768
Dorchester, qu. 494, 770
Earnings of inmates, 772
Nationality of inmates, 772
Prince Albert, Brenner, Meyer, release, 1975
Stony Mountain, 771
Trial of Eskimos charged with murder, Herschel Island, 4674

Kahn, Mr. Otto H., Elements of Success, 1399

Kamloops
Indian school, 2146
Public building, 1006

Kay, Mr. W. F. (Missisquoi)
Agriculture and Colonization Com.
Carroll, Mr., and, 3268
Oleomargarine, 3268
Reports
First, 858
Second, 911
Third, 986
Fourth, 1441
Fifth, 2204
Live Stock bill, 1441
Baker Memorial Com. report, 1256, 1991
Commissioner of Taxation, salary, 4669
Deputy ministers, salary increases, 4669
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4541
Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill, 1441
Oleomargarine
M. (Mr. Carroll) 3519
Amdt. 3520
Privilege—Mr. Carroll, 3268

Kay, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Soldier settlement, Missisquoi and Brome, 4012

Kellner, Mr. Donald F. (East Edmonton)
Address in reply, 106. Condition of country; inauguration of industrial epoch, 106; farmers in the West and immigration policy, 107; duty of government to see fair play, 108
Alberta Drainage Company, 3144
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4027, 4099-4103, 4133, 4139
Mortgages and hypothecs amdt. 4099 withdrawn, 4133
Percentage chargeable for collection, 4133
British preference and Canadian ports, 2678
Budget, 2809; commendation of Minister of Finance; tariff stability; interpretation of term; speech of Minister of Agriculture; allegation of bad farming; amendment; British preference; comparative statement of rates under government and Progressive proposals, 2809; speech of Minister of the Interior; Progressive party, assumption of power by; capitalistic interests and political parties; inheritance tax; reciprocity with the United States, 2810; agriculture, conditions of; budget; business and financial depression; "calamity howlers"; unsatisfactory conditions in West, 2811; disappointing record of Liberal party; no difference between Liberal and Conservative parties; invisible government; financial control; selfishness of those controlling destinies; prices and the tariff; interest rate; freight rates; charges of professional men; purchasing power, reduction of; conditions in the West; allegation of bad farming and extravagance, 2812; professional men, charges and standards of living, earnings of farmers; ridicule and intimidation of the West, 2813; government out of sympathy with people; Progressive party, predicament of; attention to demands of West, 2814
Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company, qu. 624
Canadian National railways, wage reductions, qu. 1363
Copper bounties, 3239
Crude petroleum duty, 3481
Dental instruments, raw materials, 3484
Deputy ministers, retirement, qu. 3135
Dominion Lands Act Amdt. bill, homesteads, 4364, 4368

Kellner, Mr. Donald F.—*Con.*
Dominion lands and parks, salaries, 3252
Dominion notes, circulation, qu. 1739
Dredging, Plamondon, Alberta, 1013
Farming at a profit, 81
Field supervisors, soldier settlement, 1090
Free trade and protection, 2923
Grand Trunk arbitration, commissioners, qu. 624
Hebridean immigrants, treatment of, 3595
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1352
Personnel, 1092
Policy, 1348
Wealth and, 1122
Inland revenue officers, salaries, qu. 3892
Irrigation, surveys and inspection, 3428
Live stock, tuberculin test, qu. 1972
Merchants bank inquiry, 3990
Solder settlement, 2024, 2027
Typewriters and parts, duty, 3485
Western provinces, conditions in, 1349

Kennedy, Mr. Donald M. (West Edmonton)
Agriculture, assistance to, 3237
Bacon imports and exports, 938
Business of the House, 1386
Canadian air force, forest patrol, 1778
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, steamship service, 2172
Canadian National Railways
Branch lines, construction of, 1185
Fidelity insurance, qu. 1029
Lifting of steel, 1664
Criminal Code Amdt. bill (scrip frauds) 730
Dominion lands, reclamation, 3430
Grain Act, litigation, 2045
Grain shipments, facilities for, 730
Grande Prairie railway, 4200
Harbours and rivers, 1001
Health department, salaries, 2170
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1180
Statement of objects, 1180
Supervision, 1092
Community clubs, 1183
Immigrants, standard of living, 1127
National land settlement plan, 1181
Policy, 1180, 1401
Indians, 2148
Labour Gazette, 1624
Land, clearing by fire, 1185
Mackenzie river district, half breed claims, 3444
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, speeches in Great Britain, 3595
Peace river district
Railway surveys, 4701

Kennedy, Mr. Donald M.—*Con.*
Settlement in, 1184
Prince Rupert Dry Dock Company, bonds, qu. 1138
Purchasing Commission, 1385
Railway Act Amdt. bill, (Equalization of rates) 730
Railway mail service, 1783, 1786
Rural mail carriers, compensation, 1833, 1834
Scrip frauds, 730
Soldier settlement, 2028
Steamship services, 2172
Northern Alberta, 2176
Unemployed pensioners, relief, 2168
Water powers, investigation, 3426

Kennedy, Mr. J. Wilfred (Glengarry and Stormont)
Agricultural conditions, 1843
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 376
Dairy Industry Act, 1914, Amdt. bill, renovated butter, 4510
Dairying industry, 1843
Exhibitions, 1454
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4272
Government workshops, Ottawa, 4620
Health department, salaries, 2170
Indian Affairs department, salaries, 2166
Labour department, employment officers. 1674
Military hospitals, 677
Pensioners, medical examination, 677
Ruddick and Wilson, Messrs. visit to Australia, 3288
St. Lawrence river islands, St. Regis reserve, 2163
Woollen industry, M. (Mr. Drummond) 935

Kennedy, Capt. William, Hudson Bay route, 1052

Kennedy, the late Hon. W. C.
Belle River harbour, 4597
References to, 4, 6, 8, 10, 54, 108
Letter of thanks for sympathy from Mrs. Kennedy, 281

Keynes, Mr. John M., on war, 46. *See also* Germany, Reparations
Economic Consequences of the Peace, 2724

Kincardine, Ont., pier, 982

King, His Majesty the, race-track betting, 728

King, Hon. J. H. (Minister of Public Works)
Armouries, fittings, etc., 1024, 2413
Bamfield public building, 1024
Brandon, damage by flood, 999
British Columbia fishing licenses, 1556

King, Hon. J. H.—*Con.*
Calgary post office, 1024
Calumet-Bryson bridge, 1014
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2410
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 536
Contrecoeur wharf, 950
Copper bounty bill, 3236
Dominion roads and bridges, 1014
Dredging
Alberta, Manitoba and Saskatchewan, 1012
Expenditure, 1012
Maritime provinces, 1009
Nanaimo harbour, 1014
Ontario and Quebec, 1011
Plamondon, Alberta, 1012
Shuswap lake, 1014
Victoria harbour, 1014
Dry Dock Subsidies Act Amdt. bill, 3583, 3979
Edmundston bridge, 1014
Esquimalt dry dock, 2671
Forest protection, M. (Mr. Michaud) 824
Fraser river improvements, 1006
Girrard Bridge Company, charter, 1008
Graving docks, 2682
Grondines wharf, 959
Harbours and rivers, 2671
British Columbia, 1002
Stanley park foreshore, 1008
Expenditures in different provinces, 947
Manitoba, 993
New Brunswick, 945
Grand Manan, 945
Wharves transferred to Dominion, 946
Nova Scotia, 941
Ontario, 981
Port Arthur and Fort William, 2675
Port Burwell harbour works, 983, 1012
Quebec, 950
Grondines wharf, 959
Matane, 970
Ste. Anne des Monts pier, 979
Saskatchewan and Alberta, 1001
Hydro Electric commission, St. Lawrence development, 2682
Lake Manitoba flooding, 1000
Land and cable telegraph lines, 2683
Laurier monument, 1017
Law, the late Bowan B., tablet to memory, 1020
L'Islet wharf, 970
Matapedia birdge, 1014
Montreal ordnance stores building, 1022
Moose Jaw public building, 1023
National Gallery, 1018, 2688
National monument, Connaught place, Ottawa, 1020, 2685
Okanagan lake wharves, repairs, 1008

King, Hon. J. H.—*Con.*
Ottawa-Hull bridge, 1015
Owen Sound wharf, 2690
Parliament buildings, 1716
Acoustics, 1721
Architects, settlement with, 1716
Cost, estimated and actual, 1723
Stone carving, 1720
Tower, 1720
Ventilation, 1722
Pointe aux Trembles wharf, 974
Port Burwell harbour dredging, 983, 1012
Port Elgin breakwater, 2690
Portage la Prairie
Member for, 2681
Sewerage outlet, 994, 998
Printing bureau
Improvements, 1022
New building, 1732, 1738
Public Works
Engineering branch, 1017
Estimates, 941, 993, 1009, 2571
Patronage, 945
Public buildings, 2690
Dominion archives building, 1730
Economy, renting or building, 1735
Local improvement taxes, 1023
Maritime provinces, 1022
New departmental, 1729
Ottawa, Daly building, 1023
Ottawa Parliament buildings, 1716. *See also under this title,* Parliament buildings
Power, 1025
Printing bureau new building, 1730
Rents, 1025
Salaries, 2684
Surveys and inspections, 1020
Public Works Act, contract and tender, 950, 955
Quebec, Champlain dock, 2675
Railway rates, equalization, M. (Mr. Clark) 1954
St. John harbour improvements, 2676
St. Laurent, the late Mr. A., appreciation of, 1006
Selkirk, repair slip, 1000
Sheguindah wharf, 2690
Swift Current public building, 1023
Telegraph and telephone lines, 1017, 2682
Toronto harbour improvements, 985, 1011, 2678
Toronto island protection breakwter, 984
Vancouver harbour bill, 267
Vancouver island telegraph lines, 1017
Victoria and Nanaimo harbours, dredging, 1014

King, Hon. J. H.—*Con.*
Victoria
Dry dock, 1002
Old post office building, taxes, 1024
Wanipigow dam, 1000
Wharves
Revenue, 975, 977
Transfer to Dominion government, 946

King, Mr. J. W. (North Huron)
Budget, 2908. Felicitations to Finance Minister; tariff; automobiles; Henry Ford greatest customs collector in Canada; tariff "purely and simply protective"; Liberal platform of 1896; Sir Wilfrid Laurier on tariff reduction and Senate reform; Liberal party repeating tactics following election of 1896; influences preventing government from carrying out pledges; Progressive party, withdrawals from; capital levy; reciprocity; new sources of revenue; luxuries; inheritance tax, 2909; reciprocity with United States; advantages of enlarged trade; diversity of products; treaty of 1854; abrogation of and its results; reciprocity in natural and manufactured products; manufacturing opportunities in Ontario and Quebec, 2910; President, Massey-Harris Company "ready for free trade"; duties under reciprocity agreement of 1911; members elected to support reciprocity; President Harding and world peace; Washington disarmament conference; trade rivalry cause of war; population greatest need of Canada; five million Canadians in United States; immigration; Canadian citizenship, value of, 2911

King, Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie (Prime Minister; Secretary of State for External Affairs; President of the Privy Council)
Address in reply, 27. Congratulations to mover and seconder; new leader of Progressive party, 27; criticisms of Speech from Throne by Mr. Meighen; co-ordination of National railways, 28; government's immigration policy, 29; national resources of western provinces, 29; Near East Crisis, explanation of circumstances, 29-33; communications from British government, 30; delay in receiving despatches, 31-32

King, Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie—*Con.*
Agricultural Conditions Com. report, 2181
Anglo-Japanese treaty, 1449
Annuities branch, transfer, 1641
Australia, trade treaty, 245
Banff national park, power privileges, 3750
Banting, Dr. F. G., annuity, 4437, 4676
Bell, Major Graham A., salary, 4557
Blackadder, the late Dr. Edward, M. P., 4
Board of Audit Act, 4249
Bolton speech, 2974
Breweries and export liquor houses, licensing, 1636
British Columbia building, London, 4630
British Empire exhibition, 3950
British mails, delay in, 2639
Budget, 3046. Speech of leader of Opposition; attack on Liberal party; fidelity to pledges and principles; Liberal platform of 1919; presentation of "chart"; statement to convention after adoption of platform; resolution presented by opposition in 1921; appeal to the country; campaign speeches, 3047; position on tariff put plainly before people; Liberal platform carried out; the budget, charge that it is protectionist; tariff reductions; British preference; preference of 50 per cent and over, 3048; reciprocity, sugar duties, reduction; no increase in taxation; substantial tariff revision downwards; commercial treaties with France and Italy; Combines Act, 3049; free trade; speech of Mr. McMaster; theoretical study and concrete application; capital, attraction of; tariff walls going higher and higher; world conditions; free trade in Great Britain; slow progress of movement after its inception; industrial revolution; gradual elimination of tariff duties; reciprocity treaty between Great Britain and France, 3050; attitude of Progressive party and Mr. McMaster; leaders in British free trade movement; problems and difficulties in connection with the tariff; amendment, 3051; stability does not mean finality; United States tariff; European situation; British preference, increase of, 3052; cattle embargo, removal of; development of Canadian railways and ports; trade to Pacific ports by Panama canal; trade relations with the United States; Canada seeking new markets; tariff and economic warfare; declara-

King, Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
tion of Genoa Conference; endorsement by Assembly of the League of Nations, 3054; economic conditions; statistics indicating revival; building operations; imports and exports; bank clearings; savings deposits; immigration; employment, 3055
Speech on, reference to, 3056, 3068
Statements omitted from, 2898
Business of the House, 179, 199, 250
Adjournments
Ascension day, 2518
Ash Wednesday, 254
Early, 74
Easter, 1162, 1483
Eleven p.m., 1360
Empire day, 2795, 2983
Hour of, 3261
King's birthday, 3323
Twelve midnight, 4672
Capital punishment bill, proceeding, 487, 1810
Economy of time, 382
Estimates, presentation, 4556, 4598, 4603
Facilitating of, 1836, 4736
Legislation pending, 2518, 3265
Announcement, 3452
M. that Com. rise to report progress, 1836
M. (Mr. Carroll) on oleomargarine, special order, 3270
Private members' day, 1158, 1160-62
Progress of, 2469
Prorogation, 4736
Facilitation of, 4732
Questions as orders for returns, 1385
Redistribution bill, motion to refer, 488
Rules, M. (Mr. Johnston) for special com., 1305
Select standing committee, personnel, 3, 202, 435, 486, 811, 1483, 2047
Sittings
Morning, 4132, 4249
Not later than midnight, 4579
Saturday, 2694, 3453, 4132
Wednesday, 99
Evening, 1163, 1995, 2518, 2694
Supply
Amendment to amendment, 1305
Concurrence, 4735
Business Profits War Tax Act Amdt. 4440
Campaign of 1921, speeches, 3047
Canada, constitutional development, 4474
Canada Temperance Act, correspondence, 1308
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, sale of vessels, 3705

King, Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie—*Con.*
Canadian National Railways
Amalgamation, 34
Order in council tabled, 53
Branch lines construction bill, 4400
Rejection by Senate, 4754
Directors, board of
Additional director from Quebec, 34
Labour representation, 1652
Grand Trunk
Gratuities, royal commission, Mr. F. T. Congdon, K.C., 2347
Shareholders' representations, 3960
Grand Trunk Pacific debenture holders, 3507
Management, responsibility and powers, 3673, 3677
Paris offices, 3673
Canadian National Safety League grant, 3954, 3959
Canadian offices in London, 4630
Canadian Press, Limited, subsidy, 4727
Canadian representative in United States, 3085, 4001
Cape Breton North and Victoria, vacancy, 2469
Capital punishment bill, 487, 1810
Carvell, Hon. F. B., alleged statements, 1869, 1910
Cattle embargo removal, correspondence, 4133
Cecil, Lord Robert, adjournment for lecture, 1685
China, trade relations with, 2313
Chinese immigration bill, 2312-33
Evasions, 2315
Exclusion, 2313
Head tax, 2312
International relations, 2312
Labour competition, 2312
Restriction of immigration, 2312
Students, 2313
Christie, Mr. Loring resignation, 3988
Civil Service
Bonus 1811
Commission, appointments, 371
Cost of living, increase, 1814
Political partisanship, 286
Superannuation, 4593
Work outside regular duties 1675
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 349, 358, 362, 374, 377, 522, 536, 545, 552, 559, 568
Special committee, 936
Appointment, 986
Change in membership, 2417
Coal, cost of, 1813
Combines bill, 254, 496, 938, 987, 2519, 2602, 2615-38, 2659-68, 2701

King, Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie—*Con.*
Combines bill—*Con.*
Amendments proposed, 2520
Civil Service Act, appointments, 2661
Commissioners, appointment and remuneration, 2627
Definition "combine" 2615, 2666
Distribution of report, 2632
Registrar
Appointment, 2628
Inquiry, 2618
Senate amendments, 3505
Statement of provisions, 987, 2520
Technicalities, 2665
Combines Investigation Act of 1910, 2605
Cost of living, reference to, 1812-13
Crowsnest pass agreement, extension, 2741. *See also under this title,* Freight Rates
Customs duties on goods shipped from one Canadian port to another, 2519
Dairy Industry Act 1914 Amdt. bill
M. (Mr. Motherwell) for discharge of order, 3449
Daylight saving, 2612
Debates, official report of
Pages said to be missing, 888, 889, 1082
Revised edition, enquiry, 122
Deceased members, tribute to, 4
Deputy ministers, salaries, 4557
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 2384, 2386
Disarmament, Great Lakes, correspondence, 244, 494, 1307
Dominion Elections Act, amdt. 1027
Duke and Duchess of York, congratulations, 2251
Election of 1921, speeches, 3047
Estimates, time of presentation, 4556, 4598,
Comparison with previous government, 4603
External Affairs, department, salaries, 3987
Fielding, Right Hon. Mr., congratulations on being called to Privy Council, 4743
Finance Act, 1914, Amdt. bill, 4249
Forest fires, relief, 4010
Freight rates. *See also under this title* Lake Freight Rates
Crowsnest pass agreement, 1962
Suspension of, 1949
Equalization of, M. (Mr. Clark), 1285, 1490, 1962
Legislation to be introduced, 3265
Fuel supply, M. (Mr. Church) 1284

King, Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie—*Con.*
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth), 336
Government publications, distribution, 3266
Grain and grain trade
Grain shipping rates, information, 2517. *See also under this title* Lake Freight Rates
Royal commission to inquire into, 1211
Grand Jury system, abolition of, 2695, 3272
Grant, Dr., civil service, 560
Halibut fishery treaty, 4437, 4474, 4736
Approval of, 4455
Correspondence tabled, 1256
Inquiry for papers, 1212
Ratification by His Majesty, 1309
Hansard. *See under this title,* Debates
Hayes, Mr. John J., dismissal of, 1694
Hector celebration, 4706
High Commissioner's office, London, 4629
Hindu franchise, 4077, 4665
Hoppe and Isenberg leases, 4442
House of Commons staff, organization, 4592
Housing, legislation, 2518
Hudson Bay railway, Motherwell, Hon. Mr., reported statement, 1686
Immigration. *See also under this title,* Chinese Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1330
Attitude of Conservative and Progressive parties, 1333
Forke, Mr., letter to Mr. Brown, 1333
Meighen, Right Hon. Mr., letter to Mr. Brown, 1333
Reorganization, inquiry, 3324
Willison, Sir John, telegram, 1331
Oriental. *See also under this title,* Chinese
Bill respecting (Mr. Neill) 4441
Exclusion, possible results, 1453
Japanese
Japanese stowaways on freighter, 1448
Lemieux agreement, 1447
Negotiations with Japanese govt. 2328, 4441
M. for return, 1261
Policy, 1330
Immigration Act Amdt. bills
Undesirable classes, 2669, 4441
Imperial Conference
Agenda, 1976, 4639-65
Opportunity for discussion, 3453, 4250
Tabled, 1991
Confidential matters, 4660
Constitutional questions, 4661
Forecast of discussion, 3453
Hindu immigrants, franchise, 4665
Preferential tariff, 4661

King, Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie—*Con.*
Imperial Conference—*Con.*
Representation of Canada, 1686
Imperial Economic Conference
Agenda, 1976, 4639-65
Opportunity for discussion, 4250
Tabled, 1991
Representation of Canada, 1686
Income War Tax Act 1917 Amdt. bill, 4440
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 2063, 4361
Illicit liquor traffic, 2208
Insurance Act 1917 Amdt. bill, 3978
Internal Economy commission, 3
International Labour Conference
Carruthers, Mrs. James, 1647
Italian Treaty bill, 2437, 2701
Japan
Immigration from. *See under this title,* Immigration
Secret agreement, 1448
Trade with, 1449, 2313
Kennedy, the late Hon. W. C., 5
King's birthday, observance of, 3323
King's Printer, Mr. F. A. Acland, 1669
Kitchener local improvements, 1022
Labour
Estimates, 1643
Right to organize, 2895
Strikes correspondence, 816
Lack of confidence vote, M. (Mr. Irvine) 213 216, 226
Lafortune the late Mr. D. A. M.P., 4
Lake freight rates, commission, 247
Legislation arising out of report, 3507
Lake of the Woods
Control, 247
Control board expenses, 4001
Levels 247
Lausanne conference, 54
League of Nations, Canada's contribution, 3992
Legislation, Senate salaries, 3949
Liberal convention of 1919, 2994, 3047
Labour resolution, 1652
Liberal platform, speech of June 1, 1920, 2994
Library of Parliament, 202
Joint committee, 516
Lowe, Dr. A. M., capture by Chinese bandits, 2695
Macdonald, Hon. E. M.
Acting Minister of National Defence, 2295
Sworn as member of Privy Council, 1764
McDougall, Mrs. William, pension, 3949
McKenzie, Hon. D. D.,
Appointment to Bench, 1810
Retirement, 2392

King, Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie—*Con.*
Militia and Defence disbursements, 344
Minister of Justice, absence, 4514
Minister of Railways and Canals
Appointment, 519, 1081
Hon. Mr. Graham, 2295
Mines and minerals com. report, 4743
Montreal harbour commission bill, 3463
Moose Jaw by-election, 2295
National monument, Connaught place, 2685
Near East crisis, 29-33
Correspondence, 45
Newspaper combines, 2524
Oleomargarine
Further legislation, inquiry, 1309, 2519
Members circularized, 3402
M. (Mr. Carroll) 3326, 3524
Precedence, 3451
Special order, 3270
Orders in council, government by, 1652, 1655
Orient, trade relations with, 2313
Pan-American union, 496
Paris agency, 4001
Parliamentary government, 1652
Passports, issuing of, 3988, 4708
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 4744
Pension board, resolution for removal, 3400
Pensions, old age
Legislation, 2518
Liberal convention of 1919, res. 1651
Mothers, and, conference with provinces, 3046
Petition of right, fiats, 3146
Postmaster General, absence through illness, 1315, 1538
Powell River Paper Company, 2895
Preston, Mr. W. T. R., 247
Prices, monopolies and, 2521
Printing Committee, 202
Private betting, M. (Mr. Good) 494
Private bills, consideration, 1836
Privilege, Mr. Carroll, 3270
Proportional representation
M. (Mr. Good) 417, 421
Single transferable vote, 1661, 2181
Public expenditure, 4556
Public Works
Estimates, 4557
Tenders, 4568
Publicity representative in London, 2984
Pulpwood, prohibition of export
Farmers and settlers, 4513
Royal commission, 4709
Purchasing commission, 3950, 4001
Salaries and contingencies, 4704
Quebec, statutes of, 1660
Race track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 494

King, Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie—*Con.*
Redistribution bill, 250, 436
Special committee
Reference to, 488, 572
Report, 4742
Returned Soldiers Insurance bill, 4735
Returned soldiers unemployment relief, 1680
Returns, inquiry for, 3962
Roberts, J. H., imprisonment, 1660
Roberts, Hon. W. F., reported statement on secession, 3145
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, hours, 4514
Rush-Bagot treaty negotiations, 2700
Russia, relations with, 3402
St. Lawrence river waterway, 204
United States, negotiations with, 3208, 4513
Saar valley commission, Mr. R. D. Waugh, 3145
Sales tax
Exemptions, 2998
Speech in 1921, 2997
Senate and House of Commons report, 2794
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4734
Senate, estimates, 2694
Sastri, Right Hon. Mr., letter from Prime Minister, 4665
Shipping combine, 4077
Shire horses from Great Britain, 2207
Singapore naval base, 2470, 3822
Stewart, the late Hon. J. A., 5
Stouffville, speech at, 1430
Supplementary estimates, presentation, 4558
Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner) 1288, 1298
Toronto viaduct, 4441
Trade Mark and Designs Act Amdt. bill, 2063
Treaties
Newspaper reports, 245-6
Signing of, 4474
Triplets, bonus for, 3145
Trueman, Mr. W. H., K. C., appointment to Bench, 1868
Unemployment relief
Conferences with provinces, 436
Expenditure, 1656
Federal and provincial responsibility, 1680
Union bank, position of, 4250, 4272
United States liquor laws, 4295
Vimy ridge memorial, 180
War
Commitments, 859
Glorification of, 2687
Wheat board
Extension of legislation, 2696, 2740
Proceedings under act of 1922, 1636
White, Mr. James, salary, 4667

King's Birthday Adjournment. *See* House of Commons

King's Printer. *See* Printing Bureau

Kingston dry dock, 4563

Kitchener
Local improvement taxes, 1022
Manufacturers and United States markets, 2856

Kitsilano Reserve. *See* Indians

Klondike. *See* Yukon

Knitting Industry. *See* Textiles

Knox, Mr. Andrew (Prince Albert)
Agricultural conditions, special committee, 667
Canadian Air Force, 1750
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 3813
Canadian National Railways
Branch lines construction bill, 4319
Rejection by Senate, 4753
Fixed charges, qu. 814
Cheque tax, 3934
Dairy Industry Act Amdt. bill, 4254
Drainage areas, 3259
Harbours and rivers, Saskatchewan and Alberta, 1001
Hudson Bay railway
Construction vote, 4680, 4685
M. for consideration of Senate report, 1032, 1079
Port Nelson terminals, 3647
Route, investigation by air service, 1750
Statement as to cost, correction, 2296
Trips through Hudson strait to Port Nelson, qu. 4011
Welland canal and, 3779
Indians, 2162
Duck lake school, 2159
Lake Grain rates bill, 4226
Melfort branch line railway, 4319
Moose Range drainage, qu. 3144, 3259
National Defence, ammunition, 1741
National monument, Connaught place, 2686
Order paper, absence of, 4744
Paddockwood branch line railway, 4319
Paris agency, 4001
Penitentiaries, 770, 773
Port Nelson dredging, 1012
Public buildings, rents, 1025
Relief of distressed Canadians, 1456
Renovated butter, 4254
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, pensions, 776
Soldier settlement, 2023, 2028

Knox, Mr. Andrew—*Con.*
Steamship services, 4003, 4004
Trent canal improvements, 3647
Waterhen lakes drainage, qu. 4303
Welland canal construction, 3779

Kyte, Mr. George W. (Cape Breton South and Richmond)
Arrangement between Whips as to adjournment, 53
Canadian National Railways branch lines bill, 4317, 4319
Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia, 4574
Hudson Bay railway, 1062
Morrison, Mr. T. D., Little Anse claim, 4574, 4725
St. Peter's-Louisburg branch line, 4319
Troops, use of in labour troubles, 869
Wrecks, removal of, 3332

Labarre, Que., postmaster, dismissal, qu. 3138

Labour. *See also* Civil Service; Housing; Immigration; Industrial Disputes; Returned Soldiers
Advertisements, 287
Asiatic competition, 2485. *See also* Immigration
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4016, 4041
British Columbia, conditions in, 1125
British National Labour party
Capital levy, 2722
Policy, 2721
Building trades. *See also* Building
Drift to United States, 1129, 1812
Canadian National Railways. *See also that title*
Directors, representation of, 1652-6, 3636
Labour costs, 1561
Capital and, 2744, 4026. *See also* Capital and Labour
Canadian Pacific railway shopmen, 3338
Cheap, 1118
Chinese, 2310, 2316, 2330. *See also* Immigration
Civil Service. *See* Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power)
Special committee, representation on, 937
Coal miners from Belgium, 1177
Combines bill, trades unions not affected, 2666
Competition, 1287, 1418, 2485
Conciliation and Labour Act, 1621
Conferences, 1443, 1678
Conventions, 1645, 1652
Copper bounty and, 3031
Cost of living. *See that title*
Costs, 1561, 2748, 2876

Labour—*Con.*
Delegates from United States, detention, *See* Howat
Demand for, 1248
Department
Actuaries, 1677
Annuities branch, 1672, 1682
Old age, administration, 1639
Basis of computation, 1683, 1694
Superintendent, 1677
Assistant deputy minister, 1671
Canada Gazette, printing, 1707
Capitalistic, 1674
Co-operation with provincial departments of labour, 1678
Deputy minister, 1675
Employees and cost, 2970
Estimates, 1621, 1668
Reduction in, 1638-43
Immigration and, 1170
Salaries and contingencies, 1657, 1668, 1694
Staff, dismissals and transfers, 1671, 2032
Statistics, 1677, 1682
Discontent, 1194
Dominion and provincial
Conference, 1442
Jurisdiction, 1442
Eight-hour day, 131, 207, qu. 279, 287, 1643
4,000. *See also under this title,* Hours
Jurisdiction, 1650
Moore, Mr. Tom., 1427
Emigration of. *See* Emigration to the United States
Employers and immigration, 1193, 1194
Employers' liability compensation, 691
Employment, 1124. *See also* Immigration and *under this title,* Unemployment
Index number, increase, 3055
Employment offices,
Co-ordination, 1643
Director of, 1672, 1676
Employment Offices Co-ordination Act, 1630
Provincial, 2169
St. John, 3453
Espionage, 1142-3
Factory and Shop Act, 1443
Farm, 37, 38, 1100, 1174,1416, 1424, 1427, 1475, 2876. *See also* Agriculture; Immigration
Competition of protected industries, 2731
Wages, 1240, 1355
Winnipeg, in, 1976
Federal and provincial jurisdiction, 1646
Opinion of Justice department, 1650
Financial Post, labour shortage in lumber camps, 1125
Grand Trunk, employees' compensation, 1564

Labour—*Con.*
Hours, 1416, 1643, 1841. *See also under this title,* Eight-hour day
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 4514
Station agents, 132
Howat, Alexander, detention. *See* Howat
Immigration. *See also that title.*
Attitude on, 332, 1167, 1177, 1186, 1193, 1197, 1224, 1241, 1337, 1413, 1426, 1892-3, 2816
Restriction of, 1104
Trades and Labour Council, and, 1419
"Unseen Hand," the, 1201
Imperial federation, 4651
Industrial disputes. *See also under this title,* Strikes
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, and, 1141
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1627, 1655, 1702, 1716. *See also that title*
Federal jurisdiction, 1646
Joint industrial councils, 1654
Granting of boards under, 287
Limited application, 1702
Industrial and "closed" towns, 2886-91
International Association of Machinists, res. 1338
International Federation of Trade Unions, 3158
International labour bureau, 3994, 4000
International Labour Conference, 1386, 1642
Carnegie, Colonel, 1648
Carruthers, Mrs. James, 1442, 1647
Incomplete return, 1539
Pacaud, Mr. L. T., 1539, 1647
Recommendations and conventions, 1643, 1645
Tabled, 1441, 1631
Report of 1922 meeting, 1442
Representation, papers tabled, 1483
Smith, Mr. Obed, 1648
Statistics, 1631
Joint industrial councils, 1654
Labour bureaus, 1424
Labour Gazette, 1621
Correspondents, 1626
Cost of living, 1684, 1812
Michell, Professor, figures, 1700
Cost prices and freight rates, 1958
Editor, 1625, 1671
Federal Printing Company, 1621
Hooper, Mr. Roland, 1625
International Labour Conference, 1386, 1442
Printing, cost of, 1621, 1708, qu. 3131
Union label on, 1621
Labour members, reference to by Sir James Lougheed, 3033

Labour—*Con.*
Labour party platform, 2728, 2815
Larkin, Mr. James, detention at border, 1163, 1212, 1309, 3156
Lewis, John L., correspondence, 250, 815
Liberal platform "plank" 1652
Lord's Day Act, federal jurisdiction, 1646
Macdonald, Mr. Ramsay, labour vote in Great Britain, 2722
May Day, 3158
Mechanics, qu. 203
Skilled, emigration to United States, 2790
Meyerscough, Mr. Thomas, detention at border. *See* Meyerscough; Howat
Miners' wages and price of coal, 1345
Moore, Mr. Tom
Delegate to International Labour Conference, 1642
Immigration, 1167
Labour representative on Canadian National Railway Board, 1654, 3636
National Industrial Conference, 2890
Organization of, 50, 123, 2815
Organized, dictation of, 1426
Organizing power of, 1857
Oriental. *See* Immigration, Oriental; Chinese Immigration bill
Penitentiaries, 772
Pensions, old age, 1646
Popular attitude towards work, 1189
Powell River Paper Company, 2886
Printing bureau. *See also that title*
Estimates, 1710
Professional agitators, 2943
Public works, 950, 956
Railway companies acting as agents, 1191
Railways, 126, 132, 1426, 3621
Renovated butter, 4251
Representation in House, 3033, 3555
Requirements in northern Ontario and Quebec, 1086
Right to organize, 2886, 2890, 2896
Bank employees, 4084, 4161
British constitution, 2894
Common law of Great Britain, 2894
Contract between workingman and employer, 2894, 2896
Federal and provincial jurisdiction, 2894
Legislation, necessity for, 2896
Treaty of Versailles, 2889
Royal Canadian Mounted Police
Duty, seven-day week, 4514
Espionage, 1142
Industrial disputes, 1141
Royal commission on industrial relations, 2889
Short hours and high wages, 1416

Labour—*Con.*
Shortage
Lumber camps, Financial Post, statement of, 1125
Saturday Night, statement as to, 1125
Skilled labour, 1224
Strikes, 84, 123-125, 1628, 1702. *See also under this title,* Industrial Disputes
Advocates of, deportation, 2434
Agricultural labourers, Great Britain, 2822
Cape Breton. *See under this sub-title,* Nova Scotia
Conciliation, 2786
District 18, coal miners, 1629
Joint industrial councils, 1654
Lewis, Mr. John L., correspondence, 250, 815
Nova Scotia coal miners, 495, 815, 866, 1627, 1716, 3155
Board of Conciliation award, 1628
Correspondence, 914
Troops, use of, 861, 893
Nova Scotia steel workers, 287, 397, 1643, 1703, 1705
Rainbow shingle mills, Chinese workmen, 2319
Shipping and railway, M. (Sir Henry Drayton) for papers, 245, 495, 815
Thetford Mines, 2207
Troops, employment of, 495, qu. 624, 861, 866, 893, 1627, 2893, 3072
United States coal miners, 1262, 2786
Technical Education
Administration of act, 1637
Director of, 1674
Trade unions, 2786
Combines bill, not affected by, 2666
Congress at the Hague, 46
Troubles, 123, 2893. *See also under this title,* Strikes
Unemployment, 50, 628, 1125, 1168, 1187, 1194, 1242, 1348, 1657, 2819, 3032. *See also* Immigration; Soldiers
Calgary post office, 629
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 3828, 3843
Decrease of, 15
United States in, 2650
Employment offices. *See under this title,* Employment Offices
Great Britain in, 1205
Hoboes, origin of, 1194
Insurance, 1638
International Labour Conference, 1646
Montreal Unemployed Workers' Association, letter, 2719
Municipalities, statements as to, 41-43
Order in council No. 220, 435

Labour—*Con.*
Unemployment—*Con.*
Pensioners, 2168
Provision for qu. 732, 1657
Purchasing power, limitation, 2716, 2725
Relief, 1644, 2730, 3032
Calgary, 1679
Expenditure, 1655, 2969
Federal and provincial responsibility, 1678
Federal assistance withdrawn, 1655-58, 1678
Soldiers' civil re-establishment, 689
Resolution passed in 1922, 436
Responsibility for, 1657
Seamen, 3379
Value of time lost, 1685
Vancouver, 1340
Waterton lakes highway, qu. 2085
Winnipeg, 435, 1124, 1215, 1416, 1883
United Mine-Workers of America, 3155
Delegates, detention at border, 2297. *See also* Howat; Meyerscough
Unorganized workers, 3534
Unskilled, employment for, 80
Wages, 1240. *See also* Cost of Living
Average, 2720
Bricklayers, $12 per day, 3017
Building trades, 2165, 3004
Canadian National Railways, qu. 1363
Inflation, 1167
Inquiry by fair wage officers, 2982
Loss through strikes, 1628
Manufacturing, 2876
Miners, 3206
Railway, 2800, 2876, 3190, 3205
Reduction, 2800
Textile industry, 3467
United States, 1165, 1248, 2650
Urban and rural, 35-36, 1240, 1355
Wage slavery, 2727
Wage system, 2723
War labour policy, 2887
Welland canal, 3762
Whitley councils, 1654
Workingman, position of, 2982

Labour Party, 2728, 2815

Labrador

Boundary, Mr. James White, salary, 4667
Discovery of placer gold, 1995
Report, 2611
Labrador Goldfields, Limited, qu. 2696

La Chambre de Commerce, Montreal, Bankruptcy Act, 1492

Lac Seul. *See* Lake of the Woods

Lack of Confidence Vote, M. (Mr. Irvine) 208; neg. on div. 243-4

Lacroix, Mr. Eugene, postmaster, Sayabec. *See* Post Office

Ladner, Mr. L. J. (Vancouver South)
Alaskan, wreck of, qu. 1763
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4105-24
Bank loans and deposits, 1133
Bankruptcy Act, M. (Mr. Casgrain) 1493, 1506
British Columbia fishing licenses, M. (Mr. Clark) 1541
Canada's participation in war, 1534
Canadian customs officer at New York, 1213, qu. 2611, 2419
Chinese immigration bill, exclusion, 2482
Civil Service patronage, 368
Dairy Industry Act 1914 Amdt. bill, 4270
Emigration to United States, 1085
Exhibitions, 1467
Forest destruction by fungi and insects, qu. 2178, qu. 2697
Fraser river improvements, 1007
Freight rates, equalization of, M. (Mr. Clark) 1967
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 316
Illicit still cases, remissions, 2299
Immigration
Assisted class, 1100
British Columbia, co-operation with, 1096 1097
Empire settlement scheme, 1096
Financial assistance to settlers, 1098
Oriental, 506
Competition of labouring classes, 1287
Immigration Act Amdt. bill, (Mr. Neill) 506
Indians, potlatching, 2163
Interest rate, 4105, 4108
Labour department, co-operation with provinces, 1678
Lack of confidence, M. (Mr. Irvine) 221
Lapointe, Hon. Mr., visit to Washington, 734
Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill, 2201
Lowe, Dr. A. M., capture and maltreatment in China, 2795
Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. bill, 2117, 2122
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3550
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3849-69
Disability attributable to war service Amdt. (Mr. Ladner) 3850, neg. 3870
Pensions
European war and active militia, 3717, 3736
Royal commission, recommendations, 2983
Prince Rupert dry dock, qu. 1664

Ladner, Mr. L. J.—*Con.*
Proportional representation, M. (Mr. Good) 390, 393, 398, 432
Renovated butter, 4270
Returned soldiers, death from tuberculosis, qu. 3134
Sales tax, M. (Mr. Stevens) for com. of inquiry, 921
Scientific knowledge, contributions to, 1286-7
Stanley park, foreshore protection, 1008
Titles, honours and decorations, M., 1285, 1297
Trader, wreck of, qu. 1763
Unemployment, provision for, 1657
Vancouver harbour bill, 199, 261, 332

Laflamme, Mr. J. N. K. (Drummond-Arthabaska)
Imperial Conference, 4653

La Flèche, Colonel. *See* Purchasing Commission

Lafortune, the late Mr. D. A., M.P., 4, 6, 8, 16
Letter from Madame Lafortune acknowledging sympathy, 281

Lake, Mr. R. S., Hudson Bay railway, 1053

Lake Freight Rates. *See* Freight Rates, Shipping

Lake Grain Rates Bill
Res. 3960, 4218; 1r., 4235; 2r., 4276; com., 4290; 3r., 4295
Sections and subjects discussed:
Canadian and American ports, 4218-4234
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 4223
Cargo space, 4219
Coasting laws, suspension of, 4219, 4222
Discussion, opportunity for, 4225
Insurance, brokers prohibited from writing, 4219, 4223
Interpretation, "board", 4291
Jurisdiction of parliament, 4227-31
Penalties, 4219
Rates, discrimination in, 4218, 4222
Power to fix minimum, 4218
Receiving and tabulating charges, 4294
Shipping combines, prosecution of, 4227
Tariff to be filed with Grain Commissioners 4219

Lake Grain Rates Commission. *See* Freight Rates, Shipping

Lake of the Woods. *See also* Water Powers
Control board
Expenses, 4001
M. for papers, 247

Lake of the Woods—*Con.*
Levels, 247, qu 2700
Water powers, 3421, 3425

Lake of the Woods Regulation Act 1921 Repeal Bill
1r., 2885-6; 2r., on div. 4163-80; com., 4181; 3r., 4185
Agreement with Ontario government, 2885

Lambton, steamer, wreck of, 3354

Lamont Park, Buffalo reserve, 3941

Lanark, election, 157

Lanctôt, Mr. Roch (Laprairie-Napierville)
Annual training, 865
Imperial Conference, 4656
Imperialism, 4657
Indemnity of members, 4242
Labour Gazette, 1622
Military expenditure, 865
M. for reduction, 866
Naval service, 4657
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4242
War, Canada's participation in, 4656

Lands. *See also* Dominion Lands; Immigration; Natural Resources
Clearing by fire, 1185
Colonization of, 1178
Decrease in value, 2019
Dominion reversion of. *See* Dominion Lands Act
Homesteads, second. *See* Dominion Lands
Hudson Bay railway, sold for, qu. 283. *See also that title*
Patents, issue of. *See* Dominion Lands Act Amdt Bill
Policy, 1344
Purchase price of, 1178
Railway, purchases or sales, 1739
Reclamation, 2969. *See also* Dominion Lands
Sales of. *See also* Immigration, Canada Colonization
Immigrants, to, 1431
Scrip frauds, 730
School lands. *See* Dominion Lands; Schools
Settlement, 43, 1893, 3060. *See also* Dominion Lands; Immigration; Soldier Settlement
National land settlement plan, 1182
Soldier settlement and, 2019. *See also that title*
Speculation in, 1119, 1395, 1887, 2955

Lands—*Con.*
Taxation, 1178, 1395. *See also that title*
Land values, 2745, 2778, 2803, 3016
Tax sales, 4062
Unimproved, 1118
Vacant, 1105, 1344

Landlord. *See* Bankruptcy Act

Language Questions. *See* French Language

Lanoraie wharf, 969

Lapierre, Mr. E. A. (Nipissing)
Eastern Lands Company, 626
Electric power, exportation, M. (Mr. Deslauriers) 661
Forest protection, M. (Mr. Michaud) 823
French river improvement works, qu. 620
Georgian bay elevators, qu. 620
Immigration policy, 1401
Kipawa Pulp and Paper Company, 1402
Lumbering in Timiskaming district, 1402
New Ontario, agricultural conditions, 1401
Nipissing Indian reserve, 1307
St. Lawrence river waterway, 661

Lapointe, Hon. Ernest (Minister of Marine and Fisheries)
Alaskan, wreck of, 1660, 3330
Atlantic fisheries commission, 3084, 3365
Belleville harbour commissioners, dismissal, qu. 491
Biological Board Act Amdt. bill, 3820, 3974
Boots and shoes, free admission, 3500
British Columbia
Fishing licenses, M. (Mr. Clark) 1540, 1544, 1546
Salmon canning industry, licenses, 1544
Business of the House, adjournments to discuss, etc. 1540
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bills
Coastal regulations, suspension, 4276
Distressed seamen, 574, 3969, 4207
Masters and mates certificates, 2418, 2668, 3146, 3972
Pilotage, 3146
Registration of foreign ships, 3749, 3961, 3973
Canadian Arctic expedition, reports, 3360
Canadian National Railways, Mr. Talbot, 2004
Canadian ports, use by United States fishermen, 3361
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 538
Detroit river, regulation of traffic, 3358
Dredging, unification of work, 3341
False creek bridge, 3376

Lapointe, Hon. Ernest—*Con.*
Fisheries
Canned and pickled fish, inspection, 3367, 3375
Deep sea fisheries, 3364
Publicity, 3364
Salmon river fishways, 3362
Sawdust pollution of streams, 3362
White Mud river, fishway, 3363
Fisheries Act Amdt. bill, 4009, 4207
French Treaty bill, 2216, 2256, 2815
Bottles, 2218
Bronze powder, 2217
Butter, 2217
Cotton, 2218, 2263
Dairy products, 2217
Favoured nation, 2219
France
Balance of trade, 2221
Exports to, 2216
Friendly relations with, 2216
Line of attack, 2216
Luxuries, 2221
Sales tax, 2279
Silks, 2221, 2256
Treaty of 1907, 2222
Grain shortages, complaint by British importers, 1764
Halibut fishery treaty, 4132, 4440, 4459
Rider inserted by United States Senate, 1308
Signing of, 858, 1308, 4461
Visit to Washington, 858
Inspection of live stock shipments, 3334
Johnston, Mr. R. M., status, 202
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4231
McConica, Mr., congratulations upon return, 1660
Margaree Salmon Fisheries Association, 3371
Marine and fisheries
Annual report, 1080
Committee, report, 3084
Distressed seamen, relief, 574, 3332, 3375, 3969, 4207
Dominion steamers and icebreakers, 3160
Bay of Fundy, 2615
Thunder bay, etc. 3359
Estimates, 2610, 3160, 3330
Hopper barge, construction, 3350
Hydrographic survey, 3336
Ice obstruction, Cabot strait, 2614
Life-saving service, 3335
Appliances, British Columbia, 1660
Stations, Long Point, Lake Erie, 3335
Lighthouse service
Lights, new, 3357
Maintenance and repairs, 3353

Lapointe, Hon. Ernest—*Con.*
Marine and Fisheries—*Con.*
Lighthouse service—*Con.*
Richibucto cape lighthouse, 3353
Salaries of lightkeepers, 3351
Marine agencies, 3351
Marine biological board of Canada, 3372
Marine signal service, 3358
Marvale, wreck of, 3333
Masters and mates, examination, 2610. *See also under this title,* Canada Shipping Act Amdt. Bill
Meterological service, 3360
Murray Stewart, steamer, 3354
Navigation
Aids to, 3357
Obstructions to, 3334
O'Hara, Captain Marshall, salary, 3331
Patrol of northern waters, 3360
Pilotage, 3146
Administration of, 3358
Pensions, 3359
Steamer Eureka, 1364
Salaries and contingencies, 3373
Steamboat inspection, 3360
Tidal and current survey, 3338
Unforeseen expenses, 3335
Wireless stations, 3337
Wrecking plant subsidies, 3334
Wrecks
Investigation into, 3160, 3330
Removal of, 3332
Montreal harbour commissioners bill, 4508
Montreal-Longeuil bridge, 2640, 3508
Northern Pacific Halibut Fishery bill, 4480. *See also under this title,* Halibut
Political patronage, 3344
Quebec arsenal, 888
Radiotelegraphy
Broadcasting stations, 3374
Radiotelegraph service, 3337, 3374
Regulations tabled, 3045
Radiotelegraph Act Amdt. bill 2086, 2284, 2467
St. Lawrence ship channel, 3339
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4240
Sorel shipyard, 3343
Alleged dismissals, 3344
Tariff
Liberal policy, 2221
Opposition resolution of 1922, 2220
Three Rivers Harbour bill, 3399, 3963, 4207
Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner) 1290
United States steamer Siloam, capture, 2207
Vancouver harbour bill, 199, 255-70, 332
Vimy ridge monument, 182
Visit to Washington, 734, 857

Lapointe, Hon. Ernest—*Con.*
West Ukrainian republic, M. (Mr. Campbell) 657
Wrangel island, ownership, 3360

Lard. *See* Meat Products

Larkin, Mr. James, detention at border. *See* Immigration; Labour

Larkin, Mr. P. C. *See* High Commissioner

Larouche, Que., postmaster, qu. 3137

Laurentians, The, 4312

Laurier, Sir Wilfrid. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget
Administration, 2815
Canadian railways and ports, traffic for, 1756
Conscription issue, 3015
Election of 1896, 2936
Hudson Bay railway, 1053, 1061,
Announcement ,1047
Immigration policy, 1177, 1425
Imperial Conference, 4663
Last public address, 2995
On hour of meeting in 1918, 1
McMaster, M., and, 3030
Monument, 1017
Protective system, 2719
Reciprocity, defeat of, 3015
Tariff reduction and Senate reform, 2908

Lausanne Conference, 54

Lavaltrie, Que. wharf, 969

Lavigueur, Mr. Henri E. (Quebec County)
Bank draft tax, 3929
Canadian National Railways, directors, 4525
Immigration dept. employees, Quebec, qu. 4752
Burne, Mr. Joseph, qu. 3141
Little, Mr. W. R., qu. 3144, qu. 4302
Transfers, qu. 2517, qu. 3141
Indemnity of members, 4240
Little, George, deportation of, qu. 3704
Orleans island bridge, 3646
Quebec, Champlain station, 4446
St. Charles river improvements, 4447
St. Malo repair shops, 4447
Ste. Petronille wharf, 4588
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4240
Talbot, Mr. O., 4525
Toronto viaduct, 4446

Law, the late Mr. Bowman B., tablet, 1020

Lawyers, charges and standard of living, 1154, 2813. *See also* Canadian National Railways, Grand Trunk

Lead Pencils, marking of goods, 2988

Leader, Mr. Harry (Portage la Prairie)
Accredited herds, 584, 2131, 2132
Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt. bill, 2131, 2137
Assiniboine river
Damage by flood, 993, 3041
Expenditure on dyking, etc. qu. 3264
Budget, 3039. Reception of budget in West; district board, Portage la Prairie, resolution; betrayal of the people; British preference; direct importation; obligation to Great Britain for removal of cattle embargo; free admission of British goods; cheque tax charged by grain buyers to farmers, 3039; cattle trade; freight rates, ocean rates; Canadian Government Merchant Marine vessels; statements of Mr. Motherwell and Mr. Grisdale, 3040; Assiniboine river floods; resolution of Elie branch of United Farmers; Canadian National Railways, traffic and management; annoyances and inconveniences to passengers; railway equipment; people patronizing their own road; cattle shipment over Canadian Pacific; Riley's army, transportation Ottawa to Toronto, 3042; government interference with railway management; government plea for economy not sincere; new officers with high salaries; Mr. Duncan Marshall; Hon. Mr. Pugsley; members' indemnities, reduction of; extravagance in administration; cabinet ministers absent from duty; cabinet ministers, number in Canada and United States; speech of Mr. McMaster on budget; Manitoba Free Press, stand in defence of common people, 3043
Cattle, ocean space, 2123, 3040
Copper bounty bill, 3241
Experimental farms, 461-486
M. to reduce neg. 486
Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia, 943
Health of animals, 583
Hudson Bay railway, 461
International fishing boat race, 114
Live stock
Ocean shipping rates, 2133, 3040
Removal of cattle embargo, 3039

Leader, Mr. Harry—*Con.*
Ministers' salaries and members' indemnities, 3043, 4243
M. for reduction of, 1153
Reference to, 2915
Officials attending fairs, qu. 285
Portage la Prairie
Representation of, 2680
Sewerage outlet, 993, 997, 2680
Railway mail service, cost of, qu. 3143
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4243
Deductions for non-attendance, 4243
Tuberculosis in cattle, 583

League of Nations. *See also* Imperial Conference
Activities and policies, 3993
Assembly
Tariff
Economic warfare, 3054
Stability, 3053
Canada's contribution to Permanent Secretariat, 3990
Canada's participation in foreign wars, 4000
Canada's withdrawal from, 3999
Cecil, Lord Robert, lecture in Ottawa, 1685
Criticism of, 3993
Expenses of Canadian delegation to, 3989
Franco-German relations, 4652
International Labour Conference, 1441, 1652
Invitation to meet in Canada, 3997
M. (Mr. Power) for withdrawal, 1529
Saar Valley Commission, Mr. R. D. Waugh, 3145
Silesia, partition of, 3995
West Ukrainian republic, settlement, 651

Leases
Cancellation of. *See* Dominion Lands Act Amdt. bill
Coal lands. *See* Hoppe and Isenberg

Leather, free admission to United States, 3016

Leblanc, Mr. Joseph, seizure of fishing boat, 1489

Leblanc, Mr. Louis, qu. 285

Le Droit d'auteur. *See* Copyright Act Amdt.

Lee, Miss Barbara. *See* Immigration department

Léger, Mr. A. T. (Kent, N.B.)
English and French, harmony between, 1341
Export Act Amdt. bill (pulpwood) 4347, 4354
Kent Northern railway, 4190
Leblanc, Mr. Joseph, seizure of fishing boat, 1489

Léger, Mr. A. T.—*Con.*
Lighthouses and lightkeepers
Maintenance and repairs, 3353
Richibucto cape lighthouse, 3353
Salaries and allowances, 3351
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4347, 4354

Legislation. *See also* Government; House of Commons; Senate
Class, 2851
Distribution between Senate and House of Commons, 4007
House of Commons, 2691
Committees, expenses of, 4674
Indemnity of members, 4674
In advance of public sentiment, 2925
Joint Committee on, 4008
Paternal, 727, 1133. *See also* Race Track Betting
Preparation and form of, 4007
Provincial, disallowance of. *See* Disallowance; Jurisdiction
Record of, 407, 408
Retroactive, 3128
Senate, salaries and contingencies, 3949
Too much, 2543, 2547, 3434. *See also* Combines bill
Uplift, 2054

Legislative Council. *See* Senate, M. (Mr. Denis, Joliette)

Leitch, Professor
Agricultural conditions, 1845
Dairying industry, 1843

Leitche's Creek, N.S. wharf, 943

Lemaire, Mr. E. J., 1822

Lemieux, Hon. Rodolphe. *See* Speaker

Lemieux Agreement. *See* Immigration; Japan

Lemont, Mr. Arthur. *See* Immigration, Agents

Leprosy, treatment of. *See* Health

Lesueur, Mr. R. V. (West Lambton)
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3869
Mother whose husband is helpless, amdt. 3870, agreed to, 3871
Petroleum, crude, bounty, 3914, 3922

Letter Carriers. *See* Post Office

Level Crossings. *See* Canadian National Railways; Canadian Pacific Raiways; Toronto

Levels, National. *See* Lake of the Woods

Lévis
Dry dock, 1261
Postmasters, qu. 519
Quarantine station, purchase of beef, qu. 3141

Lewis, Mr. Arthur J. (Swift Current)
Address in reply, 117. Expenditure on agriculture; criticisms from Maritime province members, 118; condition of western farmers; immigration policy, 119; competition in wheat markets, 120; economy in length of session, 120; Near East crisis, 120-121; sales and stamp taxes, 121; necessity for economy in public expenditures. 121
Agricultural conditions in western provinces, 119, 1841
Agriculture
Department, salaries, 611
Immigration and, 1228
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4096-4116
Bounty system, 3922
Cadet services, 881
Canadian National parks and historic sites, 3942
Canadian National Railways
Branch lines construction bill, 3626, 4201, 4333
Dunblane-Mawer, 4201, 4333
Moose Jaw-Riverhurst, 4333
Paris offices, 3626
Cheque tax, 3933
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 543
Civil Service examinations, 366
Combines bill, 2599
Registrar, powers of investigation, 2626
Cost of living, combines and, 2599
Customs drawback, hatters' sweats, 3502
Domestic servants, provision on trains, 1477
Dredging, 1012, 3340
Eggs, price of, 1841
Expenditure in excess of revenue, 1230
Free trade, necessities of life, 1230
French treaty, agricultural implements, 2247
Fruit and Fruit Containers bill, 2105
Hydrographic survey, 3336
Immigration
Alleged discrimination in favour of West, 1098
Canada Colonization Association, 3633
Child, 1227, 1470
Experience as an immigrant, 1226
Great Britain from, 1105
Literature, 1226
Mennonites, 1229, 1884
Policy, 1225
Immigration Act Amdt. bill, 2436

Lewis, Mr. Arthur J.—*Con.*
Indians, 2149
Interest rate, 4116
Life-saving service, 3335
Lighthouses
Maintenance and repairs, 3353
Salaries of lightkeepers, 3351
Magazines and periodicals, M. (Mr. Hocken) 839
Matapedia bridge, 1014
Members' indemnity, 4009
Mennonites, 1229, 1884
National gallery, 1018
Naval service, 910
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3536
Ottawa-Hull bridge, 1016
Penitentiaries, 771
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3849
Pension commissioners, board of, 3743
Petroleum bounty, 3922
Prices, spread in, 1230
Provincial educational rights, 1884
Public works, surveys and inspections, 1020
Quebec arsenal, 884
Raisins and dried currants, duty, 3478
Royal Canadian navy, 910
St. Lawrence river waterway, 3778
St. Lawrence ship channel, 3340
Sales tax, abolition of, 1230
Saskatchewan, national parks, 3942
Soldier settlement, 2021, 2027
Sorel shipyard, 3349
Spectacle and eyeglass frames, duty, 3483
Standard Oil Company, 2601
Sugar duty, 3479
Swift current public building, 1023
Tidal and current survey, 3338
Trade commissioners, 1841
Typewriters and parts, duty, 3485
Welland canal construction, 3761, 3777
Western provinces, conditions in, 1225
Wines, tax on, 3938
Wireless stations, 3337
Wrecking plants, subsidies, 3334

Lewis, John L., correspondence, 250, 815

Liberal Party. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget
British Columbia liquor law administration, 2414
Charge of abandonment of policy, unfair, 3010
Conventions of 1893 and 1919, 2777. *See also under this title* Liberal Platform
Senate, elective or nominative, 1369
Crowsnest pass agreement, 2971
Disappointment with, 2812

Liberal Party—*Con.*
Election promises in 1896 and 1921, 2951
High protectionists in, 2931
Influences preventing carrying out of pledges, 2909
Liberal platform of 1919, 2603, 2777, 2885, 2932, 2952, 2974, 2991, 3007, 4393
British preference, increase in, 454
"Chart" 3047
Circumstances of adoption, 3019
Economy, 2003
Endorsed by opposition in 1920, 2994
Euler, Mr., statement of, 3019
Failure to implement, 2981, 3066
French treaty, 2211
Government should not be asked to carry out, 2852
Immigration, Chinese, 1652
Interpretation of, 3047
Labour legislation, 1651, 1652
Maclean, Hon. Mr. (Halifax), statement of, 3019
Planks from, included in amendment, 2861
Progressive party, opposition to, 2925
Proportional representation, 407
Quotation from, 3019
Repudiation of, alleged, 2994, 3019, 3047,
Resolutions moved in opposition, 2736, 3047
Tariff, 1222, 2714, 2718, 2736, 2737, 2872, 2904, 2957, 3008
Planks not carried out, 2220, 3062, 3033. *See also under this title,* Tariff
Taxation, 2003
Luxuries, 2011
Liberals and Conservatives, Bank Act, 4019, 4048, 4125, 4126, 4142
Liberals, responsibility for expenditure, 2921
Pledges and promises, 2908, 2981, 2992. *See also under this title,* Conventions; Liberal Platform
Elections of 1896 and 1921, 2908, 2981, 2992
Repudiation of, alleged, 2793, 3035
Senate elective or nominative, 1369
Tariff
Difference between Liberal and Conservative, 3008
Platform of 1896, 2908
Policy, 3007
Protective, 2818
Record since 1896 3009
Stability, new doctrine, 3064

Liberal and Conservative Parties
Alleged union on Bank Act, 4019, 4048, 4125, 4126, 4142

Liberalism, "watchwords of the past", 3014

Libraries. *See* Public Libraries

Library of Parliament
Committee, 53, 202, 516
Change in membership, 615
Estimates, 2691
Salaries, contingencies, etc. 2692

Life Imprisonment. *See* Criminal Code Amdt. bill

Life Saving. *See* Canadian National Safety League; Marine

Lighthouses and Lightkeepers. *See* Marine

Lignite. *See* Coal; Fuel Supply

Lincoln, Abraham, on immigration, 1236

Lindsay
Arsenal 883, 1744, 1752
Market scales, 208

Linen
Linen thread. *See also* Textiles; Treaties, French Treaty
Bounty, 2647
Linen yarns, 3897
French treaty, 1981
Industry, 3897

Liquor. *See also* Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill; Customs and Excise
Beer, excise taxes, qu. 518
Bonded liquor warehouses. *See under this title.* British Columbia; New Brunswick
Bootlegging, 2410, 2419, 3358. *See also* Belle River Harbour
Brandy. *See also* Treaties, French
Duty on, 2742, 2999
French, 444, 2643, 3478
Breweries and export liquor houses
Licensing, 1636
Violation of liquor laws, qu. 1866
British Columbia, 2405-11
Purchases by British Columbia government, 2410
Warehouse licenses, qu. 1260, qu. 1866, qu. 1971, qu. 1974, 2404-7, 3144
Canadian and Scotch whisky, competition of French brandy, 3478
Canadian National Railways, transportation, 1868, 3324
Drunkenness, convictions for, 2411
Exportation, 2404, 3144, 3704, 4295
British Columbia, qu. 1260
Government control. *See* Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill
Illicit stills
Prosecutions, Vita, Manitoba, 3280
Remissions of fines, 2299

Liquor—*Con.*
Illicit traffic, Canada to United States, 2208
Importation
For sale under regulations, 2404, 3704
Provinces, into. *See* Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill
Intoxicating, consumption of, qu. 285
Laws, evasion of, 2543
Manufacture, 2410, 3704
New Brunswick export warehouses, 815
Ontario Temperance Act, 2410
United States laws, 4295
Wines, 3035. *See also* **Treaties, French**
Beer and, excise taxes, qu. 518
Duty, 2710, 2999
Abolition of, 2742
Reduction of, 2643
Excise tax, qu. 518, 2656, 3937, 4425
French treaty, 438, 442, 452, 1977, 1997, 2010, 2209, 2225
Native, prohibition of, 2411
Port, manufactured at False Creek, Vancouver, 2411
Yukon, 86

L'Islet wharf, 969

Literature. *See also* Advertising; Immigration
National. *See* Copyright Act Amdt. bill; Magazines and Periodicals, M. (Mr. Hocken)
Recognition of work in. *See* Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner)

Lithographic Works, marking of goods, 2988

Little Current, Ont., harbour, 982

Live Stock. *See also* Address; Agriculture; Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt Bill; Budget; Live Stock Acts Amdt.
Accredited herds. *See* Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt. Bill, *and under this title,* Health of Animals
Alberta, 1435
Animal contagious diseases. *See also that title*
Eradication board, 2699
Research, 2867
Canada's position as a live stock country, 2934
Cattle
Dairying industry. *See that title*
Diseases *See under this title,* Health of Animals
Embargo. *See also* Agriculture, Experimental Farms
Removal of, 15, 25, 26, 38, 48, 148, 170, 575, 1869, 2871, 3053

Live Stock—*Con.*
Cattle—*Con.*
Embargo—*Con.*
Removal of—*Con.*
Conference, 3989
Correspondence, 4132, 4184, 4295
Credit for, 3293
Doherty, Mr. Manning, 3293
Drury, Hon. E. C., 3293
Effect of, 1101
Health of Canadian herds, 2132
Inquiry, 575, 576
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, 3293
Pledge of British government, 3531
Shipment to Great Britain. *See under this sub-title,* **Shipment to Great Britain**
Stock, classification of, 3291
Export to United States, 1410, 2910, 3293. *See also* United States
Feeding
Shipment in car lots, 595
Winter feeding, 469
Markets, 2871
Ocean freight rates on, 2127, 2136, 2757, 2807, 3040
Prices, 300, 2877
Chicago, Winnipeg and Dundee, 2871
Weight and, 2871
Quarantined at Levis, qu. 3141
Reciprocity, 3082. *See also that title*
Scrub, 2810
Shipment to Great Britain, 208, 1036, 2807, 3017, 3324, 3641. *See also under this sub-title.* Embargo
Alleged unsanitary condition of boats, 2127, 2613
Finished cattle shipped as stockers, 2872
First, 3309, 3310
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, reported statement, 3041
Dundee at, 2614
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 3811
Grisdale, Dr., statement, 3040
Rates, 2133, 2963
Stockers and fat cattle, 2135
Trial shipment, expenses, 4675
Tuberculosis, report as to, 2469
Vessel space, 1868, 1869, 2757, 2963 3040
Testing, 1307, 2133
Trade, development of, 3040
Chicago Fat Stock show, 1398
Community breeding, 476
Condemnation insurance, qu. 1972, qu. 2699
Contagious diseases. *See under this title,* Health of Animals

Live Stock—*Con.*
Dairy cattle, testing, 1307
Destruction by timber wolves, 597
Dryden, Mr. W. A., trip to South America, qu. 1031, 1213, 3294, qu. 3704
Estimates, 575, 587, 4675
Experimental farms, 457, 460-85
Export. *See under this title,,* Cattle, Embargo, Shipment;*and also,* Treaties, French Treaty
Feeding. *See* Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill
Health of Animals, 483, 575, 4676. *See also* Animal Contagious Diseases Bill
Accredited herds, qu. 206, 484, qu. 492, 577, 626, 3064, 3302
Richmond county, qu. 813
Wolfe county, qu. 813
Alderson, Mr. George B., claim, 582
Compensation for slaughter, 462-486, 576, 582
Hall, O., and McDougall, W. F., veterinary inspectors, 3989
Hog cholera, 582
Contracted from whey, 3299
Pathological laboratories, 578
Watson, Dr., chief pathologist, 579, 2866, 2868
Tuberculosis, 576, 2469
Buffalo, 3439
Condemnation insurance, qu. 2699
Eradication, 3989
Restricted area, Manitoba, 576
Tuberculin test, qu. 1972, 3065
No encouragement to farmer, 2933, 3300
Hogs
Bacon type, 2864
Breeding, feeding and marketing, 2865
Corn-fed, 2865
Garbage feeding, 582
Grading, 466, 590, 1905
Prices, Chicago and Toronto, 2865
Horses
Glanders, serum for, 579, 584
Horse-breeding, 588
Market for, 590
Racing of. *See* Race Track Betting
Shire horses from Great Britain, 2207, 2253
Thoroughbred, breeding of. *See* Race Track Betting
Tariff on. *See* Treaties, French Treaty
Imports and exports, supervision of. *See* Live Stocks Act Amdt
Improvement, 2773
Indian reserves, 2159, 2162
Infected, sale of. *See* Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill

Live Stock—*Con.*
Loans, 4103
Loss from inferior, 2862, 2866, 2867
Markets, 588, 594, 1410
Prices and quality, 2862. *See also under this title,* Cattle
Marshall, Mr. Duncan. *See also that title*
Cattle embargo, 3293
Reported statements, 2614, 3041
Trip to South America, qu. 1031
Poultry. *See that title*
Prices, 2862, 2877. *See also* Prices *and under this title,* Cattle
Decrease in, 1410
West, in, 1101
Propaganda, 594
Purchase of thoroughbred stock, by Mr. E. S. Archibald, 3290
Ranching, 588
Sheep, 2866
Pure-bred, importation, qu. 3141
Screenings, feeding on, 2040, 2867
Sheep-raising. *See* Textiles; Woollen Industry, M. (Mr. Drummond)
Shipments, inspection of, 3334. *See also under this title,* Cattle, Shipment
Stockyards
Agents at Prince Albert and Moose Jaw, qu. 1156
Fraudulent practices, 276, 485, 576
Moose Jaw, qu. 1156, 2779
Prince Albert, qu. 1156, 2779
Union, 2762
Stock Growers' Protective Association, grant, 587
Trade. *See also that title*
South America, 594, qu. 1031
Visit of Canadian commissioners to, qu. 1031, 1213, 3294, qu. 3704
Transportation. *See also* Freight Rates
Hudson Bay railway, 1071
Tuberculin test. *See under this title,* Health of Animals
Western Canada Live Stock Union, 2699
World competition, 2781

Live Stock Acts Amdt. Bill. *See also* Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt. bill (Marketing, consolidation and amendment)
1r., 193; 2r., 276-277; ref, to Agriculture Com., 277; report of com. 1441; com., 2200; 2992; 3r., 2293; Senate amdts. 3150

Live Stock Exchanges. *See* Live Stock Acts Amdt. Bill

Llandovery Castle, sinking of, 1745

Lloyd George, Right Hon. David
Agricultural conditions in Great Britain, 2755
Career of, 1399
Free trade and protection, 3012
German reparations. *See* Germany
Great Britain, unemployment, 1205
Liberalism, "fair play for the under dog," 3014
Near East question, 4655
Proportional representation, 392
Socialist strength in Great Britain, 2722
Turkey, threatened war with, 2815

Loans, 93, 630, 2642. *See also* Banks and Banking; Credits; Finance; Harbours, advances to
Agricultural 1400. *See also* Credits
Borrowings of former government, 2831
Comparative commissions on, 158-9
Conversion, recent, qu, 386
Farm. *See* Banks and Banking; Credits
Interest, 2831
Live stock, 4103
New York, 1922, 154-155, 630, 640, 2963
Provincial, 2987
Roumanian and Greek, qu. 623, 2010
Vocational. *See* Soldiers Civil Re-establishment
War, delivery of dividend cheques, 1804

Lobster Canning. *See* Fish and Fisheries

Local Improvements. *See* Public Works

Lockeport, N.S. wharf, 943

Logan, Mr. Hance J. (Cumberland)
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4079
Bienfait briquetting plant, 2512
British preference, direct importation, 3455
Coal, duty, 3498
Deputy ministers, salaries, 4671
Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia, 4561
Johnston, Mr. Alex., Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries, 4671
Members' indemnity, 4009
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3878
Amdt. time for appeal, 3881, agreed to, 3881

London, publicity agent, reported appointment of Mr. W. T. Cranfield, 2927, 2983, 4707

London Times, comment on Canadian immigration, 1111

Lord Selkirk Association, monument to Indian Chief, Peguis, 4704

Lord's Day Act, discrimination against poor, 3585

Lougheed, Sir James
Hudson Bay railway, 1033
Labour members of parliament, 3033

Lovett, Mr. L. J. (Digby-Annapolis)
Annual training, 95th regiment, 863
Arthur Young and Company, qu. 1137
Black, Mr. W. J., Deputy Minister of Immigration, qu. 1633
Budget, 2944. Congratulations to Finance Minister, 2944; budget generally acceptable; return of prosperity; tariff, downward revision; revenue requirements; postage rates, reduction; fishing industry handicaps and difficulties, 2945; reduced freight rates; United States markets; machinery for manufacture of fish waste into fertilizer; optimism of Maritime provinces; immigration; pessimistic utterances of Progressives; Mr. Forke on the budget; statement of Mr. H. W. Wood, 2946; amendment; agriculture, assistance of; forest conservation, 2947; pulpwood, restriction of export; work of Mr. F. J. D. Barnjum in interest of forest conservation; cheque tax; bounties, free admission of machinery; sugar duty; sales tax; British preference; reciprocity, 2948
Civil Service Commission
Appointments, 535
Cost of 1917-22, qu. 1137
Clementsport postmaster, 1796
Export Act Amdt. bill, pulpwood, 4351
Forest conservation, 2947, 4351
Foster, Mr. A. deWitt, qu. 1633
Griffenhagen and Associates, qu. 1137
Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia, 4571
Military hospitals, medical staff, 677
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3855
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 2948, 4351

Lovie, Mr. W. J. (Macdonald)
Animal Contagious Diseases bill, 2138
Budget, 2871. Congratulations to Finance Minister; Canadian cattle embargo, removal of; value of British and United States markets; prices, Chicago, Winnipeg and Dundee, Scotland; weight and price; finished cattle shipped as stockers; unlimited quantity of cattle available for shipment; agricultural conditions; protection unfair to West; double standard of selling

Lovie, Mr. W. J.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
and buying; Premier Dunning on the tariff; Liberal tariff planks; Sir Wilfrid Laurier on protection; revenue tariff and protection; excise duty, 2872; taxes paid to protected manufacturers; agricultural conditions in Western Canada; statement of Mr. Samuel Larcombe at Winnipeg; wheat, market for; prices of agricultural and manufactured products; unprofitable crop of 1922, 2873; hard wheat; mixed farming; letter from Mr. J. Scott; farmers who own automobiles; automobiles in Ottawa, 2874; mill feeds, adulteration of; freight rates; lumber, price of, 2875; freight, classification of; transfer charges; express rates; labour costs in industrial and agricultural occupations; cost of living, 2876; protective tariff; disparity between producer's and consumer's prices; cheque tax, limitation; discrimination in favour of rich; protection, 2877; Hudson Bay railway; British preference; world conditions; cancellation of war debt, 2878; Sir George Lawson Johnston on payment by Great Britain of debt to United States; dollar reserve fund in Canada, 2879
Experimental farms, 477
Farms of 160 acres, 1087
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4271, 4546
Health of animals, 580
Horse-breeding, 588
Mill feeds, adulteration of, 600, 2875
Seed inspection, 196

Lowe, Dr. A. M., capture and maltreatment in China, 2695, 2795

Lower, Mr. A. R. M., fisheries of Hudson bay, 1065

Lucas, Mr. W. T. (Victoria, Alta.)
Address in reply, 74, 75. Unfair criticism of Progressive party, 75; Great Britain our best market; condition of western farmers, 76; immigration policy of government, 77; revision of Bank Act; transportation of grain; comparative grain rates; economy in administration, 78; the government and its platform; old party divisions, 79
Agricultural loans, 1400
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4041
Bruederheim branch railway, 4199, 4316
Canadian air force, 1749, 2418
Central repair shops, 1750

Lucas, Mr. W. T.—*Con.*
Canadian national parks and historic sites, 3942
Canadian National Railways branch lines bill, 4198, 4316
Canadian Pacific Railway, qu. 625
Land, 3704
Canadian representation in United States, 4001
Civil Service Commission, 3986
Copper bounty bill, 3240
Disallowance, Nova Scotia statute, 2378
Dredging, Maritime provinces, 1011
Elevators, dockage, 2044
Finance Act 1914 Amdt bill, 4408
Freight rates, reduction of, 1400
Grain pooling, 1400
Immigration
Banks and, 4042
Canada Colonization Association, 1399
Chinese, 1445
Policy, 1397
Institutions, surplus of, 1400
Lloyd George, Right Hon. David, 1399
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2109
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3866
Pharmaceutical preparations, qu. 3261
Public Works engineering branch, 1017
Railway mail service, 1790
Raisins and dried currants, 3478
Spectacle and eyeglass frames, duty, 3483
Tariff reduction, 1400
Western provinces, conditions in, 1398

Lumber. *See also* Forests and Forestry; Pulp and Paper; Timber
Alleged labour shortage in lumber camps, 1125
British Columbia in, 1245
Combine, 2593
Competition and prices, 2593
Creosoting industry, qu. 813, qu. 1137, 1245, 3234
Vancouver Creosoting Company. 3231
Depression, 3002
Freight rates, 139, 1961, 2855, 2875, 3036
Georgia pine, importation of, 3411
Importation for Welland canal, qu. 1867
Manufactures of, 1989. *See also* Treaties, French Treaty
Prices, 2875, 3036
Provincial revenue from, 2802
Railway ties, freight rates and prices, 3036
Sales tax, 4181, 4418
Sawdust pollution of streams, 701, 3362
Temiskaming district, 1402
Timber exportation, 3416
Wood-working industry, 2806

Lumbermen, emigration to United States, 1125

Lunenburg, N.S. harbour, dredging, 4576
Amdt. (Mr. Guthrie) to reduce item, 4577, neg. 4580

Luse Land Company. *See* Immigration

Lusitania. *See* Germany, Reparations

Luxuries. *See also* Taxation; Treaties, French Treaty
Demand for, 1856

Macallum, Dr., discoveries in helium, 4439

Macarow, Mr. D. C., application to subpœna, 4145. *See also* Bank Act Amdt. Bill, Merchants Bank

Macbrien, General. *See* National Defence

Maccan Coal District. *See* Coal

Macdonald, Hon. E. M. (Acting Minister of National Defence)
Acting Minister of National Defence, appointment, 2295
After war conditions, 1231
Annual drill, 4635
Bank Act Amdt. Bill, 4064
Business of the House
Audibility, 4593
Chair ruling of, 4720
Motions, anticipatory, 3329
Supply, M. to postpone, 3669
Camp Borden, approach to, 4565
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill, 3749
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 4732
Canadian National Railways
Branch lines construction bill, 3961
Rejection by Senate. 4698
Coal
Freight rates on, 1277
Purchase of in United States, 3493
Management, responsibility and powers, 3690
Paris offices, 3616-17, 3689
Thornton, Sir Henry, 3617
Canadian Northern railway, acquisition, 1937
Class consciousness 1233
Coal
Canadian National Railways, 1277, 3493
Duty 3493
Nova Scotia 1277
Combines bill enforcement of 4229
Criminal Code amdt. (Betting information) 4733
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute 2372

Macdonald, Hon. E. M.—*Con.*
Dredging Maritime provinces 4591. *See also under this title* Harbours and Rivers
Emigration to the United States 1234
Eskimos, trial of, 4674
Experimental farms, buildings, 4630
Fielding, Right Hon. Mr., congratulations, 4743
Freight rates
Coal, 1277
Crowsnest pass agreement, 1937
Manitoba-Canadian Northern agreement, 1939
Railway rates, equalization, M. (Mr. Clark) 1937
Fuel supply, M. (Mr. Church) 1277
Halifax grain elevator 4714
Harbours and rivers
New Brunswick, 4586
Nova Scotia, 4561, 4563
Dartmouth, 4568
Digby, 4568
Dredging, 4569, 4591
East Sandy Cove, 4570
Little Anse, 4722
Morrison, Mr. T. D., claim, 4572, 4722
Lunenburg, dredging, 4576, 4577
Ship Harbour, 4586
Windsor, 4586
Ontario, 4589, 4594
Belle River, 4596
Port Maitland, 4589
Prince Edward Island, 4586
Georgetown, 4587
Quebec, 4588
Rimouski, Raymond and Talbot, Messrs. claim, 4588
Ste. Petronille, 4588
Hawkesbury bridge, 4590
Hebridean immigrants, treatment, 3597
Hector celebration, grant, 4636, 4705
Hindu immigrants, franchise, 510
Homestead lands in the West, 1087, 1090
Hudson Bay railway, discontinuance, 1062
Immigration
Empire settlement board, 1237
Hebridean, treatment of, 3597
Maritime provinces, and, 1236
Oriental, 509
Policy, 1230-38
Immigration Act Amdt. bill (Mr. Neill) 509
Inland Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 3749
Judges Act Amdt. bill, 3452
Justice, administration of, 4674
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4229
Militia Pension Act Amdt. bill, 2052, 3582, 3975

Macdonald, Hon. E. M.—*Con.*
Mines and Minerals Com. report, 1738
Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. bill, 2121
National Defence
Canadian Air Force, desertions, 2418
Desbarats, Mr. G. J., acting deputy minister, 4673
Estimates, 4635
Militia camps at harvest time, 3976. *See also under this title,* Petawawa
National spirit, 1232
Naval service, recruiting, 2897
Northover, Major H. R., claims, 4635
Oleomargarine
M. (Mr. Carroll) 3552
Discussion of, 3329
Sub-amdt. (Mr. Good) 3571
Policy, 3451
Parliament buildings, common meeting room, 1727
Party system, 1235
Petawawa camp and Ontario elections, 3976, 4005, 4162
Petroleum and Naphtha Inspection bill, 3749
Public buildings
New, 4615
New Brunswick, 4613
Sackville, 4613
Nova Scotia, 4613, 4628
Ontario, 4615
Haileybury armoury and post office, 4615
Ottawa, new departmental, architects, 4633
Saskatchewan, 4629
Public Works
Estimates, 4561, 4594
Roads and bridges, 4590
Reciprocity, defeat of, 1233
Redistribution
Intention of government, 4250
Opportunity for discussion, 4593
Special committee, 857, 937
Reports
First, 857
Second, 3399
Third, 4510, 4736
Returned Soldiers Insurance bill, 4735
Sworn as member of Privy Council without portfolio, 1764
Toronto
Customs building, 4624
Harbour improvements, 4610
Postal station "A" building, 4624
Seed branch building, 4622
United States civil war, conditions following, 1232

Macdonald, Right Hon. Sir John A.
Confederation and, 1366

Macdonald, Right Hon. Sir John A.—*Con.*
National policy, 2838
Reciprocity, 2922
Senate and House of Lords, 1374
Title, 1295

Macdonell, Rev. Father
Immigration
Hebridean, 3585
Scotland, from, 1876

MacKelvie, Mr. John A. (Yale)
British Columbia telegraph lines, 1017
Canadian National Railways branch lines bill, 4314
Chinese immigration bill, 2322
Conditions in British Columbia, 2322
Merchants, Vernon, telegram, 2322
Officer in China, 2322
Codling moth, 597
Dredging, Shuswap lake, 1014
Experimental farms, 464
Fruits and vegetables, registration, 2307
Halifax grain elevator, qu. 4751
Hope-Princeton highway, 2342
Immigration
British Columbia, into, 1095
Canada Colonization Association, 1346
European, 1346
Labour, restriction of, 1104
Oriental, 509, 1346, 2322
Policy, 1345
Immigration Act Amdt. bill, 509
Indians, British Columbia, Major McGraw, 2163
Kamloops-Okanagan line, 4314
Magazines and periodicals, M. (Mr. Hocken) 837
Mara, B. C., postmaster, qu. 1489, qu. 1739
Military hospitals, 671
Okanagan lake wharves, 1008
Pensions, European war and active militia, 3723
Seed testing bill, 2307
Sugar lake telegraph line, 1017
Summerland experimental farm, 464
Western provinces, conditions, 1347

Mackenzie River District
Half-breed claims, 3409, 3444
Steamship services, 2176

Mackenzie, William Lyon, 47

MacLaren, Mr. Murray (St. John City and Counties of St. John and Albert)
Annual drill, 4637
Artificial limbs for disabled soldiers, 675
Boy Scouts, 879

MacLaren, Mr. Murray—*Con.*
British preference, direct importation, 1772, 2948
Budget, 2948. British preference, increase of direct importation, 2948; French and Italian treaties, limitation to Canadian ports; Canadian National Railways, comparison of mileage and traffic; Canadian grain passing through United States seaports; petroleum bounties and tariff on oil; proposal to curtail and discontinue; immigration policy; Maritime provinces ignored; lecture of Mr. F. W. Kerr in Isle of Man, 2949; Hebridean immigrants; naval recruiting in the interior; forest conservation; government economy, 2950; civil government; Hudson Bay raiway, 2951
Cadet services, 879
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill, 3970
Canadian air force, 1748
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Negotiation for sale of 27 ships, 1975
Steamship sailings, qu. 4511
For 1924, qu. 4751
Canadian National Railways, 2944
Atlantic division, 1770
Branch lines construction bill, 4310
Chicago traffic originating at, 1769
Comparison, mileage and traffic, 2949
Directors, New Brunswick representative, qu. 282
Grand Trunk, Portland terminal. 1768, 1769
Halifax terminals, qu. 4510. qu. 4751
Policy, discussion of, 1762, 1764
Regulations, 496
St. John station, 4310
Civil Service Commission, 3986
Dredging, Maritime provinces, 1009
Emigration to United States, 1198
Employers' liability compensation, 695
Esquimalt dry dock, 2674
Export Act Amdt. bill, pulpwood, 4347
Flour shipments, Canadian and United States ports, 1767
Forest protection, 2950
M. (Mr. Michaud) 822
French treaty, direct importation, 2303, 2949
Grain shipments, 1767
Harbours and rivers, New Brunswick, 948
Hector celebration, 4637
Hudson Bay railway, 2951, 4681, 4684
Immigration
Bowder, Mr., agent in Great Britain, 1198
Distribution of, 1198
Farm labourers and domestic servants, 1200
Hebridean, 2950
Maritime provinces ignored, 2949
Officers in Great Britain, 1879
Policy, 1197, 2949
St. John immigration building, 1457
Italian treaty, direct importation, 2401, 2948
Labour Gazette, printing, 1624
Macdonald, Hon. E. M., appointment as minister, 1764
Militia Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3975
Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. bill, 2116, 2119
National monument, Connaught place, Ottawa, 1021, 2685, 2688
Olympic games, Canadian team, 4706
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3854-67, 4747
Pensions, European war and active militia, 3711
Petroleum bounty, 3919
Post Office department, printing, 1818, 1820
Public ownership, railways, 1770
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4347
Questions unanswered, 4455
St. John
Employment office, 3453
Harbour improvements, 2677
Immigration building, 1457
Quarantine station, 1021
Terminals, 4445
St. John and Quebec railway extension, 4310
Sales tax, 4427
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, Vancouver office, qu. 2297, 3085, 3822
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 4427
Taxation, payment in postage stamps, 1821
Telegraph and telephone lines, 2683
Tracadie lazaretto, 702
Vancouver harbour bill, 261
Venereal diseases, 705
Vocational loans, 687

MacLean, Mr. A. E. (Prince, P.E.I.)
Aeroplane mail service, 1775
Animal Contagious Diseases bill, 2134
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4083
Budget, 2967. Congratulations to Finance Minister; debt and interest charges; Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 2967; budget the best possible under circumstances; tariff revision; tendency downwards; reciprocity, offer to negotiate; attitude of United States; British preference, increase in; sugar duty; expenditure and economy, 2968; irrigation, water power survey and land reclamation; immigration; unemployment relief, 2969; migration of Can-

MacLean, Mr. A. E.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
adians; air force; Civil Service, number of employees; Civil Service Commission; government departments, increase in cost of, 2970; Canadian National Railways; improved situation on eastern division; courtesy of officials; Crowsnest pass agreement, claim that concession forced by Progressives, 2971; natural resources of western provinces and Maritime provinces; agricultural conditions in Prince Edward Island; fishing industry; reciprocity; distribution, cost of; middleman; producer and consumer; confidence and co-operation; evidence before Agricultural Conditions Committee; cost of living, 2972; tariff stability; deficit; reduction of; reasons for supporting budget; amendment, 2973
Canadian National parks and historic sites, 3436
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 557
Combines bill, 2601
English and French, harmony, 1341
Forest protection, 3419
Fox-breeding industry, 590
Horses, market for, 590
Maritime provinces, summer resorts, 3436
Militia camps at harvest time, 3976
Natural resources, 2972, 3436
Pensions, European war and active militia, 3730
Proportional representation, 432
Public expenditure, east and west, 3436
School lands, unpaid balance, 4204
Seed potatoes, inspection, 2306
Seed testing bill, 2306

Maclean, Hon. A. K. (Halifax)
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4035, 4080-4124, 4133-60, 4509
Merchants' bank, 4037, 4050, 4156
Proceedings before Banking and Commerce Com. 3887
Shareholders' audit, 4090
Bank mergers, 4138
Merchants' bank 4037, 4050, 4156
Banking and Commerce Committee
Leave to sit while House in session, 986
Printing of proceedings, 3887
Reports
First and second, 986
Third, 1080
Fourth, 1538
Fifth, 2926

Maclean, Hon. A. K.—*Con.*
Banking and Commerce Committee—*Con.*
Reports—*Con.*
Sixth, 3505
Seventh, 3887
Eighth, 4131
Budget, 3000. Congratulations to Finance Minister, 3000; speech of Mr. Meighen; budget, form of presentation; budget statements in Great Britain; budget well received in country; expenditure and taxation, burden upon taxpayers, 3001; the future bright; agriculture; fishing industry; business and industrial depression; problems should be faced in national spirit; Canada difficult country to govern, 3002; secession, talk of; accentuation of provincial and local problems; group political organizations; Alberta farmers resolution; European reconstruction; European origin of Canadian commercial conditions, 3003; wheat prices; emigration to United States; government not responsible; economic causes of movement; inflation in the United States; building trade, 3004; balanced budget; public expenditure; attitude of public and parliament; Hudson Bay railway; commission to inquire and investigate, 3005; commercial feasibility of route; Welland canal; railway extension in the West; Canadian Government Merchant Marine, deficit; deficit in financial operations of government; railway deficit and taxation, 3006; tariff policy of government; Liberal platform of 1919; too much importance attached to; statesmen who have reversed opinions on public policy; Sir Robert Peel and repeal of Corn Laws, 3007; tariff declarations of Liberal Convention; unwise to re-write tariff schedule; Progressive platform; inconsistency of Conservative party; consistently protectionist; Conservative arguments in favour of protection; position of Liberal party, 3008; tariff board; tariff reduction; free trade; Progressive party, inconsistency of; Alberta coal, transportation to Ontario; record of Liberal party since 1896; preferential tariff, 3009; reciprocity agreement with United States; opposition to reciprocity by Progressive members; recent tariff reductions; free trade and revenue; amendment;

Maclean, Hon. A. K.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
taxation; income tax; reliance upon customs tariff; tariff, unwise to abandon; United States, attitude towards Canada; Fordney tariff, 3010; reciprocity offer; tariff stability, 3011; problems to be solved, 3012
Speech on, reference to, 3070
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill, 3973
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Committee on, 2474
Competition with subsidized service, 3381, 3385
Deficit, 3006
Canadian National Railways, 3006
Committee, 2474
Management, responsibility and power, 3695
Paris offices, 3694
Cheque tax, 3934
Cold Storage Act Amdt. bill, 272, 273
Commercial union, 3907
Companies Act Amdt. bill, 4214-17
Credit and industry, M. (Mr. Irvine) 631
Distressed seamen, 3973
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4274
Freight rates, control of, 4226
French treaty, 444
Halifax grain elevator, 4713
Hudson Bay railway commission to inquire, 3005
Insulin, supply of, 704
Interest rate, 4105
Lack of confidence, M. (Mr. Irvine) 232
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4224-28, 4292
League of Nations
Activities and policies, 3997
Invitation to meet in Canada, 3997
Liberal platform of 1919, 3003, 3019
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, appointment, 3318
Merchants' bank merger. *See under this title,* Bank mergers
New York, Canadian customs officer, 3274
Nova Scotia miners' strike, troops, 398
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3572
Reciprocity with United States, 3010. 3907
Steamship services, West Indies, 3379
Union bank, 4225
Vancouver harbour bill, 258, 259, 262

Maclean, Mr. W. F. (South York)
Bank Act Amdt bill, 4135-45, 4147
Banks
Charters, limitation of time, 4147
Combinations of, 2578
Mergers, 4135
Notes, substitution for national notes, 4408

Maclean, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Banting, Dr. F. G.. 4440
Budget, 3055. Mr. McMaster in "Greenland"; doubtful virtue of consistency; speech of Prime Minister; professed protectionist; grievances of East and West; railway question; Canadian National Railways; Canadian Pacific; public vs. private ownership; effort to acquire or destroy national system, 3056; strategic advantages; present deficits but success assured; waterways complementary to railway system; company-owned railways; railway situation in United States, 3057; traffic pools and running rights; personnel of management; capitalization; stock exchange gambling; necessities of life; grain and sugar speculation, 3058; race-track betting; new Franchise Act needed; equality of citizenship as between men and women; previous discussion in parliament; right to revise constitution, 3059; tariff; immigration and land settlement; grievances of Maritime and western provinces; banking legislation; rural credits; war clouds 3060
Canada, constitutional development, 4473
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 3842
Canadian National Railways, 1050, 3056
Annual statement of minister, 1617
Branch lines construction bill, 4193, 4335
Courtesy, 2971
Electrification, 3203
Estimates, 1566
Grand Trunk gratuities, 1667
Public ownership, 1618, 3056
Report, 3223
Securities, approval of, bill, 4403
Toronto approaches and terminals, 4193, 4335, 4447
Unification of system, 3195, 3223
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 539
Combines bill, 2575
Parliament, right to investigate, 2666
Combines, steamship, 2667
Companies Act Amdt. bill, 4209-15
Constitution
Right of Canada to make her own, 1378
Right to revise, 3059
Copper bounty bill, 4371
Dairy Act Amdt. bill, 3327
Farm loans, 1088, 3060, 4366
Finance Act Amdt. bill, 4407
Forest protection, M. Mr. (Michaud) 824

Maclean, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Franchise Act Amdt. 3223
Freight rates
Crowsnest pass agreement, 1965
Grain, 1965
Railway rates, equalization, M. (Mr. Clark) 1965
Reclassification, 1618
Waterways, 1619
Fuel supply, 3198
M. (Mr. Church) 1272
Government printing, 1733
Halibut fishery treaty, 4473
Hebridean immigrants, 2950
Highways, effect on railways, 1619
Hoppe and Isenberg leases, cancellation, 3146, 3222
House of Commons acoustics, member should occupy central position, 1721
House of Lords, constitution of, 1374, 1378
Hudson Bay railway, M. (Mr. Knox) 1049
Hydro Electric Commission, 2682
Imperial Conference, 3223
King's birthday, observance, 3323
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4219
Merchants bank, 2576
Mining companies shares, 4209
National Defence estimates, 859
National land bank, 4366
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2185
Nickle, shipments to Germany during war, 4371
Parliament buildings, 1725
Peat experiments, 3199
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3851, 3860
Petition of right, fiats, 3146, 3222
Proportional representation, 420
Public departments, consolidation, 3341
Public ownership, 3842
Railways, 3056, 4194
Railways, co-operation between, 4337
Redistribution bill
Opportunity for discussion, 488
Representation by population, 572
Rural credits, 1088, 3060, 4366
St. Lawrence ship channel, 3340
St. Lawrence water power development, 2682
Sales tax, imports, 4409
Senate, elective or nominative, 1373, 1378
Singapore naval base, qu. 3506, qu. 3820
Sugar trust, 2576, 3058
Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner) 1295
Toronto
Approaches and terminals, 4193, 4335, 4447
Viaduct, 4447
United States Federal reserve bank, 4407
United States, preferential treatment, 440

Maclean, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
War commitments, 859
Water powers
Export of electrical energy, 1272
Survey of, 3203
Woollen industry, M. (Mr. Drummand) 933

Macneil Case. *See* Disallowance of Nova Scotia Statute

Macphail, Miss Agnes C. (Southeast Grey)
Agricultural conditions, 1190, 1844
Agriculture, expenditure, 3241
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4048
Copper bounty bill, 3241
Dominion Council of Health, lady members, 3649
Experimental farms, 3241
Farm women, 1844
Immigration
Domestic servants, 1189
Farmers and farm labourers, 1190
Policy, 1189
Labour, attitude towards mental and physical work, 1189
Life on the farm, 1189
Members of parliament, party funds and, 4237
References to, 1243, 1249
Rural depopulation, 1189, 1844
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4236-47
M. to refer back, neg. 4247
Sessional allowance, M. to reduce, 4240, neg. 4242
Soldier settlement, 2022, 2026
Questionnaire, 1845
Trade
Encouragement, qu. 284
Representatives, qu. 284

Macphail, Sir Andrew, immigration, 1393

McAdoo Award, 126

McArthur, J. D. & Co., Hudson Bay railway claim, 4686, 4689

McArthur, Mr. J. J., international boundaries, 3246

McBride, Mr. T. G. (Caribou)
Animal Contagious Diseases bill, 2134
Annual training, 872
Army officers, settlement in Canada, 1432
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4065, 4096
Mutual insurance companies, 4037
British Columbia
Agricultural production, 1432
Liquor law, administration, 2427

McBride, Mr. T. G.—*Con.*
Brule lake-Grande Prairie projected railway, 4699
Budget, 3031; pessimism; playing politics; sales tax; pyramiding; equalization of the tax; copper bounty; hemp bounty, 3031; proposed extension; employment of Canadians; British preference, clothing; old age pensions; unemployment relief; highway construction; immigration bill, statement by Sir James Lougheed and Senator Fowler, 3032; labour members, reflection on; people from British Isles, 3033
Building materials, prices, 2165
Canada's participation in war, 1534
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2412-15, 2427
Canadian Forestry Association grant, 3409
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Advance, 3825
Disposal of, 3385
Grain trade, 4234
Canadian National Railways branch lines bill, 4315
Canadian National Safety League grant, 3958
Canadian ports, use by United States fishermen, 3361
Canoe wharf, 1005
Cariboo wharves, 1005
Chinese immigration bill, 2309-27
Coal
Freight rates, Mines and Minerals Com. 4514
Hudson's Hope, possibilities, 3198, 3202
Conscription of fire fighters, 3409
Distressed seamen, relief, 3332
Easter adjournment, 1162
Exhibitions, 1467
Experimental farms, 475
Export Act Amdt. bill, pulpwood, 4352
False Creek bridge, 3376
Fishways, 3363
Forest protection, 3409
Fruit industry
Alleged combine, 2616
British Columbia, in, 147
Fuel supply, 3202
Grazing inspectors, appointments, 3254
Harbours and rivers, British Columbia, 1005
Hemp bounty bill, 3913, 4388
Hindu immigrants, franchise, 4641, 4648
Hudson's Hope, coal possibilities, 3198, 3202
Immigration
Chinese, 2309-27
Estimates, 1446

McBride, Mr. T. C.—*Con.*
Immigration—*Con.*
Chinese—*Con.*
Exclusion of, 2327
Schools, 2326
South Africa, 2327
Hindu 1128
Franchise, 4641, 4648
Literature, 1433
Oriental, 511
Policy, 1432
Imperial Conference, 4641, 4648-60
Indians, 2152
Kamloops-Okanagan railway, 4315
Kamloops public building, 1006
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4234
Magazines and periodicals, M. (Mr. Hocken) 848
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2199
Navigation schools, 3331
Oleomargarine, Agriculture Com. discussion, 3267
Ore-testing plants, 2507
Peace river district
Immigration, 1433
Railway construction, 1433, 4698
Peat, comparative value of, 3202
Penitentiaries, 771
Point Grey sand head leases, 3671
Powell River Paper Company, 2895
Prince George-Peace River railway, 1434, 4701
Public Works Act, tender and contract, 952
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4352
Railway rates
Equalization of, M. (Mr. Clark) 1926
Grades, etc. qu. 625
Renovated butter, 4263
Rural depopulation, 1432
Rural mail carriers, remuneration, 1789
Salmon Arm wharf, 1006
Settlers' relief, 3447
Steamship services, 2171
Taxation, building materials, prices and, 2165
Telegraph lines, revenue, 3946
Trent valley canal, qu. 4301
Western provinces, conditions, 1252
Winter trips to California, 1252

McConica, Mr. T. H. (Battleford)
Address in reply, 166. The late Mr. Stewart; condition of the West, 166; wheat prices; amendments of Messrs. Hoey and Shaw 167; economy everywhere necessary, 168
Canadian National Railways
Branch lines construction bill, 4201
Paris offices, 3700

McConica, Mr. T. H.—*Con.*
Congratulations upon return to House, 1660
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3531
Wheat Board, correspondence, 626

McCraney, Mr. George E., Hudson Bay railway, 1064

McDonald, Mr. Angus (Timiskaming)
Haileybury public building, 4615
Unemployment, 1125

McGiverin, Mr. Harold B. (Ottawa)
Buffalo and Fort Erie Bridge Company, 1835
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 378
Government workkshops Ottawa, 4620
Private Bills Committee
Reports
First, 936
Fourth, 2204
Fifth, 2417
Sixth, 2837
Seventh, 3323
Eighth, 3887
Tenth, 4391
Suspension of rules, 4248, 4308

McInnes, Mr., resources of Hudson bay region, 1072

McIsaac, Mr. C. F. (Antigonish and Guysborough)
Canadian National Railways branch lines bill, 4317
Half Island cove, 4572
Sonora wharf, 4585
Sunny Brae-Guysborough railway, 4317

McKenna, Mr. J. A. J., Hudson bay route, 1063

McKenzie, Hon. D. D. (Cape Breton North and Victoria; Solicitor General)
Appointment to Bench, 1763, 1810
Canada Temperence Act, 574, 767
Correspondence with British Columbia, 1032
Chimney Corner wharf, 942
Fuel supply, 800
M. (Mr. Church) 1273, 1283
Naturalization Act, M. (Mr. Carroll) 1382
Nova Scotia coal, 800, 1273
Reported statement in Halifax, 147
Resignation, 1763, 2392

McKillop, Mr. Hugh C. (West Elgin)
Budget, 2981. Congratulations to Finance Minister; tariff on sugar and clothing; Liberal pre-election promises; tariff changes not very encouraging; by-election results; handwriting on the wall; duty on exports and imports of beans, 2981; production of beans in Canada; competition with Austria and Japan; Japanese wages for labourers; prices of beans to consumer; conditions of workingmen; fair wage officer; satisfied labour a bulwark against Bolshevism; country needs strong national policy 2982

McKillop, Mr. Hugh C.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
Civil Service
Appointments, 1922, 3324
Returned soldiers, 386
Grain dockage, qu. 4300

McLachlan, Mr. J. B. *See* British Empire Steel Corporation

McLean, Kennedy and Company, ocean rates, 2127

McLennan, Professor
Helium 703
Scientific discoveries, 1287

McMaster, Mr. Andrew R. (Brome)
Acoustics, "bedside" manner of speaking, 2446
Address in reply, 172. The amendments; view of Minister of Finance, 172; amendments sanctioned by best modern constitutional practice, 173; necessity for a downward revision of tariff, 174
Agricultural conditions, 1858
Special committee on
Leave to report, 911
Reports
First, 911
Second, 986
Third, 1136, 1209
Fourth, 2127
Fifth, sixth and seventh, 4007, 4075
M. to concur in, 4295, 4363
Tariff Commission evidence, 2296
Agriculture, economic organization, 1858
Alpine Club grant, 3954
Attitude towards tariff policy, 3055
Audibility of debate, 3327
British Empire exhibition, 3949
Budget, 3012. Speech of leader of Opposition; reference to Mr. Sinclair; Great Britain and debt reduction; free trade; Mr. Lloyd George, statement by; 3002; United States tariff; reciprocity; permanency of arrangement;

McMaster, Mr. Andrew R.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
treaty of 1854; trade relations and national spirit; defeat of reciprocity agreement of 1911; proposed remedy for unsatisfactory economic conditions —protection and high taxes; Liberal party, attitude towards tariff; a mere "attitude of mind" not sufficient, 3013; to vote for amendment of Mr. Forke and against budget; to sit on cross benches; justification of action; Liberal principles; "need of retrenchment and reform"; "free trade, peace, good will amongst the nations"; "trust in the people"; Mr. Lloyd George's definition, "fair play for the under dog;" absurdities of protectionist principles; language of Liberal statesmen; election of 1896; Liberal budget of 1897; British preference and reciprocity; advances to Washington; reciprocity campaign of 1911, 3014; flag-flapping; racial cries and appeals to sentiment; "No truck or trade with the Yankees"; Sir Wilfrid Laurier; conscription issue; protectionist budget with strong Maritime flavour; amendment, 3015; claims for protection; reciprocity clause; revenue, methods of raising; tax on unearned increment of land; reciprocity negotiations; standing offers on Canadian and United States statute books; questions of permanence, 3016; United States offer of reciprocity in boots, leather and agricultural implements; ups and downs of the budget; raisins and dried currants, duty; artificial silk duty; hemp and copper bounties, 3017; protection governing principle of budget; not much difference between Liberals and Conservatives on tariff; prices of agricultural and manufactured products; protection a dismal failure; National Policy, anti-national and anti-social; Edmund Burke on function of parliament, 3018; repudiation of Liberal platform of 1919; attitude of Mr. Maclean (Halifax) and Mr. Euler; framing of tariff plank; the platform quoted, 3019; claim of Minister of Finance that he is not bound by platform; acceptance of nomination for leadership; amendments moved by Mr. Fielding in 1920 and 1921, 3020; budget repudiation of utterances of Finance Minister integrity of public life and maintenance of parliamentary institutions; reasons for undertaking an "unpleasant task"; relationship between member and constituent; Edmund Burke, 3201; not leaving party but refusing to support budget, 3022
Speech, comment on, 3026, 3029, 3043, 3050, 4393
Canada Highways bill, 2340
Canadian National Railways branch lines bill, 4306
Canadian National Safety League, 3953
Combines bill, 2581, 2660-69
Application for investigation restricted, 2617
Civil Service appointments, 2662
Commissioner of Taxation, salary, 3949
Copper bounties, 3017
Bill, amdt., advances to be repayable, 4369
Cross benches, 3014
Deep sea fisheries, development, 3366
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 2349
Experimental farms, 471
Export Act Amdt. bill, pulpwood, 4393
Free trade, 3002
Agriculture and, 1858
French treaty bill, 454
Favoured nation, 2210
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 340
Grain inquiry, royal commission, 1209, 1212
Hemp bounties, 3017
Bill, amdt., advances repayable, 4376
Immigration, undesirable classes, 2669
Liberal platform of 1919, 3019, 4393
Magazines and periodicals, M. (Mr. Hocken) 853
Manitoba Court of Appeal decision, 1212
Maple products industry, 1810
Marriage with deceased husband's brother, bill, 1256, 1836
Moose Jaw election, point of order, 1714
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2453
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3533
Parliament buildings, 1718
Commons galleries, members, 1729
Patents of Invention bill, 2069-78, 2083, 2097
Appeal to Exchequer Court, 2080
New or amended patents, 2082
Points of order
Members coaching each other, 405
Moose Jaw election, 1714
Relevancy, 2663

McMaster, Mr. Andrew R.—*Con.*
Proportional representation, M. (Mr. Good) 403, 430
Protection, combines and, 2581
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4393
Purchasing commission, 3951
Purchasing power, depreciation in Europe, 1859
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 728
Res. in 1919, free food and implements, vote on, 2996
Rural depopulation, 1860
Shipping combine, 2583
Sinclair, Hon. J. E., reference to, 3012
Tariff. *See also under this title,* Budget
Commission, evidence, 2296
Duties, pyramiding, 2998
High, revolt against, 1859
Policy, attitude on, 3067, 3013
Proposals, vote against, 3022, 3081
Trent canal, Young's Point dam, qu. 1363
Victorian Order of Nurses, grant, 3954

McMurray, Mr. E. J. (North Winnipeg)
Binder twine, 4376
Educational opportunities, foreigners and, 1885
Government printing, Winnipeg, 3144, qu. 3323
Hemp bounty bill, 4376
Immigration
Hebridean immigrants, treatment, 3587
Policy, 1880
Immigration Act Amdt bill, 2429
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4231, 4277
Lake of the Woods Regulation bill, 4168
Municipal and provincial extravagance, 1890
Natural resources, 1880-1
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2463
Judges, 2463
Secretary of State, administration, 2463
Proportional representation, M. (Mr. Good) 404
Railway problems, 1880
Shipping combines, 4277
Soldier settlers, fire insurance, 496
Taxation, burden of, 1880
Unemployment in Winnipeg, 435
Unrest, alleged, in western provinces, 4514
Winnipeg coal purchases, 496

McNeill, Paul. *See* British Empire Steel Corporation

McQuarrie, Mr. William G. (New Westminster)
Anglo-Japanese treaty, 1453
Appeals from convictions bill, 4250
Bamfield public building, 1024
Bankruptcy Act, M. (Mr. Casgrain) 1505, 1525

McQuarrie, Mr. William G.—*Con.*
Bribery charge, Revelstoke and Nelson electors, 2941
British Columbia
Fishing licenses, 1553
Liquor legislation. *See under this title,* Liquor
Orientals and fishing industry, 1899
Canada Highways bill, 2341
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill, 3971
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2284, 2404-17, 2428. *See also under this title,* Liquor
Amdt., 2415, neg. 2428
Canadian Press Limited, bill, 1464
Chinese immigration bill, 2308-22
Merchants, amdt., 2320
Trade, 2320
Civil Service
Appointments, 372-3
Number in, 3264
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 370
Coast Range Steel Company, 2508
Downie, Mr. Donald, 777
Forest protection, M. (Mr. Michaud) 823
Fraser river improvements, 1003
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth), 316
Health department, returned soldiers, 2171
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1324
Oriental, 1307, 1893
Child, 1453
Chinese, 1446, 2308-22
Assimilation of, 2321
Consul General for China, propaganda, 1896
Labourers, 2310
Merchants, admission of, 1445, 2320
Regulations, evasion, 1445
Statistics, 1445
Students, 2319
Treaty with, 1448
Disallowance of British Columbia legislation, 1261
Exclusion, demand for, 503
Hindu, franchise, 508
Japanese
Alleged rights as British subjects, 1899
Correspondence with Consul-General, 1894
Escape from immigration sheds, Vancouver, 1447
Fishermen, 1899
Lemieux agreement, 1447, 1894
Petition against further immigration and naturalization, 2837, 2885, 4075

McQuarrie, Mr. William G.—*Con.*
Immigration—*Con.*
Oriental—*Con*
Stowaways on freighter, 859, 1448
Naturalization, 1453, 1899
Immigration Act Amdt. bill (Mr. Neill) 503
Japanese trade, 1453
Lack of confidence, M. (Mr. Irvine) 211
Liquor. *See also under this title,* Canada Temperance
British Columbia law
Administration, 2412, 2428
Bootlegging, 2414
New Westminster, sale of liquor, 2415
Ottawa Citizen editorial, 2412
Warehouse licenses, qu. 1974
Marine biological board of Canada, 3372
Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. bill, 2118
Naturalization. *See also under this title,* Immigration
Correspondence with Vancouver county court judges, 2199
Japanese, 1899
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2183, 2199, 2465
Oil companies, stock selling, 781
Orientals. *See also under this title,* Immigration, Oriental
Business competition, 1902
Propaganda in United States, 1896
Pacific highway, 2341
Parliament buildings, members' rooms
Allocation, 1729
Lighting, 1728
Pensioners, unemployed, relief, 2169
Petroleum bounties, 781
Proportional representation, M. (Mr. Good) 400
Provincial employment offices, 2169
Redistribution, Mr. W. M. Ivel, employment, 733
Returned soldiers
Health department, 2171
Unemployment, 2169
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, legal adviser, 777
Sales tax, M. (Mr. Stevens) 925
Salmon fisheries, British Columbia, 1553
Secret agreement, 1448
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, qu. 3137

McRae, General. *See* Canada Colonization Association

McTaggart, Mr. Neil H. (Maple Creek)
Agricultural conditions in West, 1352
Dominion lands, alienation of, 1353
Homestead pre-emption and purchase, qu. 1030, 1032, 4202

McTaggart, Mr. Neil H.—*Con.*
Immigration policy, 1352
Livestock agents, qu. 1156
School lands, 1032
Unpaid balance of purchase price, 4204

Machinery. *See also* Agricultural Implements; Customs Tariff Items; Prices
For manufacture of fertilizers. *See* Customs Tariff Items
French treaty, 1981, 1988

Magazines and Periodicals. *See also* Press
Canadian
Competition, 1418
Encouragement of, M. (Mr. Hocken) 826
Postage, 4436, 4528
Sales tax, 4415, 4421

Magdalen Islands
Hydrographic survey, 3336
Pointe à Elie wharf, 974
Pointe Shea (Amherst) wharf, 977
Steamship service, 2174

Magna Charta. *See* Immigration Act Amdt.

Magrath, Mr. C. A., Fuel supply, 799

Mail Carriers. *See* Post Office

Mail Catalogue Prices. *See* Bancroft; Prices

Mail Subsidies. *See* Steamship Services

Main Estimates. *See* Estimates

Maine, state of, railway construction, 2902

Majority Government. *See* Lack of Confidence, M. (Mr. Irvine)

Majority Rule. *See* Proportional Representation

Malbaie, Que. wharf, 968

Malcolm, Mr. James (North Bruce)
British preference, cotton goods, 3466
Civil Service Act, special committee
Order of reference, 1256
Reports
First, 1136, 1256
Second, 4592-3
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 762
Redistribution bill, 572
Textile industry, 3466

Malcolm Island, Finnish settlement, 1247

Malone, late Lieut. Col. W. P., qu. 206

Management, Charges of. *See* Finance

Manila Fibre. *See also* Bounties; Hemp
Bounties, 4369
Rope, oil used for, drawback, 3502

Manion, Hon. Robert J. (Fort William and Rainy River)
Adjournment, time of, 2694
Agriculture, votes for, 3237
Automobile insurance, 3148
Banting, Dr. F. G., 4439
Budget, 2746. Congratulations to Finance Minister; speech of Mr. Raymond; conditions serious; emigration to the United States; causes; high taxation; railway deficits; small and scattered population; sectional interests and problems; depression, causes of, 2747; prices of manufactured articles and agricultural products; Europe, chaotic condition of; production costs; France, occupation of the Ruhr; world conditions; United States tariff against Canadian products; grain, exports of; home market; lower production; grain, exports of; home market; lower production costs; interprovincial trade; immigration, 2748; European immigrants, assimilation of; taxation, reduction of; Great Britain, retrenchment and tax reduction; sugar duties; national debt; stumping machines, lowering of duties on, 2749; boots for cripples; sales tax; contracts affected; too much pessimism; wheat export; gold output; coal deposits; silver production; cobalt; nickel; asbestos; water powers; pulp, paper and forest products; fertile lands; fisheries; iron ore; vigorous and virile people; causes for optimism; agricultural conditions; farm mortgages; farm credits; United States and protection; claim that United States is a free trade country; high duties imposed by United States; industrial development of United States, 2751; free trade, advocacy of in western Canada; protection and war; trade competition between Great Britain and Germany; Great Britain and protection, 2752; tariff as it affects East and West; world opinion favourable to protection; free raw materials, 2753; agricultural implements; tariff, periodical revision; advisory tariff commission; tariff revenue in Great Britain; taxation on necessaries of life; free trade and unemployment; poverty and pauperism in Great Britain, 2754; British agriculture under free trade; Lloyd George, statement of; Liberal tariff policy; National Policy tariff; stability; amdt. of Mr Forke, 2755
Building materials, prices, 2164
Canadian Air Force
Camp Borden, 1775
Hospital, 1775
Forestry protection, 1776
Canadian National Railways
Branch lines construction bill, 4310
Long Lake branch, 4310
Paris offices, 3631
Cattle embargo, removal of, 3293
Civil Service
Appointments and promotions, 330
Commission, exemptions from jurisdiction, qu. 278
"Lady who rides to work in automobile", 1772
Returned soldiers, 1792
Cloud Bay wharf, 982
Combines bill, 2542
Copper bounty bill, 3237
Copyright Act Amdt bill, 2287, 3154
Song writers, 2287
Divorce proceedings, publicity, 2054
Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 2034
Elevators. *See under this title,* Grain
Emigration to United States, 1113
Empire Settlement scheme, 288
Export Act Amdt. bill, pulpwood, 3413, 4347
France, occupation of the Ruhr, 2748
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 320, 329
Grain and grain trade
Elevators
Leases qu. 4132
Screenings, 2039
Inquiry by Grain Commission, 2254
Sale of, qu. 1633
Unscalped or uncleaned, qu. 1739
Grain commission, 2036, 2254
Grain shipments, 3769, 3789
Injustices to western farmers, 1114
Marketing, M. (Mr. Millar), 295
Port Colborne, qu. 1209
Shipments, 3769, 3789
Great Britain, to qu. 1867
Health department, salaries, 2170
Hebridean immigrants, treatment of, 3597
Icebreaking, Thunder Bay, 3359
Immigration
Great Britain, from, 1105
Northern Ontario, 1097, 1112
Policy, 1110-1115

Manion, Hon. Robert J.—*Con.*
Immigration—*Con.*
Western Canada, conditions in, 1112
Indians
Agent, Mr. J. Garry Burke, 2151
Education, 2164
Northern Ontario, 2151
Preservation of, 2151-2
Tuberculosis, 2152
Insurance Act Amdt. bill, 3148
Labour
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1702
Strikes, 1702
Land and cable telegraph lines, 2683
Legislation
Estimates, 2691
Too much, 2543
"Uplift," 2054
Lighthouses, date of closing, 3356
Magazines and periodicals, M. (Mr. Hocken) 840
Militia Pension Act Amdt. bill, 2053
Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. bill, 2114, 2116
Home-brew, conviction, 2121
National Defence
Dominion arsenal, Quebec, bonus, 1772
Expenditure, 3238
Nova Scotia strike, use of troops, 896
Orders in council passed, 1921-1922, qu. 1488
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3853-86
Amdt, 3886, agreed to, 3886
Pensions
European War and active militia, 2166, 3707, 3713
Pension Act, suggested amendment, 2166
Pension Commissioners, salaries, 3742
Royal commission
Findings, action, 2639, 3400
Interim report, 2166
Unemployed pensioners, relief, 2168
Pilotage, administration of, 3358
Port Arthur and Fort William harbours, 2675
Progressive members and protection, 3237
Proportional representation, 431
Public Works, salaries, 2684
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 3413, 4347
Reciprocity, offer to negotiate, 3474
Returned Soldiers Insurance bill, 3744, 3892
Returned soldiers in civil service, 1772
St. Lawrence river waterway, 3769
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment bill, 3747
Soldier settlement, 2020, 2027, 2028
Tariff
Advisory tariff commission 2754
Agricultural implements, 2750, 2754
Telegraph and telephone lines, 2683
Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner) 1293

Manion, Hon. Robert J.—*Con.*
Trade
Commissioners, 1837
Manufactured goods, exports, 1839
Trade and Commerce, estimates, 2031
United States tariff, 1113, 1119, 2751
Vimy Ridge memorial, 183
Wages, building trades, 2165
War medals, 1744
Welland canal construction, 3769

Manitoba. *See also* Western Provinces
Agricultural and economic conditions, 1213, 1220, 1404, 1462, 1906, 2766
Bank Act revision, 4016, 4041, 4045
Bracken, Premier, statement on immigration, 1123
Canada Colonization Association, 1877
Change of government, 2799, 2810
Coal supply, 1265
Court of Appeal
Grain Inquiry Commission, decision, 1210
Trueman, Mr. W. N., K.C., appointment, 1868
Dairying industry, production in 1921, 2744
Dominion forest reserves and parks, 2060
Dredging, 1012
Experimental farms, 459
Freight rates, 1931, 1932
Manitoba-Canadian Northern agreement, 1939
Grand Jury system abolition of, 2695, 3272
Harbours and rivers, 993, 4589
Hemp production, 2780
Highways, 3184. *See* Canada Highways bill; Highways
Illicit stills, prosecution for operating, 3280
Income tax, 2859
Indians, 2145, 2153
Institutions and services in excess of present needs, 1214, 1400, 1890
Lake of the Woods bill, 2885
McLeod, Hon. G. L., help for needy farmers, 1404
Manitoba Pulp and Paper Company lease, 3254
Mixed farming, 2772, 2773
Natural resources. *See also* Lake of the woods Regulation bill
Cost of administration, 2782
Political patronage, 3348
Prohibition referendum, 2414
Public buildings, 4628
Radio-telegraph service, 2285, 2468, 3338
Reclamation of land, 1065
Sessional indemnity, reduction, 1156

Manitoba—*Con.*
Taxation
Agricultural products, 1404
Production and, 1391
Tax sales 2961
Unpaid taxes, 1251
Telephone system, 2285
Unemployment relief, discontinuance, 1658
United Farmers of Manitoba, 1404, 1462
Water powers. *See* Lake of the Woods Regulation bill
Wheat board, 2836

Manitoba Free Press, Sir Clifford Sifton and, 3043

Manna. *See* Dairying Industry

Manson, Hon. A. M., Attorney-General, British Columbia
Asiatic immigration 1901
Liquor legislation. *See* Canada Temperance Act

Manton, Judge, immigration, 1234, 1237

Manufactured Goods. *See also* Agricultural Implements; Industries; Textiles
Binder twine discrimination against, 2964
Export, 1838. *See also* Imports and Exports
Prices 1167, 2748. *See also* Prices
Spread between producer and consumer, 2713

Manufacturers. *See also* Canadian Manufacturers Association
Difficulties, 2854
Employers' liability compensation, 691
Farmers and, 2716
Free trade in raw materials, 2858
Japan, competition from, 2861
Licensed, 4410. *See also* Special War Revenue bill
Markets, lack of, 2856
Not able to compete, 3062
Ontario and Quebec, 2910
Orient competition from, 2861
Profit, 2854
Sales tax and. *See* Special War Revenue
Securities of manufacturing companies, 2720
Understanding between and people of East, 3023
United States
Competition from, 2861
Markets, 2856

Maple Products industry, 1810

Maps. *See* Interior, Surveys

Mara, B.C., post office, qu. 1489, qu. 1739

Marchand, Mr. J. O. *See* Parliament Buildings, Architects

Marcil Hon. Charles (Bonaventure)
Business of the House
Debates, official report, returns, 940
Private members' day 1160
Questions right to put on orders of day, 734
Canadian National Railways branch lines bill, 4186, 4307
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 542, 553
Export Act Amdt. bill, 4345
Gaspe and Bonaventure forest fires, 4010
Gaspe peninsula, railway facilities, 4186, 4307
Grondines wharf, 967
Hudson Bay railway, 1041
Japanese immigration, Lemieux agreement, 1448
La Societie des Artisans Canadians Francais, 1028
Magazines and periodicals, M. (Mr. Hocken) 843
National gallery 1018
Oleomargarine M. (Mr. Carroll) 3535
Petition of right, fiats, 3223
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4345
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 742
Rulings as Chairman
Amdt. not relevant, 3667
Debates, official report, statements not read, 1830
General argument on particular clause, 4069
Governor General acknowledgment of address, 1256
Member may not reflect on vote of committee 4119
M. that committee rise not debatable, 1836
M. to postpone resolution in supply, 3667
Newspaper article reflecting on proceedings, 4126
Reference to com. in advance of report, 2970
Reflection on sincerity and integrity of members, 4067
Rule 17B, closure, 3667
Supply, relevancy, 808, 871, 1847, 1858, 1861, 4336
Ste. Anne des Monts pier, 979
St. John and Quebec railway bill, 3404
Special delivery letter postage, 1872
Toronto viaduct, 4307

Marcouiller, Mr. C., St. Barnabé Nord postmaster, 1830

Margaree River Fisheries. *See* Fish and Fisheries
Margaretville, N.S. harbour, 4581
Marine and Fisheries. *See also* Canada Shipping Acts Amdt; Canadian Government Merchant Marine; Fish and Fisheries; Naval Service; Shipping and Shipbuilding; Vessels
Agencies, rents and contingencies, 3351
Alaskan, wreck of, 1212, 1659, qu. 1763 3160, 3330
Annual report presented, 1080
Belleville harbour commissioners, dismissal, qu. 490
Biological board, 3371
Building fishways and clearing rivers, 3362
Committee reports
First, 1307, 1384
Second, 1686, 1763
Third, 2983, 3084
Department
Estimates, 2610, 3160, 3330
Expenditure by provinces, statement, 3888
Johnston, Mr. Alex, deputy minister, 3373, 3671, 4667
Publicity, 3364
Salaries and contingencies, 3373, 3375
Distressed seamen, relief of, 3332
Dredging
Dredge No. 12, qu. 1487
St. Lawrence ship channel, 3339
Unification of work, 3341
Examination of masters and mates, 2610
False Creek bridge, 3375
Halibut Fishery treaty. See Treaties
Hopper barge, self-propelling, 3350
Hydrographic survey, 3336
Icebreakers, 3160
Ice obstruction in Cabot strait, 2614
Mikula, qu. 1384, 2614, 3160
Murray Stewart, 3354, 3359
Thunder bay, etc., 3359
Inspection
Boats over 100 tons register, 1660
Live stock shipments, 3334
Steamboats, 3360
Institutions assisting sailors, 701
Life-saving service, 3335
Appliances, 3171
British Columbia, 1659
Long Point, lake Erie, 3335
Rewards, 3335
Lights and lightkeepers
Boudrot, Mr. E., Green island, qu. 2613
Classification, 3352
Conley, Mr. James, dismissal, qu. 4183
Descheneaux, Mr. Patrick, dismissal, qu. 4512
Marine and Fisheries—*Con.*
Lights and lightkeepers—*Con.*
Lambton, loss of, qu. 812, 3354
Leblanc, Louis, qu. 285
Lighthouses, maintenance and repairs, 3353
Reliance, wreck of, qu. 812
Richibucto cape, 3353
Salaries and allowances, 3351
Marine hospitals, 701, 2167
Marine signal service, 3358
Meterological service, 3360
Murray Stewart, steamer, purchase, qu. 203, qu. 386, 3354, 3359
Navigation
Bay of Fundy, 2615
Closing of, date, 3356
Construction of lights and aids to, 3357
Detroit river, traffic regulation, 3357
Obstructions, Seymour Narrows, 3333
Safeguards, lake Superior, qu. 812
Schools, 3331
Wireless telegraphy, 1046
Ocean and river service, 2610, 3375
Distressed seamen, relief of, 3375
Investigation into wrecks, 3160
Alaskan, wreck of, qu. 1763, 3160, 3330
Maintenance and repairs to steamers, 3160
Patrol of northern waters, 3360
Pilotage. *See also* Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bills
Administration, 3358
Pensions to pilots, 3359
Pilot boats, 3358
Eureka, qu. 1364
Father Point, 3358
Radiotelegraph service, 3337, 3374
St. Lawrence river ship channel, 3339
Dredging and maintenance, 3375
Sawdust pollution of streams, 3362
Sorel shipyard, 3343
Tidal and current survey, 3338
Trout-fishing season, 1686
Unforeseen expenses, 3334
Wireless equipment for vessels, 3356
Wrecking plants 3334
Wrecks, Alaskan. *See under this title,* Alaskan

Marine Hospitals. *See* Health; Marine and Fisheries

Maritime Provinces. *See also* New Brunswick; Nova Scotia; Prince Edward Island
Bank centralization, 4079
Boards of trade, conference with Sir Henry Thornton, 1755, 1771

Maritime Provinces—*Con.*
Canadian National Railways, 1764, 1770. *See also that title*
Coal. *See that title*
Conditions in, 1207, 2763, 2936
Dredging 1009, 4590
Freight rates, 1963, 3192. *See also that title*
Coal from, 1272, 1813
Grievances, 3056
Immigration, 1086, 1131, 1198, 1236. *See also that title*
Natural markets, loss at confederation, 2852
Natural resources, 2972
Needs of, 3000
Public buildings, 1022, 4614
Secession talk 1757, 2940. *See also* Secession
Roberts, Hon. W. F. reported statement, 3145
Senate elective or nominative, 1376
Shale deposits, 2513

Markets. *See also* Address; Agriculture; Budget; Grain and Grain Trade; Industries; Live Stock; Manufacturers; Prices; Reciprocity Trade; Treaties
Access to, 2937
Agricultural products, 2731, 2861, 2910
Great Britain, 2869. *See also that title*
United States 2869. *See also that title*
Bacon, 2864
Beans, 2982
Cattle, 2871
Competition for, 2725
Dairy products, 2863
Development of, 2869
Disorganized, 2861
Export, 2869
Fish, 2906, 2946, 3002
Foreign, 4054
Fruit, 463
Hogs, 2864
Home, 2869
Industries and, 2975
Horses, 590
Live stock 588. *See also that title*
South America, 594
Manufactured products, 2910
Maritime provinces, 2852
Marketing and quality, 2862, 3066, 4027
Production exceeding demand, 2957
Purchasing power, 637
United States. *See also that title*
Fish, 2946
Wheat, 3068. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade

Marketing of Grain. *See* Grain

Markham, Violet. *See* Carruthers, Mrs. James

Marking Act. *See* Customs and Excise; Imports

Marking of Woollen Goods. *See* Wool

Marler, Mr. Herbert (St. Lawrence-St. George)
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4121
Budget, 3022. Congratulations to Finance Minister; speech of leader of Opposition, able but lacking in generosity; Sir Henry Drayton, amendment; position of Progressive party; difficult country to govern; understanding between manufacturers and people of West; agricultural and business conditions, 3023; difficulties universal; lower freight rates; loss of purchasing power, inflation; rural credits; demand for lower tariffs; free trade "a splendid theory"; revenue; not a protectionist but a development tariff; without moderate tariff industries would close, 3024; prices, Canada and United States; revenue and tariff, 3025; income tax; tax on unearned incomes; inheritance tax; excise duties, 3026; natural resources, development of; capital and people necessary; taxation direct and indirect; expenditure and economy; civil government costing too much; ratio of employees to population, 3027; deficit; spend only what we have to spend; tariff stability; tariff committee; permanent advisory tariff commission, 3028; production costs; distribution; spread between manufacturer and consumer; speech of Mr. McMaster, "chasing a rainbow"; free trade impossible, 3029; rejection of Sir Wilfrid Laurier's tariff policy; result of government defeat; Wheat board a protective measure, 3030
Cabot strait, ice obstruction, 2614
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 3836
Canadian National Railways, debenture holders, 3507
Canadian National Safety League, 3954
Canadian Pacific Railway dividends, 1203
Civil Service Commission, 1800
Combines bill, 2536, 2615-21
Definition "combine" 2615
Registrar, inquiry, 2619
Dominion Textile Company, profits, 3464
Emigration to the United States, 1128, 1392

Marler, Mr. Herbert—*Con.*
English and French speaking people, 1341
Firebrick, duty, 3482
Freight rates
Crowsnest pass agreement, 1948
Railway rates equalization, M. (Mr. Clark), 1947
Girl Guides, grant, 3954
Government publications, waste, 1713
Hospital supplies, coverings, duties, 3501
Immigration, 1391
Attitude of the West, 1129
Restrictions upon, 1128
Income tax, 3026
Proposed amendment, 4503
Unearned income, 2882, 3026
Income War Tax Act Amdt. bill, 4492, 4500
Labour, employment for all willing to work, 1124
McMaster, Mr., speech on budget, 3026, 3029
Montreal, postal appointments, 1800
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3848-82
Amdt. 3881, neg. 3882
Pension Commissioners, duties, 685
Soldier Settlement board, 1126, 1128
Taxation, increase of, 1121
Victorian Order of Nurses, grant, 3954
X-Ray plates, coverings, duties, 3501

Marriage
Publication of evidence, 1971
Settlements. *See* Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill

Marriage with deceased husband's brother, Bill respecting, 1r., 1256; 2r., 1836; com., 3r., 1837

Married Woman, rights of. *See* Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill

Marriott, Professor, England since Waterloo, 1231

Marshall, Mr. Duncan, 70, 286, qu. 384
Agricultural instruction grant, 608, 3293
Appointment as Commissioner of Agriculture, 2615, 2710, 3043, 3150, 3303, 3320
Order in council, 3294, 3320, 3303
British Empire exhibition, 4704
Cattle embargo, removal of, 2614, 2871, 3041, 3293
Fordney tariff, 3293
Inspection of live stock shipments, 3334
Qualifications, 3306
Redistribution, 3313
Reports, 3705
Salary, 608, 3043, 3287, 3309, 3352

Marshall—*Con.*
Speeches, 2615
Great Britain, 3595
South Oxford Liberals, 594, 3292, 3309, 3316
Stornoway, 2181
Trips
Great Britain, 3290, 3308, 4675
Florida, 3307, 3311
South America, qu. 1031

Martell, Mr. L. H. (Hants)
Address in reply, 101. Congratulations to mover and seconder, 101-102; deceased members; the Maritime provinces and representation, 102; government ownership of railways; Sir Henry Thornton and Canadian National Railways; development of Canadian ports, 103; Minister of Justice, 104; Hants county; Mr. Shaw and Progressives; Near East crisis, 105
Agricultural produce marketing agent, 4676
Alaskan, wreck of, 3164
Alpine Club of Canada, 3444
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3099, 3126, 3220
Bay of Fundy, icebreaker, 2615
Boyer, Dr., appointment, qu. 2418
British Columbia
Fisheries Commission, 3372
Fishing licenses, 1548, 1554
British common law, 2894
Budget, 2904. Liberal tariff platform, 2904; tariff for revenue; railway deficit and direct taxation; public ownership and low tariff; relations with United States; reciprocity; printing industry and United States market, 2905; Fordney tariff; markets; fish, 2906; reciprocity agreement of 1911; negotiations with President of the United States; the weapon in our hands; Treaty of 1818; use of Canadian ports by United States fishing vessels; license system, 2906; trans-shipment of catch; shipment in bond; suggested denial of privilege; bounties preferable to tariff increase; reasons for supporting budget; revenue requirements; revision downward; British preferance; elected to support Liberal party, 2907
Business of the House, Saturday sittings, 2694, 3452
Business profits tax, 4490
Calder Act, 2926
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 3818

Martell, Mr. L. H.—*Con.*
Canadian National parks and historic sites, 3406
Canadian National Railways, branch lines bill, 4333
Canadian Press Limited bill, 1464
Cattle shipments to Great Britain, 3291
Carvell, Hon. F. B., alleged statement of Mr. Motherwell, 3189
Civil service
Commission, ministers and, 371
Technical and professional officials, 815
Civil Service Act, M (Mr. Power) 525, 545, 546
Clementsport postmaster, 1798
Coal, duty, 3499
Cold Storage Act Amdt. bill, 273, 2056, 2086
Incorporated companies, 2058
Private enterprises, 2059
Constituents, interests of, 3550
Dairy industry, protection, 3552
Deputy ministers, salary increases, 4667
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 2350
Distressed seamen, relief, 3332
Dredging, Maritime provinces, 1010
English and French, harmony, 1341
Exchequer Court judgeship, 2500
Experimental farms, 461
Fertilizers, nitrate of soda, 2307
Fishways, 3363
Fort Edward, N.S., historic site, 3406, 3432, 3435
Fruit trees, new varieties, 2307
Fruits
Pre-cooling, 2056
Vegetables and, freight rates, 626
Howat and Meyerscough, Messrs, detention, 3157
Hudson Bay railway, 461
Hydrographic survey, 3337
Immigration
Assisted, 1178
Canada Colonization Association, 1175
Chinese, 1445
Hebridean immigrants, treatment of, 3587, 3589
Hindu immigrants, franchise, 4646
Japanese, Lemieux agreement, 1447
Imperial Conference, 4645
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act Amdt. bill, 4360, 4362
Interprovincial trade, 2177
Johnston, Mr. Alex., salary, 4667
Labour, representation in House, 3555
Lack of confidence, M. (Mr. Irvine) 226
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4282, 4290
Liberal party pledges, 3035
Litle Anse, Morrison claim, 4723

Martell, Mr. L. H.—*Con.*
Migratory Birds Convention Act, 3443
Narcotic Drugs Amdt. bill, 2118, 2122
Naturalization Act Amdt. bill, 2185
New departmental building, Ottawa, 4619
Nova Scotia
Historical society, 3406
Secession talk, 2057, 2177
O'Hara, Captain Marshall, salary, 3331
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3516, 3554
Olympic games, Canadian team, 4707
Patents of Invention bill, 2072
Pensions
Appeal board, 683
Old age and mothers, conference, 3046
Pension board, removal, res. 3399
Petition of Right Act Amdt. bill, 3128, 3223, 3224
Playgrounds, children, 3407, 3432
Prince Edward Island car ferry terminals claim, 4679
Privilege—Civil Service Com. report, 4363
Public expenditure, apportionment, 4560
Public Works Act, tender and contract, 954
Pugsley, Hon. William, appointment, 2499
Railway rates, reductions, 118
Representation, irreducible minimum of, qu. 285
Riordan Pulp and Paper Company, 4490
St. John—Windsor steamship service, 2176
Sawdust pollution of rivers, 3364
Schofield, Rev. Dr., 3399
Seed distribution, 2306
Seed testing bill, 2306
Steamship services, Maritime provinces, 2177
Tariff items carried without discussion, 3492
Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner) 1298, 4645
Toronto seed branch building, 4623
Windsor-Chester branch line railway, 4333
Windsor, dredging, 1010

Martello Tower, St. John, 3444

Marvale, wreck of, 3333

Massey Harris Company. *See also* Agricultural implements
President of and free trade, 2911
Settlement of war claims, 2497

Masters and Mates. *See* Canada Shipping Act; Marine and Fisheries

Matane, Que. wharf, 970

Matapedia Bridge, qu. 4184

Maxwell, Mr. C. F., Winnipeg-St. Croix route, 2901

May, Mr. *See* Immigration, Agents

Maybee, Mr. M. E. (Northumberland, Ont.)
Dryden, Mr. W. A., payments to, qu. 3704
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, and, 3705
Government offices, directory of, qu. 2085
Grasshopper pest, 596
Regimental funds, qu. 4010
Seed-cleaning stations, 600
Wool-combing industry, qu. 1973

Mayberry, Col. Thomas R., 286

Meaford, Ont., wharf, 983

Meagher, Mr. N. H. *See* Disallowance

Meats. *See also* Bacon; Cold Storage; Live Stock; Treaties
Canned, inspection, 2202
Chilled and preserved, shipment to Great Britain, 463, 3091, 3291, 4675
Fresh and cured
Exports, 1984
Imports, qu. 617, 2959
Inspection. *See* Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill
Meat products, lard, 1978
Pork products, French treaty, 1984
Preserved in tins, 1978

Mechanics. *See* Labour

Medals. *See* War, Medals

Medical Advisory Board. *See* Pensions

Medical Care. *See* Health; Indians

Medical Course, length of, 2934

Medical Examinations. *See* Returned Soldiers Insurance

Medical Inspections. *See* Health; Immigration; Pensions

Medical Research. *See also* Scientific Research
Banting, Dr. *See that title*
Helium, discoveries by Doctors McLennan and Macallum, 703, 4439
Insulin treatment, discovery of, 703. *See also* Banting
Standardizing and testing laboratories, 703

Medical Students. *See* Universities

Medicine Hat
Customs employees, qu. 3505
Dominion lands office, 3250

Medicines and Drugs. *See also* Health; Narcotic Drugs
"Metagen", analysis of, qu. 1867
Patenting, 703, 2077, 2078
Pharmaceutical preparations, qu. 3261

Medicines and Drugs—*Con.*
Proprietary or patent, 700
Supplies for hospitals. *See* Customs Tariff Items; Hospitals

Mediterranean
Fish from Maritime provinces, 3002
Steamship service, qu. 1488, 1636

Meductic-New Brunswick boundary line, 4309

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur (Leader of the Opposition)
Address in reply, 17. Congratulations to mover and seconder; new leader of Progressive party, 18; delay in co-ordination and amalgamation of Canadian National Railways, 18-19; Grand Trunk not yet amalgamated with Canadian Nationals; railway expenditure without authority of parliament; immigration policy of government, 19; export of grain crop; export of settlers' effect, 20-21; no government policy to check emigration, provide employment or reduce taxation, 21; natural resources of western provinces; the tariff question; customs collections, 22; national debt increased under present administration, 22-23; decrease in respect to soldiers' pensions, increase in sales tax; added burden of taxes; post office revenue and the stamp tax, 23; late government and reorganization of departments, 24; Great Britain paying off a portion of her national debt, 24; conduct of Dominion finances during war years, 24; western Canada and the harvest of 1922; sounder agricultural conditions; Canada anxious for peace and prosperity; Near East crisis, 25; removal of cattle embargo, 25-26; condition of the western farmer; Bank Act revision, 26; redistribution, 27
Alleged understanding, Mr. Shaw's amendment, 987
Admiralty Act Amdt. bill, 2051
Agricultural conditions, 1853
Committee reports, 1209, 4363
Great Britain in, 1861
Leitch, Prof., dairy industry, 1858
Luxuries, demand for, 1856
Agricultural implements duty, 2246, 2990
Reduction by Conservative government, 2756
Speech of 1910, 2848
Agricultural products, distribution, 1857
Agriculture, estimates, 575

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Alien enemy property, claim against United States, 3823
Alpine Club grant, 3415
Ammunition, 887, 1742
Anglo-Japanese treaty, 1449
Annual drill, 863, 4635
Appointments by government, 2502
Artificial silk, duty, 2990, 3489
Arts, literature and science, recognition, 1289
Atlantic fisheries commission, 3084
Attorney General, Ontario vs. Wholesale Grocers, decision, 2051, 2560
Auditor General, vacancy, 3307, 4512
Australia, trade treaty with, 245, 1849, 1850
Banff park, water powers, 3939
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4133-4160
Liberals-Conservatives, alleged union on, 4143
Newspaper articles, Montreal Standard, 4143
Bank Act revision, inquiry, 496
Bank charters, renewal of, 4143
Bank mergers, 4138
Banking and Commerce Com. proceedings, 4143
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3213-14
Banting, Dr. F. G., 4437
Belgium, treaty with, 246
Belle River wharf, 4594
M. to reduce 4600, neg. 4610
Personal explanation, 4638
Binder twine, duty free, 4379
Biological Board Act Amdt. bill, 3974
Blackadder, the late Dr. Edward, 6
Board of Commerce, 2558, 2571
Boots and shoes, free entry to United States, 3499
Breweries and export liquor houses, 1636
British and foreign news service, 4712
British Columbia
Fishing licenses, M. (Mr. Clark) 1546, 1547
Liquor law administration, 2425
British preference, 453
Fifty per cent, 3049
Increase, 3487
Woollen goods, 3460
Brussels postmaster, 1800
Budget, 2984; expressions of good will towards Finance Minister; courtesy and frankness; budget disappointing; omissions from presentation; what a budget should contain; analysis of financial position and trade conditions; budget speeches in Great Britain and Australia; public debt, 2984; additions to; demobilization and war

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
responsibilities; revenues collected during the war; comparison with Great Britain and Australia; taxation of incomes and war profits, 2985; returns for war expenditure; per capita debt; demand for a balanced budget; debt reduction by sale of war material; expenditure, reduction of, 2986; railway obligations; soldiers' civil re-establishment; pensions; soldier settlement; housing; unemployment; expenditure and revenue; tax reductions and debt increases; sugar duty; reduction; refiners' protection not interfered with, 2987; rigid adherence to protective principle; depreciated currency clause; marking clause; orders in council; two favoured industries; lead pencils; lithographic works; dumping clause; tobacco duty, cigarettes, 2988; bootlegging in tobacco; injury to tobacco-manufacturing industry; beet sugar duty; proposals of budget of 1923; British preferential tariff; reasons for changes not apparent; combines and mergers; woollen industry; duty on raisins and currants, 2989; French treaty debate recalled; tariff increase to facilitate negotiations with Australia; artificial silk duty; inconsistency of government; protection principles intact; woollens, tariff reduction and price; farm implements, reduction of duty, 2990; reduction in output and advance in prices; moderate protection; free trade sentiment not making progress; United States competition, 2991; protection cannot be abandoned; reciprocity offer; no change in opinion on question; arguments against reciprocity; geographical considerations; industrial and agricultural competition; organization and production; no guarantee of permanency, 2992; abrogation of the treaty of 1854; termination of recent trade arrangement; trade reprisals, 2993; Liberal platform of 1919, repudiation of; fidelity to political pledges flouted; statements of Mr. Euler, Mr. Stewart (Argenteuil) and Mr. Fielding; responsibility of Minister of Finance for Liberal Convention; Prime Minister and the "chart"; declaration of Prime Minister in 1920, 2994; con-

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
vention of Alberta Liberals; endorsement of Liberal platform, 2995; double-dealing policy; appeal to the farmer, assurance to the business man; stability; apostacy of western ministers; declaration for free food and implements of production, 2996; vote in 1919 on the resolution of Mr. McMaster; new taxation unaccompanied by economy; sales tax; declarations of Prime Minister in 1921, 2987; business profits and luxury taxes; pyramiding of taxes; cost of living, comparison of Canadian and United States prices; whole tax passed on to consumer; exempted articles, 2998; addition of newsprint to list; raw wool; agricultural implements; review of government taxation records; necessities of life; implements of production; luxuries; French treaty; embroideries; boots and shoes; wines and brandies; cost of living, 2999; descending curve succeeded by upward movement; professions of economy; direct taxation and "invisible" tariff; political shilly-shally; government losing ground; heroic policy needed; needs of the West and the Maritime provinces, 3000
Speech,
Comment on, 3047, 3077
Revenue statements omitted, 2860, 2898
Burrard Inlet bridge, 4709
Business of the House, 179
Adjournments
Early, 74
Hour of, 382, 3208, 3261
Bills
Alteration of, 3449
Not printed, proceeding with, 3968, 3976
Business for to-morrow, 3750
Closure, Rule 17B, 1301, qu. 1867, 3667
Committees
Conduct, review by House, 3270
Discussion of questions not referred, 3268
Voting in, 4611
Legislation
Old age pensions, 2518
Pending, 2518, 3265, 3452
Motions
Anticipatory, 3327, 3329
Non-debatable, ruling of Mr. Speaker, 4076
Order of, 4163

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Business of the House—*Con.*
Post office estimates in absence of minister, 1314
Private members' day, 1158, 1161-2
Privilege—Mr. Clark, 1911
Questions
Answers to, 343, 1385
Dropping of, 4511
Passed as orders for returns, 939, 1139, 1385, 4303
Right to put on Orders of the Day, 734
Redistribution bill, motion to refer, 488
Resolutions, explanations on, 3483
Returns, inquiry for, 2208, 2394, 3324, 3962, 4513
Cattle embargo, correspondence, 4295
Rules
Closure, 17B, 1301, qu. 1867, 3667
M. (Mr. Johnston) for special committee, 1301
Supply
Amdt. to amdt. 1301
Motion to postpone, 3667
Procedure, 179
Undiscussed items not appearing in official report of debates, 3285
Canada Colonization Association. *See under this title,* Immigration
Canada Gazette, 1707
Canada Grain Act administration, 4710
Canada Highways bill, 2339
Canada's participation in war, M. (Mr. Power) 1537
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2425
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Advances, 3827, 3830
Construction without tender and contract, 957
Cost per ton, 957
Policy, 3827
Vote under closure, 4598
Canadian National parks and historic sites
Expenditure, 3941
Water powers, 3939
Canadian National Railways
Advances, $13,099,493.34, 1753
Amalgamation, 18, 28, 34, 58, 2471
Economies resulting, 1616
Audit staff, transfer from Moncton, 575
Branch lines construction bill, 3265, 4303-39, 4397, 4689
Expenditure, appropriation of, 4303, 4339, 4397
Amdts. 4337, neg. 4339; 4398, neg. 4401
Finance, 4329, 4337
Rejection by Senate, 4695

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
Canadian Northern, 57, 1615
Acquisition of, 1937
Coal purchases, 4708
United States, 3494
Committee on, 2473
Deficits, 1613
Directors, board of. *See also under this title,* Management
Additional director, Quebec, inquiry, 34
Labour representation of, 1653
Removal of late, correspondence, 3962
Dominion Express Company, 2470
Equipment orders, 2701
Estimates, 1620
Expenditure, 4304
Express and electric lines, 2470
Fixed charges, 1614
Grand Trunk and, 1562
Arbitration, 60
Gratuities to directors and officials
Royal commission 1665, 1668, 1976
Condon, Mr. F. T., K.C., 2297, 2502
Operating results, 1613
Shareholders, list of, 940
Hanna, Mr. D. B., resignation, 1666
Insurance, 1616
Mortgaged premises, 1635, 2048
Management. *See also under this title,* Directors
Changes in, 1612
Flavelle, Sir Joseph, 1612
Kelley, Mr. Howard G., 1612
Non-interference with from day to day, 2473
Responsibilities and powers, 3653, 3677 3687
Resolution of 1921, 3688
System of, 2472
Thornton, Sir Henry, 1612
Minister's annual statement, 1612
Paris offices, purchase, 3208, 3653, 3676, 3683, 3687
Amdt. (Mr. Stevens), Chairman's ruling, 3667
Forke, Mr., reference to, 3675
Property, purchases and sales, 3324
Real estate transactions, 2518
Revaluation, 2860
Robb, Mr. 2471
Securities, approval of, bill 4403, 4516
Expenditure to be voted by parliament, amdt. 4527, neg. 4528
Thornton, Sir Henry, 1612
Appointment, correspondence, 495
Traffic staff, removal to Halifax, 4708

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
Transcontinental, 1615
Unification of systems, 1616
Canadian National Safety League, 3953
Cape Breton North and Victoria, vacancy, 2469
Carruthers, Mrs. James. *See under this title,* Labour, International Labour Conference
Cattle embargo, removal of, 575
Cecil, Lord Robert, adjournment for lecture, 1685
Cheque tax, 3923
Chinese immigration, 1441
Estimates, 1443
Chinese immigration bill, 2327-34, 4536
Cigarette duty, 2988, 3230
Civil Service
Appointments, 208
Bonus, 1811, 1814
Commission, appointment of postmasters, 1798, 1829
Political partisanship, 286
Reform, 409
Superannuation, 3402
Work outside regular duties, 1675
Civil Service Act
Abuse of, 3254
Combines staff, appointment, 2661
M. (Mr. Power) for repeal, 345, 356, 368, 374, 529, 550
Special committee, 937
First report, 1256
Civilization, evolution of, 1856
Clementsport postmaster, 1798
Coal. *See also under this title* Fuel,
Anthracite and lignite, duty, 3493
Reciprocity, 3497
Combines, 2989
Printing, 1623
Combines bill, 496, 990, 992, 2519, 2556, 2604, 2607, 2624-29, 2660-68
Attorney General vs. Wholesale Grocers, 2051, 2560
Civil Service Act, violation of, 2661
Commissioners, appointment of, 2627
Contempt of registrar or commissioner, 2660
Criminal legislation, 2559
Discussion, reservation of right, 2520
Legislation, history of, 2557
Privy Council judgment, 2559
Registrar, appointment of, 2628
Commissioner, and, 2558
Senate amendments, 3505

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Combines and Fair Prices Act, 2559
Appeals, 2051
Compensation for slaughtered animals, 484
Conferences, 3411
Congdon, Mr. F. T., K.C., appointment, 2297, 2502
Conscription of fire fighters, 3410
Copper bounty bill, 4370, 4374
Copyright Act Amdt. bill, 2345
Corn laws, abolition of, 1858, 1860
Cost of living, 1684, 1812, 2999
Increase of, 1812, 1853
Sales tax and, 1813
Cotton fabrics for pneumatic tires, 3487
Criminal Code Amdt. bills
Inquiry, 1483
Publication of evidence in marriage and divorce proceedings, 1971
Crowsnest pass agreement, 1620, 1929. *See also under this title* Freight rates
Extension, 2741
"Cuckoo" government, 3451, 3510
Customs duties, reduction, 90
Customs tariff items, passing of, 3486
Dairy Industry Act, Amdt. bill, 3325, 3449
Deceased members, tributes to, 6
Deputy ministers, French-speaking, 1805, 1808
Deputy postmaster general, appointment, 1806
Desbarats, Mr. G. J., 3342
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 2364, 4678
Distressed seamen, relief of, 3332
Dominion archives building, 1730
Dominion arsenals, 887, 1752
Dominion Lands Act Amdt. bill, homesteads, 4365
Dominion lands and parks
Contingencies, 3408
Medicine Hat office, 3250
Salaries, 3250
Dominion Textile Company, stock, 1853
Dredging. *See also under this title,* Harbours and rivers
Expenditure, 1012
Manitoba, 1013
Ontario and Quebec, 1011
Unification of work, 3341
Dry Dock Subsidies Act Amdt. bill, 3583
Dry red lead, etc., duty, 3481
Duke and Duchess of York, congratulations, 2252
Editorial Committee 1670, 1675-86, 1714
Edmundston bridge, 1014
Emigration to the United States, 211, 1093, 1657

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Emigration—*Con.*
Montreal, from, 2216
New York Tribune, reported statement of, 2790
Esquimault dry dock, 2671
Estimates.
Canadian National Railways, expenditure, 4304. *See also that title*
Commitments, 4598
Obligations maturing 1754
Supplementary, 4420
Time of presentation, 4420, 4422, 4594, 4605, 4703
Excise taxes, payment with postage stamps, 1817
Experimental farms, 484
Export Act Amdt. bill, pulpwood, 4012, 4354
Fielding, Right Hon. Mr.
Complimentary reference to, 2013
Congratulations on being called to Imperial Privy Council, 4742
Finance Act, 255
Firebrick duty, 3482, 3896
Fiset Sir Eugene, retirement, 3342
Fisheries Act 1914 Amdt. bill 4009
Forest protection, 3415
M. (Mr. Michaud) 820
France
Imports and exports, 2015
Trade arrangements, termination, 1999
War losses, 2215
Free trade
Great Britain in, 1860
Not making progress, 2991
Freight rates, 3194
Crowsnest pass agreement, 1620, 1948
Suspension of, 1948
Equalization, M. (Mr. Clark) 1307, 1928
Manitoba, 1931, 1932
Shipping. *See also under this title,* Lake Grain Rates
Legislation, 3265, 4710
Westward from prairie provinces, 1158
French-speaking deputy ministers, 1806, 1808
French treaty, 440, 456
Analysis 449
Border states, 440, 450, 2215
British preference, 453
Concessions to United States, 449
Consideration of, inquiry, 1740
Luxuries, 450
French treaty bill, 2013, 2209, 2239, 2242, 2259-63, 2299-2304, 3910
Agricultural implements, 2246
Boots and shoes, 2240
Brandy, 2302
Bronze powder, 2016, 2217

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
French Treaty bill—*Con.*
Butter, 2217
Buttons, 2214
Canadian Manufacturers' Association, 2209
Embroideries, 2214
Exports and imports, 2222
Exports to France, 2210, 2213
Favoured nation, 2210, 2213, 2402
Inconsistent laws, 2303
Livestock, 2211
Luxuries, 2213, 2259
Modus vivendi of 1921, 2212, 2259
Revenue, loss of, 2209
Sales tax, 2299
Silks, 2215
Specific duties 2215
Treaty of 1907, 2212
Value of, 2210
Watches and clocks, 2214
Wines, 2302
Fuel supply, 790
Children, death of, 751, 1657
Geodetic survey, 3245
Geological survey estimates, 2504, 2508
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 338
Government commissions, appointments of, 2502. *See also under this title,* Grand Trunk, Gratuities
Government publications. *See also under this title,* Editorial Committee
Reduction in number and volume, 1671
Waste, Judge Snider's report, 1715
Grain and grain trade
Grain inquiry commission, 1210, 4710
Delay in appointment, 2254
Scott, Mr. D'Arcy, 4711
Grain sample market, 304
Grain shipments, Quebec elevator, 3768
Halifax elevator, 4713
Grand Jury system, abolition of, 2695
Great Britain
Depression in, 1854
Free trade, 1860
Taxation, 2796
Great Lakes disarmament, 244, 247, 494
Grant, Dr., civil service, 558
Graving docks, 2682
Grazing inspectors, appointment, 3254
Grondines wharf, 959
Haileybury armoury and post office, 4616
Halibut fishery treaty, 4456-79
Correspondence with British government, 1032
Inquiry for papers, 1212
Lapointe, Hon. Mr., visit to Washington, 857

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Halibut fishery treaty—*Con.*
Rider inserted by United States Senate, 1308
Signing of, 858, 1308, 4480
Harbours and rivers. *See also under this title,* Dredging
Estimates, 2671
Manitoba, 993
Nova Scotia, 941
Ontario, 981
Saskatchewan and Alberta 1001
Tenders for repair work, 950
Hayes, Mr. John J., dismissal, 1692
Hector celebration grant, 4636, 4705
Helmer, Mr., appointment, 3254
Hemp bounty bill, 3912, 4378, 4384
High Commissioner's office, London, 4630
Hindu immigrants, franchise, 4658
Homesteads
Inspectors, 3252
Second, 4365
Hoppe and Isenberg leases, 3226
Hopper barge construction, 3350
Housing legislation, 2518, 2987
Hudson Bay railway
Construction vote, 4683
Correspondence, 208
Feasibility of route, 1069
History of, 1076
Letter to Melfort Journal, 1062
McArthur J. D. & Co., claim, 4690
M. (Mr. Knox) 1075
Motherwell, Hon. Mr., reported statement at Moose Jaw, 1686
Rail removals, qu. 203
Senate investigation, 1076
Welland canal and, 3787
Hydrographic survey, 3336
Immigraton. *See also under this title,* Emigration
Advertising, 1085
Black, Mr. W. J., appointment, 2664
Canada Colonization Association
Agreement with, 1321
Letter to Mr. M. A. Brown, 1333, 1334
Field supervisors, Soldier Settlement Board, 1090-2
Chinese. *See under this sub-title,* Oriental
Estimates, 1387
Hindu, 4640, 4658
Ingram, Mr., appointment, 2664
Late administration and, 1335
Lemont, Mr. Arthur, 1086
May, Mr., appointment, 2663
Oriental
Chinese, 1441, 1443, 2327-34, 4536

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Immigration—*Con.*
Oriental—*Con.*
Disallowance of British Columbia legislation, 1262
Japanese, 1450
Legislation, principle of, 2328
Policy, 1164, 1335
Immigration Act Amdt. bill, 2430, 2669
Legislation of 1919, 2431
Undesirable classes, 2669
Vessel crews, 2671
Imperial Conference
Agenda, 1976, 4638-63
Opportunity for discussion, 3453
Egypt, British policy, 4663
Representation of Canada, 1686
Imperial Economic Conference
Agenda, 1976, 4638-63
Opportunity for discussion, 3453
Representation of Canada, 1686
Income tax. *See under this title,* Taxation
Income War Tax Act Amdt. bill, 4495, 4504
Indians, 2154
Agents, 2162
Perth, N.B., 2154
Cattle, 2162
Doctors, Portage la Prairie, appointments, 2160
Education, 2158
Greater production, 2155
Kitsilano Indian reserve, 383
Reorganization, 2162
St. Peter's reserve, hay lands, 2154
Treatment of, 2158
Industrial Disputes Investigation bill, 4359
Inland Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 3230, 3969, 4528
Inspection of livestock shipments, 3334
Insurance Act 1917 Amdt. bill, 3045
International boundaries, surveys, 3246
International Labour Conference. *See under this title.* Labour
Italian treaty bill, 2401-04, 2701
Favoured nation, 2402
Lord Curzon, signature, 2403
Japanese fishing licenses, 1547
Johnson, Mr. R. M., status of, 202
Judges Act Amdt. bill, 3265
Kennedy, the late Hon. W. C., 6
King's Printer, Mr. F. A. Acland, 1668
Labour
Department
Estimates, 1621
Reduction of officials, 524
Drift to United States, 1812. *See also under this title* Emigration

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Labour—*Con.*
International Labour Conference, 1386
Carruthers, Mrs. James, 1442, 1648
Incomplete return, 1539
Report of last meeting, 1442
Liberal Convention of 1919, 1651
Organizing power of, 1857
Labour Gazette, cost of printing, 1621, 1708, 1712
Lack of confidence, M. (Mr. Irvine) 227
Lafortune, the late Mr. D. A., M.P., 6
Lake Grain Rates Commission, 3265, 4710
Lake of the Woods
Control, M. for papers, 247
Levels, 247, qu. 2700
Lake of the Woods bill, 2886, 4163, 4165
Land. *See also under this title,* Dominion Lands, Immigration
Homesteads, 3252, 4365
Soldier settlement, 2019. *See also under this title,* Soldier Settlement
Speculation and taxation, 1395
Laurier monument, 1017
Legislation, record of, 407, 408
Lewis, John L., correspondence, 250
Liberal appointments by late government, 2503
Liberal Convention of 1919, 2994
British preference, 454
French treaty, 2211
Labour res. 1651
Liberals-Conservatives, alleged union on Bank Act, 4143
Library of Parliament, 2693
Life-saving service, 3335
Lindsay arsenal, 884
Linen yarn duty, 3898
Lumber, sales tax, 4419
Macdonald, Hon. E. M., appointment, 1764
McKenzie, Hon. D. D.
Appointment to Bench, 1764, 1810
Retirement, 2392
Magazines and periodicals, M. (Mr. Hocken) 849
Manitoba Pulp and Paper Company, 3254
Marine and Fisheries
Committee report, 3084
Unforeseen expenses, 3334
Marshall, Mr. Duncan
Appointment, 3293, 3303, 3320
British Empire exhibition, 4704
Live stock shipments, 3334
Salary, 3287
Speeches, 2615
Masters and mates, examination, 2610

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Mennonites
Contract with, 1885
Emigration of, 1884
Merchants' bank investigation, 4159
Militia and Defence disbursements, 345
Militia Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3976
Mines department, salaries, 3207
Minister of Justice, absence, 4514
Minister of Railways, appointment, 519
Ministers' and officials' travels, 343
Moderate protection, 2991
Moose Jaw election
Motherwell, Hon. Mr., alleged statement, 1686
Murdock, Hon. Mr., 1714
National Defence
Ammunition, 887, 1742
Clothing and necessaries, 883
Dominion arsenal, Quebec, bonus, 887, 1752
Estimates, 1751
Pay of staff, 890
Salaries and contingencies, 902
National gallery, 1019
National ownership, 93
Natural resources, western provinces, 2782
Expenditure upon, 2510
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2188, 2191, 2195, 2440-63
Judges, 2446, 2451
Favourable report necessary to issue of certificate, 2440
Secretary of State
Administration by, 2440
Certificates, issue, 2440
Powers of, 2188
Naval service, 902
Department, 3341
Navigation schools, 3332
O'Hara, Captain Marshall, salary, 3331
Near East crisis, 25, 31
New departmental building, Ottawa, architects, 4633
Newspaper postage, 4436, 4528
North Essex by-election, 4595. *See also under this title,* Belle River
Alleged statement, 670, 708, 2014
Fielding, Hon. Mr. and, 2013
Northern Pacific Halibut Fishery bill, 4480, 4487. *See also under this title,* Halibut
Nova Scotia strikes, troops, 868, 898
Offensive partisanship, 3344
Oil bounty, 2511
Old age pensions, legislation, 2518
Oleomargarine
Dairy Industry Act Amdt. bill, 3449

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Oleomargarine—*Con.*
Discussion, 3327
Drawback on materials, 3503
Further legislation, 2927
Inquiry, 1309, 2519
M. (Mr. Carroll) 2519, 3526, 3536, 3573
Amdt. (Mr. Kay) 3521
Sub-amdt. (Mr. Good) 3571
Precedence, 3271, 3451
Point of order, Mr. Sutherland, 3327
Ontario
Elections and Petawawa camp, 3976, 4162
Number of members, 252
Orders in Council, 1027
Government by, 1652, 1655, 4354, 4487
Repeal by statute, 3504
Ore flotation, 2509
Ore-testing plants, British Columbia, 2509
Ottawa-Hull bridge, 1015
Ottawa Typographical Union, copyright, 2144
Owen Sound wharf, 2690
Pan-American union, 496
Paper. *See also under this title,* Pulpwood
Control, 2573
Newsprint, exemption from sales tax, 2999
Prices in Canada and United States, 829
Parliament buildings, cost, 1725
Parliamentary government, 1652
Patents of Invention bill, 2129
Penitentiaries, 771
Penny Bank of Toronto bill, 2052
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 4703, 4746, 4748
Pensions
District board of review, 4703
Federal appeal board, 4703
Old age, 1651, 2518
Women, 1651
Petawawa camp and Ontario elections, 3976, 4162
Petition of right, fiats, 3226
Petroleum and Naptha Inspection bill, 3969
Pledges, violation of, 2220
Point of order, relevancy, 2663
Pointe aux Trembles wharf, 974
Policies, review of, 408, 409
Political patronage, 2160, 3344
Population, increase of, 1398
Port Arthur and Fort William harbours, 2675
Port Elgin breakwater, 2690
Portage la Prairie
Indians, medical service, 2160
Sewerage system, 993, 2679
Postmaster General, absence of, 1314, 1538
Post Office Act Amdt. bill, 4436, 4528

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Post Office department
Administration, 1817
Coulter, Dr. R. M., retirement, 1825
Revenue attributable to postal service, 1817
Ross, Mr. George W., retirement, 1825
Verrett, Mr. Hector, retirement, 1826
Preston, Mr. W. T. R., 249
Prices. *See also under this title,* Budget; Cost of living
Agricultural products and manufactured goods, 1853
Producer and consumer, 1853
Prince Edward Island car ferry claim, 4678
Printing
Contracts to newspapers, etc., 2394
Reduction in cost, 1671
Printing bureau, new building, 1735
Fire hazard, 1736
M. to reduce item, 1737, 1738
Privilege
Carroll, Mr., 3267
Committee, discussion, anticipatory, 3267
Production costs and labour organization, 1857
Progressive party, Union government and big interests, 1853
Promissory notes, tax, 3923
Proportional representation
Alternative vote, 389, 410
M. (Mr. Good) 406, 430
Protection, increase in industries, 2798
Public buildings
New departmental, 1729
Nova Scotia, 4612
Renting or building, 1736
Public debt, responsibility for, 2920
Public expenditure. *See under this title,* Address; Budget; Estimates
Public Service Act Amdt. bill, 3402
Public Works Act, tender and contract, 950-5
Public works, committments, 962
Publication of evidence, etc., 1971
Publicity agent, London, Mr. W. T. Cranfield 2927, 2983, 4707
Pugsley, Hon. William, appointment, 2501
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4012, 4354
Royal commission, 3412, 3413, 4709
Purchasing Commission, 4704
Quebec
Champlain dock, 2675
Grain elevator, 3768
Statutes of, 1660
Radiotelegraph Act Amdt. bill, 2467
Railway Commission, 3192

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Railway Commission—*Con.*
Carvell, Hon. F. B., alleged statement of Minister of Agriculture, 3192
Criticism of, 3192
Railways. *See also under this title,* Canadian National
Branch lines, 1735
Financial situation, 1753
Railways and Canals, Minister, appointment, 1081
Raisins and dried currants, duty, 3474
Reciprocity with United States
Agreement of 1911, 3902
Agricultural implements, 3499
Macdonald, Right Hon. Sir John A., 2922
"No truck or trade with the Yankees" 3080
Offer to negotiate, 3901, 3908
Permanency, 3079
Request for information, 3504
Redistribution, 27, 162, 487
Ivel, Mr. W. M., 733
Special Committee on bill, 937
Printing of proceedings, 3399
Report, 4736
References to, 89-96. *See also speeches* on Budget
Returned soldiers
Appointment, 1800
Civil Service appointments, 1797
Revised Hansard, inquiry, 122
Riordan Pulp and Paper Company, tax, 4490
Robb, Hon. Mr., trip to Australia, 1849, 3475
Royal Canadian Mounted Police
M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 1149
Reason for increase in force, 1149
Royal Canadian navy, 902
Recruiting for volunteer reserve, 2898
Rural credit system, 4144
Rural population, 1854
St. John and Quebec railway bill, 3403
St. John harbour improvements, 2677
St. Laurent, the late Mr. A., 1006
St. Lawrence river waterway, qu. 204, 3786
St. Lawrence ship channel, 3339
Sales tax. *See under this title,* Address; Budget; Special War Revenue; Taxation
Second homesteads, 4365
Secretary of State dept. estimates, 2392
Seed grain advances, 4367
Seed testing bill, 2304
Senate estimates, 2694
Sheguindah wharf, 2690
Sinclair, Hon. J. E., reference to, 2996

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Singapore naval base, 3822
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment
Expenditure, 2894
Walkerville, alleged statement at, 2014
Reference to, 670, 708
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment Act Amdt. bill, 2892
Soldier settlement, 2987
Advertising, 2023
Expenditure, 2018
Land taxation, 3260
Legal expenses, 2018
Sorel shipyard, 3343
Dismissals, 3344
Special War Revenue Act Amdt., 4364, 4409
Stewart, the late Hon. J. A., 7
Stumping machines, duty, 3486
Tariff. *See also under this title,* Budget; French Treaty
Agricultural implements, 2756
Election pledges, violation, 1658
Figures, 90
Luxuries, 2015
Policy of government, 3492
Reduction of duties, 2561
Rural population and, 1854
Taxation. *See also under this title,* Address; Budget; Income Tax; Special War Revenue
Increased burden of, 1854
Sales tax, 4409
Imports, 4410
Increase in, 2213
Necessaries of life, 94-5, 2999
Telegraph and telephone lines, 2682
Terrebonne public building, 2690
Thornton, Sir Henry, qu. 284, 495. *See also under this title,* Canadian National Railways
Director Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, 3208, 3845
Three Rivers harbour bill, 3964
Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner) 1288
Tobacco duties, smuggling, 2989, 3230
Topographical surveys, 2509, 3244
Toronto
Breakwater protection, 984
Harbour improvements, 985, 2678
Viaduct, 4441
Treaties. *See also under this title,* French; Halibut; Italian
Government and, 1850
Signing of, 4457
Tree-planting, 3416
Troops, use of in labour troubles, 868, 898

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Trusts, 3231. *See also under this title,* Combines
Typewriters and parts, duty, 3485
Unemployment, 2987
Minister of Labour, responsibility, 1657
Order in council No. 220, 436
United States. *See also under this title,* Reciprocity
Borrowings from, 95
Industries in Canada, 4380
Liquor laws, 4295
Obligations to, 23, 93
Unrest, western Canada, 4514
Vancouver harbour bill, 259
Victoria dry dock, 1002
Vimy Ridge memorial, 182
War claims, adjustment, 900, 1747
War profiteering, 2921
Waste paper, sale by government, 1714
Water powers, forest reserves, 1256
Welland canal construction, 3786
Western provinces, conditions, 1854
Wharves, revenue, 977
Wheat board
Establishment of, 409
Extension of legislation, 2696
Proceedings under act of 1922, 1636
Wines. *See also* French Treaty
Native, 2011
Wingham postmaster, 1800
Wrecking plant subsidies, 3334

Melita, Man. bank robbery, 1147

Melville, Mr. G. D., Hudson Bay railway, 1064

Members of Parliament. *See* House of Commons

Memorials. *See* Monuments and Memorials

Mennonites. *See* Emigration; Immigration

Mental Tests, 1219

Merchants' Bank. *See* Banks and Banking

Merchant Marine. *See* Canadian Government Merchant Marine

Mercier, Mr. Paul (Westmount-St. Henri)
Bankruptcy Act M. (Mr. Casgrain) 1508
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3091
Immigration policy, 1115
Lachine canal bridge, 2299
Senate and House of Commons bill, 4244
Transcontinental, Montreal branch line, qu. 2392

Mergers. *See* Bank Act Amdt. bill; Combines bill

Merit System. *See* Civil Service

"Metagen" analysis of, qu. 1867

Metals. *See* Mines and Minerals

Meteorological Service. *See* Marine

Metric System, qu. 914

Mewburn, Hon. S. C. (East Hamilton)
Ammunition, 887
Annual training, 859, 867
Hamilton public building, 4628
Harbours and rivers, Ontario, 4588
Oleomargarine, discussion, 3329
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3859
Port Maitland pier, 4589
Sales tax, 4418

Meyerscough, Mr. Thomas, detention of, 2297, 2469

Michaud, Mr. Pius (Restigouche and Madawaska)
Bankruptcies among farmers, 1495
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3105
Capital punishment, 769
Civil Service salaries, qu. 2086
Dorchester penitentiary, supplies, qu. 494
Export Act Amdt. bill, pulpwood, 4345
Forest protection, M., 816
Fuel supply, qu. 203
Indian agent, Perth, N.B., 2155
Marketing of grain, M. (Mr. Millar) 310
Amdt. 311
Mechanics, qu. 203
New Brunswick forest fires, relief, 4010
Pensions, European war, 3713
Political patronage, 3348
Potatoes
Exports, qu. 621
Industry, 310
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4345
St. John river, sawdust pollution, 701
Steel, L. R. Company, qu. 1994

Michell, Professor, cost of living, 1700, 1812

Michigan Central Railway, bridge, qu. 1257

Middleman. *See* Prices

Midland wharves, 983

Migration. *See* Emigration

Migratory Birds Convention Act, administration, 3443

Militarism, 4652. *See* National Defence, Annual Drill, Cadet Services

Military Camps. *See* Petawawa

Military Decorations. *See* Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner); War

Military Expenditures. *See* National Defence

Military Hospitals. *See* Hospitals

Militia Act, aid to civil power. *See* Labour, Strikes; National Defence

Militia and Defence. *See* National Defence

Militia Pensions. *See* Pensions

Militia Pension Act Amdt. Bills
1. Retired war officers in Public Service.
Res. 1740, 2052; 1r., com., 2053; 3r., 2086
2. Period of service entitling to pensions.
Res. 3582, 3975; 1r., 2r., com., 3976; 3r., 3977

Milk. *See* Dairying Industry; Prices

Mill Feeds, adulteration. *See* Agriculture; Feeding Stuffs Act; Grain and Grain Trade; Milling Industry

Millar, Mr. John (Qu'Appelle)
Address in reply, 50. Unemployment question, 50; immigration; soldier land settlement; Canada Colonization Association, 51; lake grain rates; deep waterways; Sir Henry Thornton and Canadian National Railways; com. on agricultural conditions, 52; marketing of grain, 53
Agricultural expenditure, 3239
Agricultural implements, standardization, 789, 805
Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt. bill, 2135, 2137
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4081-4113
Barnjum, Mr. Frank J. D., work of, 3412
Binder twine industry, 4386
Canada Grain Act, administration, 784
Canadian Air Force, Saskatchewan, 1784
Canadian National parks and historic sites, 3407, 3434
Canadian National Railways
Branch lines construction bill, 4336
Paris offices, 3610
Cattle shipped to Great Britain, 2135
Report as to tuberculosis, 2469
Civil Service Commission, 3986
Cold storage companies, 188
Combines bill, 2546
Copper bounty, 3239

Millar, Mr. John—*Con.*
Dairy Industry Act 1914 Amdt. bill, 3152
Deputy ministers, salaries, 4670
Dominion Lands Act Amdt. bill, homesteads, 4368
Dominion lands and parks, 3252
Dominion lands, reclamation, 3431
Experimental farms, 469, 485
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4549
Finance Act 1914 Amdt. bill, 4407
Freight rates, shipping, 3763, 3787
Fuel supply, 792, 805, 3205
Government publications, distribution, 3266
Grain and grain trade
Elevators
Dockage, 784
Government, mixing, 2036
Screenings, 2039
Sheep feeding, 2040
Weights, difference in, 2037
Grain commission, appointment, 1763
Marketing and shipment, 53, qu. 494
Amendment, 311
Insurance, 3764
Motion, 288
Shipping rates, 3787. *See also under this title*, Lake Grain Rates bill
Grants to military associations, 889
Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia, 4561
Health of animals, 576
Historic sites, 3407, 3434
Hogs
Cholera contracted from whey, 3299
Grading, 591
Homestead inspectors, 3252, 3254
Hudson Bay railway, M. (Mr. Knox) 1057
Immigration, Canada Colonization Association, 51
Income War Tax Act Amdt. bill, 4497
Interest rate, 4111
International boundaries, surveys, 3248
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4221-33
Lightkeepers salaries, 3352
Live Stock Acts Amdt., 276
Live stock industry, 469
National gallery, 1019
National monument, Connaught place, 2688
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2457, 3985
Foreigners, attitude towards Canada, 2458
Judges, 2457
Naturalization, obstacles in way of, 2457
Oil-drilling, southern Alberta, 2508
Penitentiaries, 773
Pensions, European war, 3722
Public expenditure, 4422
Public works, apportionment of, 4561
Quebec wharves, 980
Rural mail delivery, 1790

Millar, Mr. John—*Con.*
St. Lawrence river
Ship channel, 3340, 3343
Waterway, report, 3428
Sales tax, 4422
M. (Mr. Stevens) 922
Saskatchewan wharves, 1001
Seed Purchasing Commission, qu. 279
Settlers' relief, 3448
Soldier settlement, qu. 206, 2021
Special war revenue, 4422
Tree-planting stations, 3413
Tuberculous cattle, fraudulent trade, 485, 576
Vancouver harbour bill, 262, 263
Wages, 3205
Water power leases, 3426
Welland canal construction, 3763, 3787
Wharves, revenue, 976
Winnipeg sample market, qu. 345

Miller Bill. *See* Race Track Betting

Miller, Mr. Roger, claim, 4676

Millerand, Mons. A., President French Republic, 1538

Milling Industry. *See also* Feeding Stuffs Act; Flour; Grain and Grain Trade
Millers, conference, 604
Millfeeds. *See also* Feeding Stuffs Act
Adulteration of, 600, 2875
Legislation, inquiry, 2795
Milling in bond, 2960
Protection, 146-147
Selection of wheat for milling, 2980

Milne, Mr. Robert (Neepawa)
Binder twine, price, 4387
Experimental farms, 470
Fuel oil, standardization, 808
Fuel supply, 808
Gasoline, short measure, 810
Hemp bounty bill, 4387
White Mud river, fishway, 3362

Milner, Lord, credit and industry, 627

Mines and Minerals. *See also* Coal; Fuel; Geological Survey
Asbestos, 460, 2750
Assay office, Vancover, 3207
Cobalt, 2750. *See also* Treaties, French
Committee, 3204
Changes in membership, 1483, 2047
Failure to function, 1271
Reports
Coal on, 4514, 4743
First, 1384, 1738
Second, 1738
Third, 4436, 4592

Mines and Minerals—*Con.*
Consolidated Mining and Smelting Company, 3235
Copper bounty on bars or rods, 2646, 2778, 2827, 2861, 2931, 2943, 3035. *See also* Bounties; Copper
Customs drawback, 2655
Rod mill, opening of, 2943
Copper Mountain, 2504
Department
Deputy minister, Mr. Camsell, 1265
Estimates, 2504, 3197
Publications, 3197
Salaries and contingencies, 3207
Dome Mines Company, 4209
Explosives division, 2514
Fuel-testing division, 3197
Gaspé, 1242
Gold. *See also that title*
Labrador gold discovery, 1995, 2611, qu. 2696
Output, 2750
Percentage of national wealth, 2720
Gypsum, 2349
Plaster quarries and, 1010
Hudson bay region, 1049, 1076. *See also* Hudson Bay railway
Institute of Mining and Metallurgy
Alberta coal, 1163
Edmonton, 1268
Iron ores
Alberta 2512
Deposit, Vancouver island, 2514
Irrigation, rights of leaseholders. *See* Irrigation Act Amdt. bill
Mineral and oil rights, 2510
Miners' strikes. *See* Labour
Mining companies
Dividends. *See* Companies Act Amdt. bill
Shares, 4208
Mining rights. *See* Dominion Lands Act Amdt. bill
Nickel, 2750
Shipments to Germany during war, 4371
Ontario Goldfields, 4209
Ores
Flotation, 2509
Ore-dressing division, 3197
Ore-testing, Nelson, B.C., 2505
Shipment to Ottawa testing plant, 2505
Precious metals, content of, 4371
Quartz mining in Yukon, 249
Queen Charlotte islands, 150
Revenue from leases, 2510
Shale deposits, Maritime provinces, 2513
Silver production, 2750
Sudbury copper mines, 4371

Mines and Minerals—*Con.*
Trail, B. C., smelter, 2861, 3235
Refractory ores, 2506
Yukon, 86-89, 249. *See also that title*
Exhibit, British Empire exhibition, qu. 3143
Mayo silver strike, 3943

Mining Companies. *See* Companies Act Amdt. bill

Mining Leases. *See* Irrigation Act Amdt. bill

Mining Rights. *See* Dominion Lands Act; Yukon Act Amdt. bill

Ministers of the Crown
Absence of, 2934, 3043. *See also* Murphy, Hon. Charles
Graham, Hon. George P., appointed Minister of Railways and Canals, 2295
Macdonald, Hon. E. M.
Appointed acting Minister of National Defence, 2295
Sworn as member of Privy Council, 1764
Number of, 3043
Salaries, 4671. *See also* Senate and House of Commons Act
Proposed reduction of 12½ per cent, M. (Mr. Leader) 1153, 2915
Travels of, qu. 283, qu. 343
Robb, Hon. Mr., trip to Australia, 1848-9 2815, 3017, 3474-5

Minorities, Senate and, 1377

Miramichi River fishing. *See* Fish and Fisheries

Miscellaneous Private Bills. *See* Private Bills

Miscou-Shippegan Steamship service, 2173

Mitchell, Mr. A. J. *See also* Canadian National Railways
Interest in insurance companies, 2050

Mitchell, Mr. Walter (St. Antoine)
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4140, 4145
Banking and Commerce Com., Mr. D. C. Macarow, 4145
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 2390

Mixing of Grain. *See* Grain and Grain Trade

Modus Vivendi. *See* Fish and Fisheries; United States

Moncton, N.B.
Canadian National Railways
Audit staff, 1756
Transfer to Montreal, 574
Headquarters, 13, 2971
Dairy cattle, testing, 1307

Moncton and Buctouche Railway, qu. 203, 3646, 4197

Money. *See also* Banks and Banking; Credits; Finance; Prices; Public Expenditure; Purchasing Power
Gold standard, 4249, 4405, 4666
Origin and function of, 632, 633
Paper, 635
Purchasing power, 44, 1167, 1168, 4666

Money Bills. *See* Appropriation; Supply

Monk, the late Hon. F. D. *See* Proportional Representation

Monopolies. *See* Combines

Monte Grappa, foundering of, qu. 912

Montreal (city)
Canadian National headquarters, suitability, 62-63
Chamber of Commerce, Bankruptcy Act, 1492
Coal situation, 254
Customs house and revenue, 3280
Daylight saving, post office, qu. 3143
Emigration, 2216
Skilled mechanics, 2790
Montreal Unemployed Workers' Association, 2719
Ordnance stores building, 1022
Post office
Appointments, 1800
Bolte, Mr. Camille, 1032, qu. 1138
Daylight saving, qu. 3143
Inquiry branch, qu. 2516
Postal stations
Number of, qu. 3135
Postal station "G", qu. 623
Promotion examinations, qu. 2298
Public Works employees, 381
Transcontinental railway, connection, qu. 2393
Unemployment, 42, 2719
Union stockyards, 2762

Montreal (port). *See* also Vancouver Harbour Bill
Cold storage warehouse, 185, 272, qu. 1633, qu. 1488, qu. 2204, 3289. *See also* Cold Storage Act Amdt
Grain elevator
Capacity, 3767
Grand Trunk, qu. 1974
New, qu. 1663
Grain shipments, 1768, qu. 1973, 1974, 4230
Shortages, complaint of British importers, 1764, 2037
United States grain handling, 1760
Wheat shipments, qu. 385

Montreal (port)—*Con.*
Harbour commission. *See also* Montreal Harbour Commissioners Bill
Advances, qu. 812, 4363, 4508
Lumber importations, qu. 1867
Names and salaries, qu. 1137
Harbour master, qu. 1867
Montreal Corn Exchange, lake tonnage, 4289

Montreal Harbour Commissioners Bill
(Advance of $10,000,000.)
Res. 4363; 4508; 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 4508

Montreal Shipping Federation. *See also* Immigration Act Amdt. Bill
Vessel crews, 2670

Montreal Standard editorial, Bank Act, 4125, 4142

Monuments and Memorials. *See also* Canadian National Parks and Historic Sites; War
Baker, Late Lieut Col. G. H., M.P., 435, 730
Champlain monument, Orillia, 4705
Dollier and Galinee, Fathers, cairn at Port Dover, 3433
Laurier, the late Sir Wilfrid, 1017
Law, the late Bowman B., 1020
National monument, Connaught place, Ottawa, 1020, 2685
Peguis, Saulteaux Indian chief, 4704
Vimy Ridge monument, 811. *See also that title*

Moore, Mr. Tom, President Dominion Trades Congress, 1170
Immigration, 1167
Labour
Eight-hour day, 1427
Representative on Canadian National board, 1652-6, 3636

Moose Jaw. *See also* Elections; Johnson, R. M.
By-election, 2224, 2760
Announcement of vacancy, 615
Certificate, Registrar of Supreme Court, 515
Eggs, price of, 1852
Hopkins, Mr. E. N.
Congratulations to, 2760
Introduction, 2417
Hudson Bay railway
Alleged statement of Mr. Motherwell. 1686, 2774, 2787, 4683
Promises, 1073
Murdock, Hon. Mr. 1714
Oleomargarine, 3536
Results, 2760

Moose Jaw—*Con.*
By-election—*Con.*
Return, delay, 2295
Tariff, one of main issues, 2714
Income tax office, qu. 2699
Member for and reciprocity agreement, 3010
Public building, 1023
Stockyard, 2779

Moose Mountain
Forest reserve, 3453
Pleasure resort, 3408, 3453

Moose Range drainage, qu. 3144, 3259

Morel, Mr. E. D. *See* Germany, Reparations

Morin, Mr. L. S. René (St. Hyacinthe-Rouville)
Bankruptcy Act Amdt bill, 3211
Canada, constitutional development, 4469
Halibut fishery treaty, 4469
Imperial Conference, 4653
Macphail, Miss, members and party funds, 4238
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4238
Translation of bill, 4435
Treaties, signing of, 4469

Morinville postmistress, qu. 1028

Morrisburg and Waddington ferry, qu. 1029

Morrisburg dam, 1270

Morrison, Mr. D. W., postmaster, St. Peter's, N.S. qu. 1488, 1489

Morrison, Mr. John (Weyburn)
Budget, 2928. Congratulations to Finance Minister; agricultural conditions; prices of agricultural and manufactured products;purchasing power; manufacturing overhead; "calamity howlers"; British preference; further increase; combines; shipping; Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 2928; trade with Great Britain and the United States; high duties interfering with trade; cigarettes; immigration; branch lines; emigration to the United States; farm credits; rural credits; commission on banking and credits; unjust treatment of farmers by banks; United States credit service; amortization plan; Canadian Pacific railway, land sale contracts; copper; artificial silk and hemp bounties; assistance to capitalists

Morrison, Mr. John—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
but nothing for the farmer; budget a step backwards; high protectionists in Liberal party; camouflaged Tories masquerading under false colours; reciprocity, defeat of in 1911, 2931; Conservatives true to false principles; Liberals false to true principles; election promises not carried out; Liberal platform of 1919 treated as scrap of paper, 2932
Cold Storage bill, 187, 189, 275
Economic conditions, 1238
Farm labourers, wages and dwellings, 1240
Forestry, fire prevention, 4346
Hudson Bay railway, 98
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1240
Literature, 1239
Policy, 1238
Immigration Act Amdt. bill, 2668
Land, sale of to immigrants, 1091
Postmasters, appointment of returned soldiers, 1799
Tariff as it affects East and West, 2753
Western provinces, conditions in, 1238
Woollen industry
British preference, 3471
Protection, M. (Mr. Drummond) 933

Morrison, Mr. T. D., Little Anse breakwater claim, 4572, 4722

Mortgaged Premises, Insurance. *See* Canadian National Railway Bills

Mortgages. *See* Bank Act Amdt. bill; Farms, Mortgages

Moss, Mr. H. R., illegal arrest, 2030

Mothers' Pensions. *See* Pensions

Motherwell, Hon. W. R. (Minister of Agriculture)
Accredited herd system, 577. *See also under this title,* Health of Animals
Agricultural conditions, 2763
Special committee, 667, 706
Agricultural instruction grant, 607
Agriculture department
Dairy branch activities, 3283
Deputy minister
Deduction for rent of house, 4669
Salary, 611
Estimates, 456, 575, 3283, 3988, 4674
Salaries and contingencies, 610
Watson, Dr., chief pathologist, 579

Motherwell, Hon. W. R.—*Con.*
Air service, insect pest control, 597
Alberta coal, freight rates, 3201
Alderson claim, hog cholera, 582
Animal Contagious Diseases bill, 666, 2047, 2131. *See also under this title,* Health of Animals
Archibald, Mr. E. S., purchase of thoroughbred stock, 3290
Bacon
Grading, 593
Salty, 3301
Bees, suppression of foul brood, 4675
Bounties, copper and hemp, 2778
Budget, 2756. Tariff of Sir John Macdonald on agricultural implements; civil service, increase of; Department of Agriculture, staff; civil government, cost of; estimates, preparation of, 2756; grain shipments; stream of wealth from the West; wheat board; demands from the West; idle statements and threats; no turning back; cattle shipments, space on ships; Manitoba Free Press, 2757; Canadian Government Merchant Marine and cattle shipments; letter from Mr. R. B. Teakle; letter from Sir Henry Thornton, 2758; fictitious demand for space; rates, 2759; cattle embargo, removal of; Moose Jaw election; Atlantic shipping rates; conference in Great Britain; report of North Atlantic Conference; rate on Canadian and United States flour, 2761-2; union stockyards, 2762; agricultural conditions; Maritime provinces; specialized farming; potato-growing in New Brunswick; fruit industry, 2763; Quebec; co-operative cold storage; silos and ensilage; farming on poor land; farm credits, 2764; dairying; Ontario fruit-growing; pre-cooling plants; dairy industry; modernized methods; antipodean competition; butter and cheese, 2765; grading; western provinces; dairying; improved methods; cold storage; diversified farming; chief industry; grain-growing, 2766; failures and successes, 2767; debt, 2768; farm credits; dairying; Holstein cow at Agassiz farm, record production; debts of municipalities; unpaid taxes, 2769; Saskatchewan farm loan bonds bought by farmers; Premier Dunning on economic conditions, 2770; wheat production; cost and selling price; Premier Dunning and the

Motherwell, Hon. W. R.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
budget, 2771; tariff stability but not finality; agricultural questionaire and answers; mixed farming, 2772; grain unsold, 2773; insect and fungus pests; grasshoppers; live stock and dairy industry; Moose Jaw election; Hudson Bay railway; immigration, 2774; disparagement of the country; opportunities and prospects, 2775; amdt. (Mr. Forke); tariff reduction, Progressive party and; British preference, list of articles admitted at 40 per cent or over of present general tariff rate, 2776; Liberal and Progressive tariff planks; free trade with Great Britain, 2777; reciprocity agreement of 1911; revenue; land values tax; not a protectionist budget; bounties, 2778; assistance to new industries, 2779; excise tax on luxuries; hemp bounty; binder twine, 2780; discrimination against the West; protection of no essential value to prairies; cause of discontent; bad farming, 2781; natural resources; cost of administering; transfer of to western provinces, 2782; terms of settlement discussed with Alberta and Saskatchewan, 2783
Speech, reference to, 2845, 3064
Canadian Council of Horticulture, 2307
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Advance, 3819
Cattle shipments. *See also under this title* Cattle
Canadian National Railways
Branch lines construction bill, 4316
Management, responsibility and power, 3657
Paris offices, 3657
Canned meats, inspection, 2202
Carvell, Hon. F. B., statement regarding, 3188
Cattle
Cattle embargo
Breeding cattle, 3291
Correspondence, 4295
Removal of, 575, 2760
Shipments
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 2758, 3040, 3819
Cattle boats, unsanitary conditions, 2613
Chilled beef, trial shipment, 3091, 3291, 4675
Fat cattle, trial shipment, 3091, 4675

Motherwell, Hon. W. R.—*Con.*
Cattle—*Con.*
Shipments—*Con.*
Tuberculosis, report as to, 2469
Stockers and fat cattle, 2135
Vessel space, 1869, 3040
Fictitious demand for, 2759
Cereal rust, 595
Civil Service
Commission, appointments, delay, 3292
Increase of, 2756
Codling moth, 597
Cold Storage Act Amdt. bill, 184, 271-6, 2054, 2055, 2086, 2199
Cold storage plants, 3289
Cheese, 2055
Co-operative, 2764
Pre-cooling, 2056, 2765
Compensation for slaughtered cattle, 484. *See also under this title,* Animal Contagious Diseases
Dairy Industry Act 1914 Amdt. bills
Butter substitutes, 2518, 3150, 3325
M. for discharge of order, 3325, 3449
Renovated butter, 2961, 4251, 4270, 4344, 4510
Dairying industry, 609, 2765, 3283
Butter grading, 2766, 3283
Butter, pasteurization, 3298
Certified milk, 3300
Cheese grading, 2766, 3283, 3295
Dairy produce graders, appointment, 3289
Milk
Filled, 3152
Pasteurizing, 3283
Research laboratory, 3297
Dehydration of fruits and vegetables, 4674
Destructive insect pests, 595, 2774, 3988
Dryden, Mr. W. A., trip to South America, 3294
Experimental farms, 456-485
Buildings, 4631
Ottawa Central, 481
Farm and Ranch Review, fraudulent stock-yard practices, 576
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4012, 4271, 4273, 4538
Fertilizer Act, administration, 601
Field crop competitions, 602
Fruit and Fruit Containers bill, 193, 277, 2105, 2131, 3150
Fruit industry, 598, 2763
Fruits and vegetables, new varieties, 2307
Grain
Grain-growing, 2766
Marketing, M. (Mr. Millar) 301
Unsold, 2773
Grasshopper plague, 596, 2774

Motherwell, Hon. W. R.—*Con.*
Health of Animals, 575-87, 4676. *See also under this title,* Animal Contagious Diseases; Cattle; Live Stock
Contagious diseases, 484
Tuberculosis, 484, 580, 2134, 2469
Eradication, 3989
Tuberculin test, 3300
Veterinary inspectors, 3989
Hemp bounty bill, 4382
Hog grading, 594
Horses
Horse-breeding, 589
Market for, 590
Shire horses from Great Britain, 2253
Hudson Bay railway, 2774
Alleged statement, 4683
Immigration
Hebridean immigrants, 3594
Policy, 2774
Progressive members, 2774
"Someone with more money than brains" 1205
International Institute of Agriculture, 599
Live Stock, 587. *See also under this title,* Cattle; Horses
Commissioners, visit to South America, 1213
Tuberculosis. *See under this title,* Health of Animals
Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill, 192, 276-7, 2200, 2292, 3150
Penalties, 2203
Marshall, Mr. Duncan
Activities, 3310
Appointment, 2614, 3305, 3310
Cattle embargo, reported statements on, 2614
Political partisanship, alleged, 3316
Qualifications, 3306, 3310
Salary, 608, 3287
Speeches, 2615
Great Britain, in, 3595
Stornoway, 2181
Trips
Florida, to, 3311
Great Britain, 3291, 3310, 4675
Millfeeds, adulteration, 2795. *See also under this title,* Feeding Stuffs Act
Moose Jaw by-election, reported statement, 1686, 2774
Moose Mountain forest reserve, 3453
Noxious weeds, 2305
Oleomargarine. *See also under this title,* Dairy Industry Act
Attitude on, 3576
Dairy Industry Act, correspondence, 3327

Motherwell, Hon. W. R.—*Con.*
Oleomargarine—*Con.*
"Manna" 3152
M. (Mr. Carroll) 3574
Quebec harbour, cold storage, 2055
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 746
Renovated butter, 3151, 4251. *See also under this title,* Dairy Industry Act
Riordan Pulp and Paper Company, tax, 4490
Ruddick and Wilson, Messrs. visit to Australia, 3283, 3288
Seed, feed and fertilizer control, 599
Seed potatoes, inspection of, 2306
Seed purchasing commission, 599
Seed testing bill, 195, 277, 2304
Seeds, purity of, 601
Speeches, pre-election, 2952, 3188
Spruce bud worm, 596
Stock Growers' Protective Association grant, 588
Supply, undiscussed items, 3285
Tariff, attitude on, 2996
Thunderhill branch line railway, 4316
Toronto seed branch building, 4621
Tuberculosis in cattle *See under this title,* Animal Contagious Diseases; Health of Animals
Winnipeg Free Press, 2790
Woollen industry protection, M. (Mr. Drummond) 935

Mounted Police. *See* Royal Canadian

Moving Pictures, fisheries publicity, 3365

Mowat, Capt. Henry, St. Croix harbour, 2900

Mulgrave-Guysboro steamship service, 2173

Mulligan, Mr. D. B., qu. 1257.

Multi-Member Constituencies. *See* Proportional Representation

Mulvey, Mr. Thomas. *See* Secretary of State

Municipalities
Extravagance, 2797
Historic sites, 3432
Municipal cold storage. *See* Cold Storage
Municipal government in park areas, 3436
Soldiers, hospital treatment, 673
Taxation, 4493. *See also that title*
Irritating, 2804
Land taxes, 1395
School taxes, 3445, 4205
Unpaid, 637, 2953, 2961, 3445, 4205
Tax sales, 2961

Murdock, Hon. James (Minister of Labour)
Annuities
Agents for, 1642
Basis of computation, 1683, 1694
Old age pensions and, 1639, 1651, 1682
Board of Commerce, 2564, 2570
British Empire Steel Corporation employees, 1705
Canada Gazette, 1707
Canada National Railways, printing, 1623
Canadian National Safety League grant, 3953
Combines bill, 2562, 2616-34
Definition "combine" 2616
Distribution of report, 2634
Registrar, inquiry, 2620
Combines and Fair Prices Act, 2565
Cost of living, 2569
Reference to, 1812
Statistics, 1684
Michell, Prof., 1700
Dominion-provincial labour conference, 1442
Editorial committee, cost, 1669
Emigration to United States, 1657
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 321
Government publications
Distribution, 1712
Waste paper sold, 1713
Hansard
Distribution of, 1715
Revised, inquiry, 122
Immigration, contingencies
M. to reduce, agreed to, 1908
Industrial Disputes Investigation bill, 1361, 2061
Senate amdts., non-concurrence, 4357
King's Printer, 1669
Labour
Concilliation and Labour Act, 1621
Conference, 1678
Department
Annuities branch, 1639, 1682
Cooperation with provincial departments, 1678
Estimates, 1621, 1637, 1668
Decrease in, 1643
Salaries, 1657, 1668
Staff, reduction of, 1671
Statistics, 1682
Eight-hour day, 1650
Employment offices, 1674
Employment Offices Co-ordination Act, 1630
Employment service director, 1676
St. John, 3453
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1627, 1629, 1646, 1702, 1707, 1716

Murdock, Hon. James—*Con.*
Labour—*Con.*
International Labour Conference, 1386
Carruthers, Mrs. James, 1442
Incomplete return, 1539
Delegates and expenses, 1642
Draft conventions and recommendations, 1441
Papers tabled, 1483
Recommendations
Federal-provincial jurisdiction, 1645
Text, tabled, 1631
Report of last meeting, 1442
Joint Industrial councils, 1654
King's Printer, 1668
Liberal Convention of 1919, 1651
Provincial departments, 1706
Right to organize, 2889
Strikes, 1628, 1702
Nova Scotia miners, 915, 1627, 1716
Sydney steel workers, 287
Thetford Mines, 2207
Year, 1922. M. (Sir Henry Drayton) 245 495, 815
Technical Education
Administration, 1637
Director of, 1674
Labour Gazette
Correspondents, 1626
Editor, 1671
Expenses, 1624
Hooper, Mr. Ronald, 1625-6
International Labour Conference, report, 1442
Printing, cost of, 1621, 1625, 1708, 1712
Ministers of the Crown, number, 3043
Moose Jaw, by-election, 1714
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3456
Pensions, old age, 1648. *See also under this title,* Annuities
Post office supplies, purchase, 3953
Powell River Paper Company
Labour organization, 2889
Speech, reference to, 3072
Printing bureau
Employees, 1623
New building, 1731, 1735
Plant
New, 1710
Repairs and renewals, 1710
Reorganization, 1731
Retiring allowances, 3949
Printing contracts to newspapers, 2394, 2614
Purchasing Commission, 3953, 4002
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 764
Reference to, 3067
Returned soldiers, unemployment relief, 1679

Murdock, Hon. James—*Con.*
Riley's army, transportation, 3042
Unemployment
Federal-provincial responsibility, 1678
Meighen, Mr., responsibility, 1657
Order in council No. 220, 436
Relief, 1644, 1658
Calgary, 1683
Expenditure, 1655
Responsibility for, 1657, 1678
Returned soldiers, 1679
Winnipeg, 435

Murphy, Hon. Charles (Postmaster General)
Absence through illness, 1538, 1816, 1826
Boulay, Mlle., Sayabec postmistress, 3706, 3756
Newspaper postage, 4436, 4528
Parliament buildings committee, 1718
Patronage, 1795
Postal treaties, 4529
Post Office Act Amdt. bill, 4436, 4528
Railway mail service, 4529

Murray Bay Point au Pic wharf, 973

Murray Stewart, steamer. *See* Marine; Vessels

Musgrave, Governor, 1916

Musk Ox in Barren Lands, evidence of Mr. Stefansson, 1073

Mustapha Kemal. *See* Near East Crisis

Naphtha. *See* Petroleum and Naphtha

Nappan, dairy herd, 2863

Napoleon, Code. *See* Code Napoleon

Napoleonic Wars
Agricultural products and rents, 1858
Conditions following, 1231

Narcotic Drugs
Export of, 698
International conference, 698
Opium and Narcotic Drugs Act
Administration, 697, 1443
Enforcement by Mounted Police, 1142
Prosecutions, 698

Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. Bill
(Consolidation; appeals; identification; penalties)
1r., 1136; 2r., com., 2114; 3r., 2124; Senate amdts; 3149

Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. Bill—*Con.*
Sections and subjects discussed:
Appeal, restriction of, 2120
Certificate of Dominion analyst, 2119
Definitions, 2114
Deportation, convicted alien, 2123
Importing or exporting without license, 2114
Licenses and fees, 2114
Liniments, ointments, etc. 2117
Onus of proof, 2117, 3149
Opium
Resort, being in, 2117
Smoking, 2117
Penalties, 3149
Persons to whom drugs may be sold, 2115
Physicians, veterinary surgeons, dentists, 2115
Power to search for drugs, 2120
Records, not keeping, 2115

National Council of Women, Mrs. James Carruthers, 1647

National Dairy Council. *See* Dairying

National Debt. *See* Public Debt

National Defence
Accounts, qu. 205
Active militia, pensions, 2166, 3706
Ammunition, 884
Artillery, 1740
MacBrien, General, 1742
Great Britain from, statement, 1740
Quantity in store, 1741
Small arms, 1741, 1743
Annual training. *See under this title,* Militia
Armouries
Fittings and alterations, 1024
Haileybury, 4615
Minto Street, Winnipeg, qu. 2084
Army, mental tests, 1219
Arsenals, 2165
Lindsay, 883, 1744
Quebec, 884, 1740
Bonus to employees, 1751, 1772
Boy Scouts, 879
Cadet services, 877, 1743
Canadian Air Force, 1748
Camp Borden, 1749
Approaches to, improvement, 1749, 4565
Building and equipment, acquisition of, 1777
Desertions, 2418
Hospital accommodation, 1777
Repair shops, 1750, 1774
Central repair shops, 1750
Equipment, new, 1774, 1748

National Defence—*Con.*
Canadian Air Force—*Con.*
Expenditure, 2970
Forest patrol, 1776
Royal air force, aeroplanes, gift, 1748
Vickers company, 1748
Clothing and necessaries, 883
Colt machine guns, inventions, 4635
Department
Acting Minister, 2710. *See also* Graham; Macdonald
Desbarats, Mr. G. J., financial controller, 1806, 3342
Estimates, 859, 1740, 1772, 4635
Expenditures by provinces, 3891
Fiset, General Sir Eugene, 1806
Retirement, 891, 3342, 3135
Macdonald, Hon. E. M., appointment as Acting Minister, 2295
Naval Service, amalgamation, 3342
Salaries and wages, 900, 901
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, amalgamation, 3893
Staff reduction, 1773
Survey work, 2508
Disbursements, qu. 344
Engineer services and works, 4638
Fort Osborne barracks, 4628
Grants to associations, 889
Hector celebration, 4636, 4705
May, Miss H. M., compassionate grant, 900
Militarism, 866
Military districts, reduction, 868
Military expenditure, 858, 873, 901, 2921, 3076, 3238
Reduction of, M. (Mr. Lanctot) 866, neg. 876
Military properties, maintenance, 889
Military signal service, 3338
Militia
Annual training, 859, 4635
Expenditure and results, 2933
Militia camps at harvest time, 3976
Payments since 1922, 386
Pensions. *See* Militia Pensions bill; Pensions
Petawawa Camp and Ontario elections, 3976, 4005, 4162
Regimental funds, qu. 4010
Services, 859, 1747
Use of in strikes. *See under this title,* Troops
Militia Act, aid to civil power. *See under this title,* Troops
Naval Service, 1744
Consolidation with National Defence and Marine depts., 3341
Curtailment of, 2933

National Defence—*Con.*
Naval Service—*Con.*
Esquimalt
Naval college, 1744
Navy yard, qu. 1634
Stores, 4638
Expenditure, 3076
Naval colleges, Esquimalt and Halifax, 1744
Royal Canadian naval reserve, recruiting, 2897, 2950
Royal Canadian navy, 900, 902
War claims, adjustment, 900
Llandovery castle, sinking, 1745
Vickers Company, contract, cancellation, 1746
Northover, Major H. R., Colt machine guns, 4635
Ordnance
Arms, lands, etc. 890
Montreal stores building, 1022
Pay of staff, 890
Peachy, Mr. C., Regina, grant, 4638
Permanent force, 892
Physical training, 877
Royal Canadian regiment, 4638
Schools of instruction, 900
Tecumseh barracks, London, 4638
Topographical surveys, expenditure, qu. 1865
Troops, use of in labour troubles, 495, qu. 624, 861, 866, 893, 1627
Valcartier camp grounds, qu. 2298
War claims, adjustment, 1745
Militia services, 900
War medals, 1743
Warlike stores, 900
Wireless stations, 3337
Wolseley barracks, London, 4638

National Fuel Policy. *See* Fuel

National Gallery, 1018, 2688

National Industrial Conference. *See* Labour

National Monument. *See* Monuments and Memorials; Ottawa

National Parks. *See* Canadian National Parks and Historic Sites; Dominion Lands and Parks

National Parks and Reservations Bill
(Separation of parks from reservations; administration as recreation grounds; bird and wild animal sanctuaries; historic sites) 1r., 3131

National Policy. *See also* speeches on Budget
Adoption by Liberal party, 2838
Agriculture and, 2786
Anti-national and anti-social, 3018
Budget in accordance with, 2718
Canada's development due to, 2818
Permanency of, 4652
Results, 3060
Rural interests, unjust to, 2786
Special privileges, 2786

National Railways. *See* Canadian National Railways

National Trust Company, 57
Statement of president on immigration, 1123

National Status. *See* Canada's Participation in War; Imperial Conference; Treaties, Halibut Treaty

National Transcontinental. *See* Canadian National Railways

Nationalists, Conservative alliance with, 2924

Nationality. *See* Naturalization
Mental tests according to, 1219

Natural Gas. *See* Natural Resources

Natural Resources, 1880-1, 2836. *See also* Coal; Forests and Forestry; Fuel; Hudson Bay Railway; Immigration; Mines and Minerals; Timber
Alberta, revenue from, qu. 2515
Development, 2785
Capital necessary for, 2744, 2802, 3027
Estimate of value, 2719
Valuable only when developed, 2744
Drainage, 3256
Forests, 3416. *See also* Forests and Forestry
Gaspe, 1242
Hoppe leases, 3128. *See also* Hoppe
Interchange with United States, 2910
Maritime provinces, equity of, 2972
Minerals, 3198. *See also* Coal; Mines
Investigation of, 3197
Natural gas, well-drilling machinery, 3487
Ownership and taxation, 2729
Paternalism, 3071
Per capita value, 2714
Regaining of, 2728
Unemployment, 629
Water powers, 3420
Western provinces, 21, 2782, 2972, 3424
Expenditure upon, 2510
Immigration policy and, 1092. *See also* Immigration

Naturalization. *See also* Aliens; Immigration
Administration of acts, 2495
Judges and. *See* Naturalization Acts Amdt.
Jurisdiction over. *See* Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill
Oriental. *See* Immigration, Oriental
Repatriation, M. (Mr. Carroll) 1379, withdrawn, 1382
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 778. *See also* Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill

Naturalization Acts Amdt. Bill
1r., 1384; 2r., com., 2107; com., 2182; 2437; 3983; 3r., 3985
Sections and subjects discussed:
Application for naturalization, 2109
Arbitrary powers, 2456
British system, 2438
Citizenship, obstacles in way of, 2455
Consolidation, 2110, 2182, 2199, 2437
Correspondence, Secretary of State and county court judges, Vancouver, 2199
Denaturalization, 2332, 2451, 2456
Foreigners, attitude towards Canada, 2458
Japan, nationality, 2443
Japanese, 1899
Judges, 2437, 2446, 2451
Application for naturalization, 3983
Investigations, "huge joke," 2446
Judicial and executive authority, 2462
Nationality, dual, amdt. (Mr. Neill) 2442, 2451, 2456, 2463
Natural-born British subject, definition, 2107
Naturalization
Imperial, 2463
Limited, 2461
Politics and, 2438, 2466
Orientals, 2461
Relationship, naturalization law to Immigration Act, 2455
Repeal, 3983
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 2438
Secretary of State, 2437
Administration by, 2437, 2453
Discretion, 2447
Winnipeg Free Press, editorial, 2454

Naval Defence. *See under* National Defence, Naval Service

Naval Protection. *See* Canada's Participation in War

Naval Service. *See* Imperial Conference; National Defence

Navigation. *See* Marine and Fisheries; St. Lawrence

Navy. *See* Canadian Government Merchant Marine; National Defence

Near East Crisis. *See also* Canada's Participation in War; Imperial Conference
Canada's participation, 12-13, 25, 40, 45, 71, 105, 120-121, 141, 162, 169, 1266, 2815, 4655
Prime Minister, statement, 29-33

Necessaries of Life. *See* Address; Budget; Combines; Consumer; Cost of Living; Prices; Tariff; Taxation

Negro Point breakwater, 4587

Neill, Mr. Alan W. (Comox-Alberni)
Address in reply, 174; the two amendments, 174; economy and free trade, 175-176; policy of moderate protection, 177
Agricultural conditions in West, 1192
Alaskan, wreck of, 1212, 1659, 3160
British Columbia fishing licenses, 1550
Business of the House, M. to increase taxation, 3937
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill, 3971
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2408
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, 114
Canadian National Railways, agents for labour supply, 1191
Canadian Pacific railway, labour supply, 1191
Certificated masters, coasting vessels, 3971
Cheque tax, 3925, 3931
Amdt. 3935
Payment with postage stamps, 1818
Chinese Immigration bill, 2310-36, 4537
Children born in Canada, 2323
Head tax, 2323
Merchants and students, 2323
Fraudulent entry, 2324
Merchants
Definition of, 2483
Retail, attitude towards, 2322
Scope of, 2323
Coal, bituminous, duty, 1278, 3495, 3499
Eight-hour law, conference, qu. 207, qu. 279
Excise taxes, payment with postage stamps, 1818
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4274
Fish and fisheries
British Columbia fishing licenses, 1550
Freight rates, 1953
Norwegian fishermen, 1192
Free trade, Progressives and, 1196
Freight rates
Oliver, Hon. John, 1952
Railway rates, equalization, M. (Mr. Clark), 1951
Original motion, effect of, 1953

Neill, Mr. Alan W.—*Con.*
Fuel oil, competition with coal, 807
Fuel supply, 807
M. (Mr. Church) 1278
Hindu immigrants, franchise, 4643
Immigration
Attitude of labour towards, 1193
Canadian National and Canadian Pacific agents, 1191
Commonwealth Club of California, 1195
Labour employers and, 1193
Norway and Sweden from, 1191
Oriental. *See also under this title,* Chinese Immigration
Chinese, registration certificates, 1452
Exclusion from United States, 1194
Japanese
Anglo-Japanese treaty, 1450
Lemieux agreement, 1450
Naturalization, 2442
Registration system, 1452
Supposed special privileges to landholders, 1450
Violation of regulations, 1451
Policy, 1191
Population not increased by, 1195
Propaganda, 1192
Railways and, 1193
"Unseen Hand", the, 1193
Immigration Act Amdt. bills, 3981
Intending immigrants, 74, 497, 4441
Imperial Conference, 4643-49
Income tax, 1195, 4501
Japan, trade with, 1450
Labour. *See also under this title,* Immigration
Discontent, 1194
Right to organize, 2896
Macphail, Miss, members and party funds, 4240
Naturalization. *See also under this title,* Immigration
Japanese, 2442
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2109, 2442, 2465
Amdt. 2442
Nationality, dual, 2442
New Zealand Immigration Act, 497
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3516, 3564
Opium and Narcotic Drugs Act, 700
Pacific coast steamship services, 4003
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3860
Pensions
Appeal boards, 680
Committees, 288
Powell River Paper Company, 2886, 2896
Promissory notes tax, 3925

Neill, Mr. Alan W.—*Con.*
Proportional representation, 393
Railway Commission, steamship services and, 4003
Reciprocity with United States, 1196
Renovated butter, 4266
Revenue stamps, 1818
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4240
Seymour Narrows, obstruction to navigation, 3333
Steamship services
Canada-West Indies, 3388
Competition, 3398
Railway Commission, control, 4003
Tax exempt bonds, qu. 342
Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner) 1291, 4645
Amdt. (Mr. Neill), 1292
Seconder, 1308
Uchucklesit-Ecoole telegraph line, 1017
Unemployment, 1193
Hoboes, 1194
Wheat bounty, 1196

Nelson, B.C.
Board of Trade, Mounted Police, 2943
Ore-testing plant, 2505, 2507

Netherlands, The. *See also* Holland; Immigration
Senate, constitution of, 1372

New Brunswick. *See also* Maritime Provinces
Agricultural conditions, 2763
Assignments and Preferences Act, 3087
Bonded warehouses, 1212
Canadian Air Force, 1748
Capital punishment, execution of sentence, 768
Coal, 804
Dredging, 4951
Employment offices, 1630
Forest fires, relief, 4010
Gas and oil fields, 2949, 3920
Geological survey, 2504
Harbours and rivers, 945
Highways, 3182, 4587. *See also* Canada Highways; Highways
Immigration, 1086, 1198, 1476
Bowder, Mr., representative, Great Britain, 1086
Indians, 2124, 2153
Kent Northern railway, 4189
Labour scarcity in lumber camps, 1125
New Brunswick Gas and Oil Fields, 2949, 3920
Permanent force, strikes, 1627
Petroleum bounty, 2648
Potatoes, 137-139, 2763

New Brunswick—*Con.*
Public buildings, 4613
Representation, Canadian National board, qu. 282
Shale deposits, 2513
Veniot, Premier, statement, qu. 1488

New Carlisle, Que., wharf, 973

New Ontario. *See* Ontario

New Westminster, liquor sales, 2415

New York
Canadian customs officer at, 1213, 1920, 2419, qu. 2611, 3272, 3275

New York Tribune, reported statement, Mr. Meighen, on immigration, 2790

New Zealand
Butter competition, 2863
Dairying industry, 3297
Immigration
British, 2932
Chinese, 2313
Empire settlement scheme, 1473
Immigration Act, 497
Policy, 1882
Land settlement policy, 1406
Legislative council, constitution, 1371
Participation in Eastern Crisis. *See* Near East Crisis

Newcombe, Mr. E. L., K.C.
Opinions
Canada Temperance Act, 2408
Naturalization, 2440
Wholesale Grocers' Case, 2521
Visit to United States, 3823

Newfoundland steamship service, 2171, 2173, 3377

News Items, dissemination of. *See* Press

News Service. *See* Press

Newspapers. *See* Press

Newsprint. *See* Pulp and Paper

Niagara and St. Catharines Railway, 2475

Niagara Falls
Michigan Central bridge
Construction contracts, qu. 1864
Remission of sales tax, qu. 1257
Power. *See* Welland canal

Niagara District, Grape-growers, competition, 452. *See* Treaties, French; Wines

Nickle Resolution. *See* Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner)

Nickle, shipments to Germany during war 4371

Nicolet
Descoteaux, Mr. J. F., election, 2837
Vacancy, 2178

Nicomen Island, protection, 626

Nipissing Indian reserve, 1307

Nitti, Ex-Premier, of Italy, 46, 313

"Noble Eighteen". *See* Reciprocity

Noble Foundation Farm, 2813

Nolin, Mrs. J., St. David postmistress, 1489

Nominative Scheme. *See* Immigration

Nominative Senate. *See* Senate

North Atlantic Trading Company. *See* Immigration

North Atlantic and U.K. Conference. *See* Freight Rates, Shipping

North Essex Election. *See* Elections

North Vancouver. *See* Vancouver

Northern Ontario. *See* Ontario

Northern Pacific Halibut Fisheries Protection Bill. *See also* Treaties, Halibut
(Close season; use of Canadian ports; seizures; International Fisheries Commission)
Res. 4480; 1r., 2r., com., 4485; 3r., 4489

Northover, Major H. R., Colt machine guns, 4635

Northwest Rebellion. *See* Pensions

Northwest Territories
Administration, 3944, 3948
Indians, 2145
Procedure in criminal matters, qu. 1974
Purchase and maintenance of new ship, 4702

Northwest Territories Act Amdt. Bill
1r., 180; 2r., com., 270; 3r., 271; Senate amdts., 2050

Norway
Immigration from, 1191
Storthing, constitution of, 1372

Notes, Tax. *See* Taxation

Nova Scotia. *See also* Maritime Provinces
British Empire Steel Corporation, employees, 1705,
Coal, 1269, 1273, 1277, 3199. *See also* Coal; Fuel Supply
Coke and, 1268
Freight rates on, 1277, 2828
Production, qu. 490
Resources, 800
Confederation, attitude towards, 1376
Disallowance of statute. *See* Disallowance
Dredging, 4591
Emigration from, 1404
Expenditure, 4555
Experimental farms, 460
Harbours and rivers, 941, 4554, 4560, 4635, 4722. *See also that title*
Hector celebration, 4636, 4705
Highways, 3183. *See also that title*
Hydrographic survey, 3336
Immigration, 1086, 1200, 1476
Indians, 2124, 4702
Markets for, 2243
Miners
Strike, 495, 1627, 1716
Troops, use of, qu. 624, 866, 869, 892, 2893
United States delegates, detention, 3155. *See also* Howat; Meyerscough
Nova Scotia Historical Society, 3406
Ports, used by United States fishermen, 3906
Public buildings, 4612
Redistribution and, 73. *See also that title*
Representation, reduction. *See* Redistribution
St. Margaret's Bay road, qu. 3135
Secession, 2057, 2177
Resolution, 2243
Senate, elective or nominative, 1368-76
Sessional indemnity, reduction in, 1155
Steel bounties, 4371
Steel-workers strike, 1643
Supreme Court, Hon. D. D. McKenzie, appointment, 1810
Telegraph and telephone lines, 4590
Windsor, site of Fort Edward, 3406

Noxious Weeds. *See* Seed Inspection

Nursery Stock. *See also* Horticulture
Insects and pests, 596
Sales tax, 4432

Oaths of Office Bill, 1r., 3

Observatories. *See* Astrophysical; Interior

Ocean and River Service. *See* Marine

Ocean Freight Rates, 69. *See also* Freight Rates, Shipping

Ocean Ports. *See* Canadian National Railways; Ports

O'Connor, Mr. P. J., qu. 2085

Official Report of Debates. *See* House of Commons

Officials, travels of. *See* Government; Marshall

Ogilvie Milling Company, mill feeds, 2875

O'Halloran, Mr. George F. *See also* Patents Copyright Act Amdt. bill, 2346

O'Hara, Captain Marshall. *See* Marine

Ohta, Hon. T. *See* Immigration, Oriental, Jananese

Oil. *See also* Bounties; Natural Resources; Petroleum
Alberta, 2802
Bounty, 2510
Prospecting and development, 780
Revenue from, qu. 2515
Southern, 2508, 3423
British Columbia oil companies, 2505
Coutts Sweet Grass Company, drilling, 2508
Customs drawbacks, 2655
Drilling operations, 2505
Fort Norman, 3423
Fuel oil
Competition with coal, 807, 1245
Importations, 1245
Shale deposits, Maritime provinces, 2513
Standardization, 808
Hudson's Hope, 4699
Imperial Oil Company, 4380
Leases, 3423
Lubricating, standardization, 808
Mineral and oil rights, 2510
New Brunswick Gas and Oil Fields, 3920
Petroleum. *See also that title*
Bounty, 2648, 2510, 3914
Duty, 2653, 2644
Oil companies, stock selling, 781
Search for, 2802
Speculation in claims, 3423
Southern Alberta, 2508, 3423
Used in manufacture of manila rope, 3901
Drawback, 3502
Well-drilling machinery, 2653, 3487

Oil Springs, Ont., postmaster, qu. 518

Old Age Annuities. *See* Labour, Annuities

Old Age Pensions. *See* Pensions

Oleomargarine. *See also* Dairying Industry
Agriculture and Colonization Com., discussion in, 3266
Butter and, 386. *See also* Dairying Industry
Canada Food Board, 3520
Canada only country prohibiting, 3531
Canadian Lumberman's Association, 3508
Class interests, 3534
Dairy Industry Act Amdt. bill, M. (Mr. Motherwell) that order be discharged, 3325, 3449. *See also that title*
Dairying industry and, 3296
Denmark, 3515, 3523
Difference of opinion in government, 3530
Duty, 2777
French treaty, 1984
Great War Veterans' Association, 3547
Health and, 3558
Ingredients, 3562
Labelling, 3152
Local Council of Women, 3513
"Manna," 3152
Manufacture, 3153, 3553
Manufacture, importation and sale
Further legislation, inquiry, 230, 1309, 2519, 2927
M. (Mr. Carroll) 1382, 3508; agreed to as amended, 3581
Amdt. (Mr. Kay), reversion to status quo ante, 3520, agreed to, 3580
Point of order, amdt. direct neg, 3521
Sub-amdt. (Mr. Good) govt. to submit legislation before end of session, 3567; neg., 3581
Point of order, 3571
Opportunity for discussion, 3510, 3519
Point of order, anticipatory motion, 3326
Precedence of, 3451
Materials for, imports, duty and drawback, 3503, qu. 3505
National Dairy Council, 3269, 3509
Order in council suspending prohibition, 3520, 3525, 3526
Pledge to dairymen, 3525, 3531
Propaganda, 3266, 3402
Protection, 3534, 3546
Regulations, 3517
Restaurants, sale in, 3517
Restrictions, 3517
Retail Merchants' Association, 3508, 3551
Substitute, 3522
Victoria Board of Trade, telegram, 3513
War measure, 3520, 3525
Western farmers and, 1423
Women, 3508

Oliver, Hon. Frank, Hudson Bay railway, 1053

Oliver, Hon. John
Freight rates, 1915, 1952
Kitsilano Indian reserve, 383

Olivier, Hon. Mr., Senate, elective or nominative, 1367

Olympic Games, Canadian team, 4706

One-Sixth Vote. *See* Supply, Interim Supply

Ontario
Agricultural conditions, 2765
Attorney General
Betting information, 1483
Combines, 2585
Wholesale Grocers case, decision, 2051 2521
Bootlegging, 2410
Canadian Air Force, 1748
Coal, reported discovery, 2512
Court of Appeal, decision, 2051, 2521
Dredging, 1011, 4590
Drury government, expenditure and debt 2824
Experimental farms, 459
Farm labour, scarcity, 1416
Farmers and protection, 2818
Farmers' government and immigration, 1420
Government house, 4628
Government savings offices, qu. 1488
Interest rate, 1697
Grain elevators, 2037, 4716, 4719
Harbours and rivers, 981, 4588, 4594
Highways, 3177. *See also* Canada Highways; Highways
Expenditure, 2489
Home markets, 2818
Hydro-electric development, 426, 3056. *See also* Hydro
Hydro Power Commission, 1270
Immigration, 1085, 1096-8, 1320, 1428, 1475, 1476. *See also that title*
Child, and foster homes, 1099
Domestic servants, 1099
London office, 1428
Indians, 2124, 2146
Lake of the Woods. *See that title*
Legal, fees, expenditure, 1155
New Ontario
Agricultural conditions, 1401
French-Canadian settlement, 1401
Market for agricultural products, 1402
Northern Ontario
Colonization and settlement, 1401
Conditions and possibilities, 3037
Immigration into, 1097, 1112, 1320
Indians, 2151
Opportunities for settlers, 1097

Ontario—*Con.*
Oil bounty, 2510
Ontario elections and Petawawa camp, 3976, 4005, 4162
Ontario Factory Act, printing bureau, 1763
Ontario Temperance Act, 2410
Petroleum bounty, 2648
Protection sentiment, 2852
Public ownership, 3056
Pure-bred sheep, qu. 3141
Radial railways, 3056
Raney, Hon. W. E., Attorney General
Native wines, reduction of duty, 3035
Race-track betting, 712
Letter from, to Mr. Good, 2181
Rural mail carriers, remuneration, qu. 1255
See also Post Office
Soldier settlement, qu. 492
Timiskaming and Northern Ontario railway, 1071, 3056
United Farmers, co-operative stores, 4068
Water powers. *See* Lake of the Woods

Opium and Narcotic Drugs. *See* Narcotic Drugs

"Opium Joint". *See* Criminal Code Amdt.

Opposition. *See* Conservative Party; Meighen

Orders in Council
Canadian National Railways, 815
Civil Service Commission
June 29th, 1922, qu. 278
September 22nd, 1922, 380-1
Depreciated currency, 2988
Duties against United States, reduction by, 2649, 2650
Exemptions by, 359
Expenditure by, 949, 950
Government by, 1652, 1655, 4354
Marking of goods, 2988
Lead pencils, 2988
Lithographic works, 2988
Northern Pacific Halibut Fishery Protection bill, 4487
Number passed, 1921 and 1922, qu. 1488
Numbers
P. C. 220, unemployment, 435
P. C. 223, 815
P. C. 1053, qu. 516
P.C. 1566, 249
Oleomargarine, suspending prohibition of, 3520, 3525, 3526
Peace treaty, under, 767
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4349, 4393
Raisins and dried currants, duty, 3474, 3479
Repeal of by statute, 3504
Tariff reduction under, 3049
Wheat Board, 3046
Legislation extended, 3045

Ordnance Lands. *See* Interior

Ore-Testing. *See* Mines and Minerals

Orient, Trade with. *See* Trade; Vancouver Harbour Bill

Oriental Immigration. *See* Immigration

Orientals. *See also* British Columbia; Fish and Fisheries; Immigration; Labour; Narcotic Drugs Act; Naturalization
British Columbia in, 1541, 1893-1903
Deportation. *See* Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt.
Fishing licenses, reduction, 1548
Naturalization of, 2442. *See* Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill

Orillia, Champlain monument, 4705

Orthopedic Boots. *See* Customs Tariff Items

Ostrea Lake, N.S. wharf, 943

Ottawa
Canadian Press, Limited, 2523
Chateau Laurier, deficit, 2976
Daly building, purchase, 1023
Dominion Archives building, addition, 1730
Dominion observatory, 3242
Government workshops, 4616
National Gallery, 2688
National monument, Connaught place, 1020 2685
New departmental building, 1729, 4617
Architects, compensation, 4633
Newspaper combine, 2522, 2630
Ore-testing plant, 2505
Ottawa-Hull bridge, 1015, 4590
Parliament buildings, 1716
Printing bureau, 1022. *See also that title*
Too much government from, 3434

Ottawa Dairy Company, 2526, 2569

Ottawa Free Press Company, Labour Gazette, 1622

Ottawa-Pembroke highway, qu. 2085

Ottawa Printing Company, Labour Gazette, 1622

Ottawa River
Water powers, qu. 1974
Point Fortune, qu. 1974
Water storage, 815

Ottawa Typographical Union, copyrights, 2144

Overages. *See* Grain and Grain Trade, Elevators

Overseas Settlement Board. *See* Immigration

Owen, Admiral Sir W. F. W., St. Andrew's harbour, 2899

Owen Sound Wharf, 2690

Oxford Paper Company, Rumford, Maine, 835-6

Pacaud, Mr. L. T.
Appointment, 2710
International Labour Conference, 1539, 1647
Pacific Cable Board, representative, 1832

Pacific Cable Board, 1832

Pacific Coast Trade. *See* British Preference; Customs Tariff; Trade

Pacific Fisheries. *See* Japanese; Treaties, Halibut

Pacific Ocean ports. *See* Vancouver Harbour

Pacific Salvage Company, payments, qu. 1763

Paddle, Mr. J. W., claim of, 1832

Paints, 2739. *See also* Customs Tariff Items

Pairs. *See* House of Commons, Divisions

Panama Canal. *See also* New York, Customs Officer
Canadian customs regulations, 2519, 2615
Canned salmon via, 2615
Duty on goods passing between Canadian ports, 2519, 2615
Grain shipments, 77, 1921. *See also* Grain
Imports through to British Columbia, 1921
Rail and water competition, 1920
Trade from western to eastern Canada, 2868
Trade, Great Britain to Pacific ports, 3053

Pan-American Union, 496

Panet, Mr. L. C., appointment. *See* House of Commons

Paper. *See* Press; Prices; Pulp and Paper

Paper Control. *See* Pulp and Paper

Paper Makers. *See* Powell River Company

Papineau, Mr. L. J. (Beauharnois)
Estimates, time of presentation, 4555
Public expenditure, 4554

Parent, Mr. George (Quebec West)
Arctic expedition, 4012
Arctic islands and northern Quebec, 814
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4094

Parent, Mr. George—*Con.*
Canadian Pacific railway, Quebec terminals, 815
Cold storage Act Amdt. bill, 2054
Demers, Mr. Amedee, qu. 1868
Ottawa river, water storage, 815
Patents of Invention bill, 2102
Quebec Harbour Commission, cold storage, 2055
Raisins, imports, qu. 2699

Pari-Mutuel System. *See* Race Track Betting

Paris Agency, expenses, 4001

Paris Offices. *See* Canadian National Railways

Park-Davis Company, Metagen, qu. 1867

Parks. *See* Canadian National Parks and Historic Sites; Dominion Forest Reserves and Parks; Dominion Lands and Parks; Interior

Parliament
Farmers in, 2732. *See also* Progressive Party
Function of, statement of Edmund Burke, 3018
Opening of, 1
Prorogation, 4755

Parliament Buildings, 1716
Architects, settlement with, 1716
Baker, the late Col. G. H., memorial, 435, 730, 1256, 1991
Central column at entrance, memorial, 2685
Committee, 1718
Common meeting room, 1727
Commons chamber
Accoustics, 1721. *See also* House of Commons
Lighting, 1728
Members' galleries, 1729
Estimates, M. (Sir Henry Drayton) to reduce, 1727, neg. 1728
Expenditure
To complete, 1716
To date, 1718
Law, the late Mr. Bowman B., tablet, 1020
Marchand, Mr., architect, commission, 1718
Members' rooms
Allocation of, 1729
Lighting, 1728
Ventilation, 1728
Old walls, destruction of, 1723-24
Pearson, Mr. John A., architect, 1716
Policing, 778
Tower, 1722
Chimes, 1722
Completion of, 1719

Parliamentary Documents. *See* Government Publications

Parliamentary Library. *See* Library

Parliamentary Practice, amending of. *See* Lack of Confidence, M.

Parliamentary Procedure. *See* Deputy Speaker; House of Commons; Speaker

Parliamentary Responsibility. *See* Canadian National Railways, Branch Lines, Management Lack of Confidence

Parliamentary Restaurant, Committee, 53, 382

Parole System. *See* Justice

Participation in War. *See* Canada; Near East Crisis

Partisanship. *See* Political Partisanship

Party Funds, members and, 4237

Party System of Government, 1235, 1254

Passamaquoddy Bay, harbour, 2899, 2938

Passports
Immigrants, 1170
Passport office, 4707
Requirements as to, 3988

Pasteur, Louis, scientific contributions, 1287

Patent Medicines. *See* Health

Patents. *See also* Patent Act Amdt. bill
Revocation of, 2528
Under Combines Act, 2522

Patents and Copyright Branch. *See* Trade and Commerce

Patents of Invention Bill. *See also* Trade Marks and Designs Bill
(To amend and consolidate acts)
1r., 331; 2r., 2064; com., 2064, 2086; 2128; 3r., 2131; Senate amdts., 3154
Sections and subjects discussed:
Appeals, 2129
Exchequer court, 2079
Application for patents, 2067
Conflicting
To be decided by Exchequer court, 2079
To be submitted to arbitration, 2129
Joint, assignments, 2057, 2104, 2130
Particulars required, 2073
Withdrawal of, 2079

Patents of Invention Bill—*Con.*
Section and subjects discussed—*Con.*
Assignments, refusal to execute, 2069
Berne convention, 2064
Commissioner, duties and powers, 2064, 2104, 2128
Conditions, 2089, 2104
Definition, 2064
Domicile, election of, 2070
Food or medicines, 2078
Foreign patents, 2068
Form of issue, 2082
Government use of patented inventions, 2100
Improvements, patenting of, 2069
Inspection by the public, 2101
Issue of new or amended patents, 2082
Models and specimens, 2076
Oath of inventor, 2069
Patent agent or attorney, 2102
Patent office, 2064
Patents for inventions by persons in Public Service, 2082, 2104
Patents to be assignable, 2083, 2086
Register of attorneys, 2101
Repeal, 2102
Restoration and revival of patent, 2100
Revocation of patent, time limit, 2099
Right of appeal, 2100
Special methods or processes of manufacture, 2076
Specifications, drawings, etc., 2073
Suit pending, 2102
Tariff of fees, 2100
Term limit, 2082
What patents shall contain, etc., 2082

Paternalism, excess of, 1133. *See also* Legislation

Patronage. *See* Civil Service; Political Patronage

Patterson, Hon. J. C., investigator of titles, 3360

Peace Relations. *See* Imperial Conference; League of Nations

Peace River District
German settlers, 1184
Immigration literature, 1433
Railways, 4324
Construction, 1433, 1440, 3006
Grande Prairie railway, 4200
Prince George railway, 1434, 4701
Survey, 4698
Settlement in, 1184
Soldier settlers, 1185

Peace Treaty. *See* Germany, Reparations; Treaties

Pearson, Mr. John A., architect. *See* Parliament Buildings

Peat. *See* Fuel Supply

Pecuniary Claims Convention, with United States, 779

Peel, Sir Robert, Corn Laws
Abolition of 3050
Reversal of policy on, 3007

Pelee Island steamship service, 2174

Pelletier, Mr. F. J. (Matane)
Belanger, Mr. A. C., 1489
Boulay, Mlle, postmistress, Sayabec, 3751, 3759
Matane harbour improvements, 971
Printing committee, fourth report, 4510

Penitentiaries. *See* Justice

Penman's Limited, securities and dividends, 3463

Penny Bank of Toronto Act Amdt. Bill
(Change of name)
1r., 1739; 2r., com., 3r., 2052

Pension Act Amdt. Bill
(Cases subject to review; district appeal boards; federal appeal boards)
Res. 3401, 3748; 1r., 3748; 2r., com., 3848; 3r., 3887; Senate amdts. 4744
Sections and subjects discussed:
Appeals to district review board, 3875
Recommendations final, amdt. (Mr. Black, Yukon), 3875, neg. 3881
Time for, 3881
Extension from 3 months to one year, amdt. (Mr. Logan) agreed to, 3881
To be decided under Pension Act, amdt. (Mr. Marler) 3881, neg. 3882
British expeditionary force, members, 3873
Date of coming into force, 3873
Death within five years, 4745
Amdt. (Mr. Clark) 3884, agreed to, 3885
Disability
Attributable to military service, 4745
Amdt. (Mr. Ladner) 3850, neg. 3870
Extent of, how estimated, 3873
In respect of which pensions claimed, 3848
Pensions according to, 3873
Pre-enlistment, 3849
Time of appearance, 3872

Pension Act Amdt. Bill—*Con.*
Section and subjects discussed—*Con.*
District review boards, 3874
Staff or ex-staff officer not eligible, amdt. (Mr. Black), Yukon) 3875, neg. 3875
Federal appeal board, 3875
Insurance principle, 3851
Payment of expenses, 3881
Pension payable to descendants, amdt (Mr. Manion) agreed to, 3886
Review of pension legislation, 3851
When no deduction of pension, 3873
Widow, 4745
Bigamous marriage, 3732, 3886
Who marries after disability appears amdt. (Mr. Caldwell) 3882, agreed to 3884
Widowed mother, 3870
Mother whose husband is helpless, amdt. (Mr. LeSueur) 3870, agreed to, 3871

Pensions. *See also* Canadian National Railways; Judges; Militia Pension Act; Ministers' Salaries and Members' Indemnities; Pensions Act Amdt. Bill
Appeals
Appeal boards, 77, 3875
Dominion Veterans Alliance, com. 3860
Federal, 4703
Attributability, 3850
British expeditionary force, members, 3873, 3885
Committee, re-appointment, inquiry, 288
Commutation of, qu. 4132. *See under this title,* European War
Decrease in amount, 23
Disability entitling to, 677
District boards of review, 4703
European war and active militia, 2166, 3706, 3707
Estimates, suggested postponement, 2166
Expenditure, 2987
Fenian raid, 3742, 3873
Great War Veterans' Association, 2167, 4535
Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railway employees, 3195
Judges, qu. 492
McDougall, Mrs. William, 3949
Malone, late Lieut.-Col. qu. 206
Medical examination of prisoners, 670
Militia. *See* Militia Pension Act. Amdt bills
Mothers, 2827
Conference with provincial governments, 3046
Northwest rebellion, 3742

Pensions—*Con.*
Old age, 1646, 2817, 2827, 3032. *See also* Labour, Annuities
Conference with provincial government, 3046
Federal and provincial jurisdiction, 1646
Inquiry as to legislation, 733, qu. 2517, 2518
Liberal convention of 1919, res., 1652
Pension Act. *See also* Pension Act Amdt.
Administration of, 3706
Suggested amendments, 2166
Pension Commissioners, board of
Appeal from, 677
Charges against, 685
Estimates, 2166
Interpretation of Pension Act, 2639, 2943
North Essex election and, 670, 708, 2014
Report, 516, 4736
Res., Victoria, B.C., for removal, 3399
Salaries and contingencies, 2168, 3742
Pension legislation, review of, 3851
Petition from veteran organizations, 4535-36
Pilots, 3359
Ralston report. *See under this title,* Royal Commission
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 774, qu. 1362
Royal commission
Expenses, 691
Recommendations of, 2394, 2942, 3733
Legislation to be introduced, 2394, 2519, 2639, 3400. *See also* Pensions Act Amdt. Bill; Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act Amdt. Bill; Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment Act Amdt. bill
Inquiry as to, 2639, 2983
Opportunity to discuss, 674, 2394
Reports
First interim report, 2166, 2926, 2983
Final, inquiry, 2516
Printing, qu. 207, 288, 1631, 3401
M. for 1992, 2128
Senators, 1376
South African War, 3873
Tuberculous patients, 3850
Unemployed relief, expenditure, 2168
Women, 1651
Widows, 681

Perfumery. *See* Treaties, French

Peribonka, Que., wharf, 973

Periodicals. *See* Magazines and Periodicals;

Permanency. *See* Reciprocity; Tariff

Permanent Force. *See* National Defence

Peru, Senate, constitution of, 1373

Petawawa Camp, Ontario elections and, 3976, 4005, 4162

Peterborough, weights and measures inspection, qu. 492, 810

Petition of Right Act Amdt. Bill. *See also* Dominion Lands Act Amdt. Bill (Coal Leases)
(Revocation of fiat obtained by fraud)
1r., 2639; 2r., com., 3127; 3r., 3130
Sections and subjects discussed:
Fiats, issue and publication of, 3222, 3224
Hoppe leases, 3127
Isenberg estate, 3128
Revocation of fiat obtained by fraud, 3127

Petroleum. *See also* Oil
Administration of act, 780
Bounty, 2510, 2648, 2949, 3914, 3963
Duty, 2644, 2653, 3035, 3963
New Brunswick Gas and Oil Fields, 2949
Production and payment, qu. 3262

Petroleum and Naphtha Inspection Act Amdt. Bills
1. Regulations governing sale of naphtha
Res. 3749; order discharged, 3969
2. Sale of naphtha
1r., 4248; 2r., 4249; com., 4276; 3r., 4276

Petroleum Bounty Act Amdt. Bill
(Reduction and discontinuance of bounty)
Res. 2657, 3914, 3963; 1r., 3963; 2r., com., 3r., 4392

Pharmaceutical Preparations. *See* Health

Physical Training. *See* National Defence, Cadet Services,

Piche Point, Que. wharf, 973

Pictou, N.S., dredging, 4584. *See also* Harbours and Rivers

Pictou-New Glasgow-Antigonish steamship service, 2174

Pictou-Souris-Magdalen Islands steamship service, 2174

Pictures. *See* National Gallery

Pierreville, Que., postmaster, qu. 4511

Pilotage. *See* Canada Shipping Act; Marine and Fisheries

Pineapples, production in Fiji Islands, 1848

Pioneer, the, recognition of, 1394, 2870

Piracy. *See* Copyright Act Amdt. Bill

Pitt, William, reciprocity treaty, France, 3050

Plains of Abraham, Battle of, soldiers who became farmers, 1188

Plaster Quarries. *See* Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute

Playgrounds. *See* Canadian National Parks and Historic Sites

Plebiscites. *See* Canada Temperance Act

Pocket Boroughs. *See* Labour, Right to Organize

Pointe à Elie, Que. wharf, 974

Point au Pic, Murray Bay, wharf, 973

Pointe aux Trembles, Que. wharf, 974

Pointe Shea (Amherst) pier, 977

Poland
Immigration, 1204
Treatment of Ukrainians. *See* West Ukrainian Republic

Political Offenders, imprisonment, 3157

Political Parties. *See also* Conservative; Liberal; Progressive
Big interests, contributions, 2856, 3070
Capital and, 2810
Liberal and Conservative, 2793, 2812

Political Partisanship. *See also* Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power)
Costly, 2787
Dismissals for, 3344

Political Patronage. *See also* Civil Service; National Policy
Alberta, 522
Appointments, 2710. *See also* Post Office
Boulay, Mlle, dismissal of, 3706, 3750
Canadian National Railways, 134-135
Charlotte county, N.B., 945
Civil Service, 519
Indians, medical service, doctors, 2160
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, appointment, 3303. *See also that title*
Patronage list, 946
Political supporters, jobs for, 2710
Post offices, 3316. *See also* Post office
Sorel shipyard, 3344, 3374

Political Policies. *See also* speeches on Budget; Conservative Party; Liberal Party; National Policy; Progressive Party; Reciprocity
Appropriation of, 2781
Big interests and, 2856, 3070
"Doubtful virtue of consistency," 3056
Economic group organization, 3003
Graft, big interests and old parties, 2855
Liberal and Conservative, 2812
Platforms
Repudiation of, 2973, 2994
Value of, statement, Mr. Euler, 2852, 2974, 2991
Proposed, Hon. Mr. Tolmie, 2870
Reversal of, 3007
Two parties but one policy, 2793

Pollution of Boundary Waters. *See* Health

Pollution of Rivers. *See* Marine

Pool Rooms. *See* Race Track Betting

Pool Selling. *See* Criminal Code Amdt. Bill

Pope, Sir Joseph. *See* External Affairs

Population. *See also* Budget; Emigration; Immigration
Birth rate, 1197
Death rate, 1197
Distribution of, 2747
Immigration
Natural increase and, 1871-1921, 1207
Not increased by, 1195
Increase, 1398, 2819
Net, 1173
Loss of, 119, 1439, 3018. *See also* Emigration
Ratio of public employees to, 3027
Representation by. *See* Proportional Representation
Tax burden upon, 3001. *See also* Taxation
Triplets, bonus for, inquiry, 3145

Pork Products. *See* Bacon; Meats

Port Arthur
Grain shipments, 1114. *See also* Grain
Harbour improvements, 2675, 4610

Port Arthur Shipbuilding Company, 3354

Port Burwell harbour works, 983, 1012

Port Colborne elevator, 4690. *See also* Grain

Port Dover, Fathers Dollier and Galinee, monument, 3433

Port Elgin breakwater, 2690

Port Greville, N.S. breakwater, 944

Port Mulgrave-Bras d'Or Lakes steamship services, 2174

Port Nelson. *See* Hudson Bay Railway

Port Renfrew, B.C. wharf, 1008

Portage la Prairie
Assiniboine river floods, 993, 998, 3041
District board, resolution, 3039
Indians medical service, doctors, 2160
Sewerage outlet, 993, 2679

Portage River, N.S. breakwater, 950

Porter, Mr. E. G. (East Hastings)
Belleville harbour commissioners, dismissal, qu. 491
Vancouver harbour bill, 269

Portland, Maine. *See also* Canadian National Railways, Terminals
Grain shipments via, qu. 1484

Ports. *See* British Preference; Canadian National Railways; Freight Rates, Shipping; Grain and Grain Trade; Imports and Exports; Shipping, *and also* their individual titles
Canadian, 2898. *See also* Lake Grain Rates
British preference and, 140, 2948, 3053, 3454. *See also* British Preference; Budget
Direct importation by, 3454, 3895
Discrimination against, 2960
Loading of grain cargoes at, 3974
Shipments via, 4714
Use of. *See also* Northern Pacific Halibut bill; Treaties, Halibut treaty
United States fishermen, by, 2735, 2940, 3361, 3906, 4480
Montreal. *See that title*
Ocean ports, 2937. *See also* Halifax; St. John
Comparative mileages, 2939
Passamaquoddy bay, 2938
St. Croix, 2899, 2938
Shippigan, 2938
Comparative mileage, 2939
Pacific, trade through Panama canal, 3053
Quebec. *See that title*
United States, grain shipments through, 3764
Vancouver. *See that title*
Wardens. *See* Canada Shipping Act

Portugal, Upper Chamber, constitution, 1372

Postal Conference. *See* Post Office

Postage Stamps. *See* Post Office

Postmaster General, absence through illness, 1314-15, 1538, 1816, 1821, 3067

Post Office
Aeroplane mail service, 1775
British mails, delay in, 2639, 2694, 2695
Canadian federation of postal employees, salaries, 1794
Daylight saving, qu. 3143
Department
Acting Minister, 2710
Annuities branch, 1640-42
Transfer to Labour dept., 1639
Bolte, Mr. Camille, correspondence, 1032 qu. 1138
Coolican, Mr. P. T., General Superintendent of Postal Service, 1816
Deputy Postmaster General
Appointment of, 1805, 2710
Coulter, Dr. R. M.
Retirement, 1822, 1825
Service and superannuation allowance, qu. 3135
Estimates, 1778, 1814
Proceedings in minister's absence, 1314
Hayes, Mr. John J., dismissal, 1687
Lemaire, Mr. E. J., 1822
Purchasing Commission and, 4001
Revenue
Gross, 1818, 1825
Not connected with postal service, 1815
Salaries and contingencies, 1793-4, 1814
Staff, 1824
Superintendeent of mail services, 1814
Superintendent of postal services, Mr. George Ross, retirement, 1825
Supplies, purchase of, 3951
Surplus claimed, 1817
Verrett, Mr. Hector, retirement, 1826
Dismissals and appointments. *See under this title,* Postmasters
International Postal Conference, 4529
Letter carriers
Bonus to, 1784
Salaries, 1780
Mail contracts. *See also under this title,* Rural Mail
Demers, Mr. Amedee, qu. 1868, 1977
Sporting Mountain, N.S., qu. 707, 856
Trois Pistoles, qu. 4302
Mail service, 1778
Mail subsidies and steamship subventions. *See* Steamship Services
Ocean mail, pilot boats and, 3359
Pacaud, Mr. Lucien T., 1832
Patronage, 1794. *See also under this title,* Postmasters

Post Office—*Con.*
Postage rates
Letter rate
United States and Canada, comparison, 2745
War tax, 2744, 2858
Newspapers and periodicals, 4436, 4528
Public libraries, 1809
Reduction of, 1779, 2824, 2945
Special delivery, 1872, 2933
Postage stamps
Commission on sale of, 1819
Payment of excise taxes with, 1815, 1818, 1820, 2979, 3927, 3937, 4435
Sale of, 2979
Selling cost, 1818
Postal contracts. *See under this title,* Mail, Rural Mail
Postal service
Quebec district, extra service compensation, 1832
Postal Treaty with United States, 2, 4529
Postmasters
Agents for annuities, 1641-42
Appointments and dismissals, 1809, 1827, 4534
Appointments
List of, 1830
Members' recommendations, 1799-1829
Political patronage, 3316
Returned soldiers, 1799
Dismissals, 4534
Angouleme, Quebec, qu. 3139
Blondin, Mr. C. E., Pierreville, qu. 4511
Boucher, Mrs., Pierreville, qu. 4511
Boulay, Mlle. Adrienne, Sayabec, 3706, 3750
Brussels, 1800
Chicoutimi-Saguenay, qu. 3138
Clementsport, qu. 1363, 1795, 1831, 4534
Frenette, Mr. George, qu. 2698
Herbertville, qu. 3139
Labarre, Que. dismissals, qu. 3138
Larouche, qu. 3137
Levis county, qu. 519
Mara, B.C., qu. 1489, qu. 1739
Midland, qu. 623
Morinville postmistress, qu. 1028
North Oakville, 914
Oil Springs, Ont., qu. 518
Portsmouth, Ont., 1832
Rawding, Mr., dismissal, 1795
Renfrew, qu. 205
St. Barnabe Nord, Que., 1830
St. Bruno, Que. qu. 3140
Ste. Claire, Que., qu. 1031

Post Office—*Con.*
Postmasters—*Con.*
Dismissals—*Con.*
St. Joseph d'Alma, qu. 3140
St. Peters', N.S., 1795
Morrison, Mr. D.W., qu. 1488
Sorel, qu. 1487
Tadoussac, Que., qu. 3139
Wingham, 1800
Woodbridge, 1821
Commission on stamp sales, 1818
Patronage, 3316
Residence, 1796
Post office money orders, tax, 3923
Post Offices
Grade Three, qu. 4300
Montreal. *See also that title*
Appointments, qu. 1361
Bolte, Mr. Camille, correspondence, 1032 qu. 1138
Inquiry branch, qu. 2516
Number of post offices, qu. 3135
Postal station "G," qu. 623
Promotions, qu. 2298
Saskatoon post office, 1785
Toronto
Postal station "A," 4624
Post office building, 3277
Revenue, 1779
Radio equipment, 1780
Railway mail service, 1783, 4529
Payments to Canadian Pacific, qu. 3143
Rural mail service
Anderson, Mr. G. C., 1821
Carriers
Compensation for loss, 1832
Paddle, Mr. J. W., claim, 1832
Legal holidays, 1804
Names and addresses, 3144, 3264
Remuneration, 1780, 1822, 3070, 3076
Ontario, average, qu. 1259
Contracts, 1781
Extension of, 1802
Improvement of, 1780, 2830
Spur lines, 1826
Western provinces, 1441, 1790, 1801
War loan dividends, delivery of, 1804
Winnipeg postal employees, salaries, 4672

Post Office Act Amdt. Bill
(Rates on newspapers and periodicals)
1r., 4436; 2r., com., 4528; 3r., 4535

Potatoes. *See this title under* Vegetables

Potlatch. *See* Indians

Potter, Mr. Howard G., Clementsport postmaster, qu. 1363, 1795

Poultry. *See also* Eggs
French treaty, 1983
Turkeys, dressed, importation, qu. 1139

Powell River Paper Company, labour organization, 3071
M. (Mr. Neill) to adjourn House, 2886; withdrawn, 2897

Power, Mr. C. G. (Quebec South)
Ammunition, 887
Annual training, 861, 872
Canada's participation in war, M., 1529
Civil Service Act, M. for repeal, 345, 371, 519, 520, 568
Copper bounty bill, 4371
Export Act Amdt. bill, pulpwood, 4346, 4348, 4395
Amdt. six months' hoist, 4396, neg. 4397
Forests, preservation of, 4349
Grondines wharf, 965
Labour troubles, use of troops, 861, 893
League of Nations
Activities and policies, 3998
Withdrawal, M., 1529, 3999
Military expenditure, 873
National Defence, pay of staff, 890
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3849-87
Pension commissioners, removal, 685
Pensions, commutation of, 3725
Permanent force, 892
Petawawa camp and Ontario elections, 3976
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4346, 4348, 4395
Quebec riots, 893
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 712
Returned Soldiers' Insurance bill, 3744
Saar valley, administration of, 4000
Soldiers 'Civil Re-establishment bill, 3747
Vocational loans and training, 688

Power Development. *See* Hydro Electric; St. Lawrence River Waterway; Water Powers

Prairie Provinces. *See* Alberta; Manitoba; Saskatchewan; Western Provinces

Pre-Cooling Plants. *See* Cold Storage

Pre-emptions, sale of. *See* Lands

Preferential Tariff. *See* British Preference; Reciprocity; Treaties, French, Italian

Press
British and foreign news service, 4712
Canadian Press Limited, 1464, 2555, 4735
British cable service, 4727
Canadian telegraph service, 4727

Press—*Con.*
Canadian Press Limited—*Con.*
Franchises, granting of, 4728
Ottawa franchise, 4730
Payments to, qu. 3703
President, 2630
Subsidy, 2631, 4535, 4728
Control, 3074
Capitalistic, 2726
Fisheries publicity, 3364
Gambling in staples, justification of, 3059
Hearst syndicate, 828
Magazines and periodicals, Canadian, encouragement, M. (Mr. Hocken) 826
Newspapers
Alleged combine, 2522, 2555, 2580, 2587, 2591, 2630, 4728
Postage rates on, 4436, 4528
Printing contracts with government, 2298, 2394, 2614
Quotations from. *See* Deputy Speaker; Speaker
Registration of ownership, 615
Size of, 4534
Statement as to treaties, 245
Newsprint, exemption from sales tax, 2979. *See also* Pulp and Paper
Publishing business, difficulties of, 4415
Reuter's news service, 4712
Subsidy to, 2631
Windsor Telegram, Canadian Press and, 2630

Preston, Mr. R. F. (Lanark)
Introduced, 3

Preston, Mr. W. T. R., qu. 206, 247, 1362. *See also* Freight Rates, Shipping

Prevost, Mr. Jules E. (Terrebonne)
Canadian National Railways
Branch lines construction bill, 4312
Grande Freniere-Rinfret Junction, 4312
Laurentians, the, 4312
Quebec highways, qu. 814
Railway commissioners, qu. 1260

Price Waterhouse & Company, report, 2954

Prices. *See also* Address; Agriculture; Budget; Combines; Cost of Living; Customs Tariff Items; Finance; Immigration; Markets; Taxation; Trade
Agricultural products, 2731, 2835, 2862, 3068-9
Higher south of boundary, 2715
Manufactured products and, 1403, 1407, 1851, 1853, 1885, 1907, 2747, 2787, 2873, 2928 3018, 3024
Past and present, 2978

Prices—*Con.*
Agricultural implements, 2739, 2836, 2991, 3070
Comparative, 1407
Babson, Mr. Roger, report, 1084
Bacon, 2933
Banks and, 4047
Binder twine, 4377
Building materials, 2164, 3004
Butter, 2821, 3513, 3533. *See also* Dairying Industry
Canada and United States, 2801, 3025
Comparison of, 2738, 2742, 2836, 2916, 3025
Canadian Pacific railway lands, 3704
Cattle, 2871
Cheese, 3295
Coal, 1812, 2824, 3198. *See also* Coal; Fuel Supply
Combines and, Jenks, Professor, 2600
Combines in restraint of trade. *See* Combines bill
Commodity, 1167
Agricultural and, 1083
Consumer. *See also that title.*
Producer, and, 1813, 2727, 2829
Control of, 2812, 4226
Cost, 1851
Cotton goods, 3463
Credit inflation and, 4226
Dairy supplies, 2740
Denims, drills, ginghams, 2738
Electric energy, 3784
Farm products. *See under this title,* Agricultural
Fencing and poultry netting, 2740
Fixing, 2520, 2606, 2786
Food, 2584, 2824, 2933
Clothing and, 2873
Freight rates and, 1958. *See also that title*
Furnaces, warm air, 2739
Gasoline engines, 2740
Harness, 2739
High, 2583, 2737, 2748, 2812
Hogs, Chicago and Toronto, 2865
Increase, 2713
By taxation, 2716
Since 1912, 1408
Indians, charged to, qu. 3142
Inflation and deflation, 64, 647, 2800, 3024, 4226
Interest rate and, 4166
Live Stock. *See also that title*
Producer and consumer, 2877
Lumber, 2875, 3036
Manufactured goods, 2823, 2836, 2972, 3018, 3029, 3068
Higher, north of boundary, 2715
Middleman and, 1230, 2972

Prices—*Con.*
Milk, 2569, 2591
Monopolies and, 2521
Nails, 2740
Oleomargarine, 3513
Paints, 2739
Paper, 829, 2888
Potatoes, 2820
Price level, inequality of, 629
Producer and consumer, 1853, 2727, 2829
Pulpwood, 3036, 3417, 4345. *See also* Pulp and Paper
Railway ties, 3036
Re-sale, fixing of, 2525, 2546
Rubber boots, 2740
Safety razors, 2740
Sewing machines, 2739
Silks, 2397-2400
Spread
Producer and consumer, 1852, 2713, 3029
Wholesale and retail, 1230
Stabilization of, 4069, 4666
Sugar, 2646, 2888, 2933, 3069
Gambling in, 3058
Tools, 2740
United States. *See under this title,* Canada and United States
Washing machines, 2740
Wheat, 628, 3004. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade
Wheat Board, 2857
Woollen goods, 2990, 3459

Prime Ministers' Conference. *See also* Imperial Conference
Imperial Shipping Committee, qu. 3137

Prince Albert stockyards, 2779

Prince Edward Island. *See also* Maritime Provinces
Aeroplane mail service, 1775
Agricultural conditions, 2763, 2972
Car ferry terminals claim, 4676
Emigration from, 1404
Experimental farms, 460
Fox industry, 2763
Harbours and rivers, 945, 4586
Highways, 3184. *See also* Canada Highways; Highways
Immigration and, 1200
Land settlement policy, 1406
Potato-growing, 131, 2763
Public buildings, 4614
Railway employees' pensions, 3195
Railway facilities, 128
Telegraph and telephone lines, 2682

Prince George-Peace River projected railway, 1434, 4701

Prince Rupert, 110, 115
Civic employees union, 2086
Development of port, 261, 2734
Dry dock, qu. 1664
Dry Dock and Shipbuilding Company
Creditors, 4708
Guaranteed bonds, qu. 1138
Fishing industry, 2734

Printing. *See also* Government Publications; Printing Bureau
Combines, 1623
Contracts, 1974
Newspaper and printing companies, 2298, 2394, 2614
Copyright, 2140. *See also* Copyright Act Amdt. bill
Government publications, 3266
Government, Winnipeg, 3144, qu. 3323
Immigration publications, 1873
Interior dept. reports, 3443
King's Printer, audit of outside accounts, 1623
Parliamentary and departmental publications, 811
Postage stamps, 1818
Presses
Duty, 2653, 2858, 3486
French treaty, 1981
Railway department, 3197

Printing Bureau. *See also* Editorial Committee; Labour
Boilers, condition of, 1736-38
Canada Gazette, 1708
Depreciation, 1711
Draper, Mr. P. M., Director of Printing, 1668
Employees, 1623
Grievances, opportunity to present, 1654
Retiring allowances, former, 3949
Fire hazard, 1736
Govt. publications, distribution, 1712
Immigration publications, 1873
Improvements, 1022
King's Printer, Mr. F. A. Acland, appointment, 1668
Labour Gazette, 1621, 1712
Miscellaneous printing, 1716
New building, 1712, 1730
M. (Mr. Beland) to reduce 1730, agreed to, 1737
Ontario Factory Act, 1736
Outside printing, cost of, qu. 3131

Printing Bureau—*Con.*
Plant
New, 1710
Repairs and renewals, 1710
Post Office department, 1818, 1820
Publications and documents, distribution, 1712
Purchasing Commission, 1674
Reorganization, 1731, 1735
Stationery, embossed, 1716

Printing, Joint Committee, 53, 202
Reports
First, 1156, 1361
Second, 2252, 2295
Third, 3261, 3581
Fourth, 4436, 4510

Prison Reform. *See* Justice, Penitentiaries

Pritchard, Mr. John (North Wellington)
Agricultural conditions, 1842
Binder twine, price of, 4380
Budget, 2730. Speeches in Parliament; divergence of views as to policy; condition of agriculture; failure of fiscal policy; unemployment; wages and prices, 2730; farmer, unsatisfactory condition of; farm labour; markets; agricultural products, price of; the tariff; natural resources; agricultural production; national debt, 2731; burden upon the farmer; education, cost of; immigration policy; contrast between treatment of native-born and immigrant; farmers in Parliament, 2732; financial influence and class rule in politics; economy, 2733;
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4544
Hemp bounty bill, 4380
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 743, 751
Rural mail carriers, remuneration, 1793
Vocational loans, 689
Vocational training, 689

Pritchard, Capt. William, Hudson Bay route, 1052

Private Betting. *See* Race Track Betting

Private Bills, Committee
Reports, 936, 2204, 2417, 3323, 3887, 4391
Suspension of rules, 4248, 4308

Private Bills Discussed
Buffalo and Fort Erie Public Bridge Company, 1834
Canadian Press Limited, 1464
Huron and Erie Mortgage Corporation, 2281
La Societe des Artisans Canadiens Francais, 1027
Woodmen of the World, 3982

Privilege. *See* House of Commons

Privy Council
Appeal from Railway Commission, 1284, 1307, 1912, 1926, 1936
Combines, decisions. *See* Combines Bill

Producers' Dairy Company, Vancouver, 2526

Producers' Dairy Company, Ottawa, 2569

Production. *See also* Agriculture; Industries; Manufacturers; Textiles
Annual, statement of, 2720
Costs, 640, 2748, 2815, 2835, 2836. *See also* Labour; Manufacturers
Lower, 2748
Public debt, 640
Exceeding demand, 2957
Implements of, control, 2722
"Produce more, consume less," 4054
Production for use, 2727
Want and, 4053

Professional Men, charges and standard of living, 2813

Profiteering, 2578. *See also* Combines Bill

Progressive Party. *See also* Address; Budget; Forke; Immigration
Alberta, 2799, 2810
Attitude, extreme, 3065
Budget amendments
Forke, Mr., 2717-18, 2809
Opportunity to move, 2711
Constitution and policy, 2791, 2793
Criticism of, 3070
Crowsnest pass agreement and, 2971
Appropriation of Liberal policy, 2781
"Concession forced by Progressives," explanation, Mr. Forke, 2971
Demands, alleged selfish, 3030
Economic, not political, group, 1863, 3003
Expenditures suggested, 3076
Farmers in Parliament, 2732, 2787
Farmers' movement, 2884
Free trade and, 1196, 2818, 3024, 3030
Grand Trunk gratuities, 1666, 1687
Hammell, Mr., 2884
Immigration policy, 1413. *See also* speeches on Immigration
Attitude of some Progressive members on, 2774
Leader of. *See also* Forke
Campaign of 1921, 1853
New, references to, 11, 17, 27
Liberal platform of 1919, opposition, 2925
Manitoba, 2799, 2810
Organization, 2815

Progressive Party—*Con.*
Platform, 2845
Tariff, 2777
Policy and action, 2935
For Western provinces only, 2817
Predicament, of, 2814
Proportional representation, 424
Right to move amendment, 1299-1307
"Stronger and more menacing enemy," 2976
Speeches, pessimistic, 2936
Tariff and, 1421, 2737, 2745
Concessions to, 2743
Reduction of, 3024
Taxation, 2837
Union government and big interests, 1853
Withdrawals from, 2976

Prohibited Classes. *See* Immigration Act Amdt.

Prohibition. *See also* Canada Temperance Act Amdt. Bill; Liquor; Race Track Betting
British Columbia Association, control of liquor, 2409
Native wines, reduction of duty, 3035
Ontario Temperance Act, 2410
Plebiscite, cost of, 2495

Promissory Notes. *See* Taxation

Promotions. *See* Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power)

Proof, Onus of. *See* Narcotic Drugs

Proportional Representation, 171
Alternative vote in single member constituencies, 388, agreed to, 389
Effect on public ownership, 426
Multi-member constituencies, M. (Mr. Good) 389, neg. on div. 434
Single transferable vote, 1660, 2181

Proprietary Medicines. *See* Health

Prorogation, 4736, 4755
Probable date of, 2166

Prosecutions. *See* Combines Bill

Protection. *See also* Bounties; speeches on Budget; Industries
Adequate, 2957
Agricultural depression and, 1837-64
Agricultural implement industries, 2975
Applications for, 3235
Basis of government policy, 2718
Budget and, 3077
Case for to be heard publicly, 2718, 3016
Class privilege, 3069

Protection—*Con.*
Conditions
Comparison before and after adoption, 2819
Solution for, 3013
"Dismal failure," 3018
Double standard of buying and selling, 2872
"Economically and fundamentally wrong," 2973
Free trade and, 2806, 2922. *See also that title*
Granted without investigation, 3492
Great Britain, 2752. *See also that title*
"Illogical absurdities of," 3014
Inequity of, 2792
Laurier, Sir Wilfrid on, 2872
"Legalized robbery," 3071
Minister of the Interior and, 2805
Money and moral cost of, 3070
Oleomargarine, 3534, 3546
Ontario, 2852, 2856
Political contributions, 3071
Principle of, 2792
Intact, 2990
Unsound, 2718, 2836
Protected industries and, 2957
"Protectionist budget," 3068, 3077
Quebec, 2852
Rigid adherence to by government, 2988
Sugar refiners, 2987
Suggested remedy for conditions, 1253
Tariff stability, 2648
United States and, 2751
Vancouver Creosoting Company, Limited, 3231
Wheat Board, 3235
Woollen industry, 3458

Providence, R.I. *See* Canadian National Railways; Terminals

Provinces, federal representation. *See* Redistribution

Provincial Governments. *See also* Immigration
Conferences on source of revenue, 65
Extravagance, 2797
Senators, nomination of, 1377

Provincial Jurisdiction. *See* British North America Act; Disallowance; Jurisdiction

Provincial Legislation. *See* Legislation

Provincial Rights. *See also* Disallowance; Jurisdiction; Legislation
Anglo-Japanese treaty, restriction of, 1453
Bankruptcy, 3097
Senate and, 1377
Water Powers. *See* Lake of the Woods

Public Accounts. *See* Board of Audit Bill

Public Archives, 3985
Building, addition to, 1730
Doughty, Dr. Arthur, Dominion Archivist, salary, 4673

Public Buildings. *See also* their respective titles; Public Works; Supply
Alberta, 1023
Calgary post office, 1024
Armouries, fittings and alterations, 1024
British Columbia
Bamfield, 1024
Victoria, old post office, 1024
Charlottetown, 4614
Coal purchases, 496
Economy in. *See* Printing Bureau
Experimental farms, 4629
Generally, 1025
High Commissioner's office, London, 4629
Improvements, repairs, 1024
Installation of fuel-saving devices, 4629
Manitoba, 4628
Brandon, 4628
Emerson, 4628
Winnipeg, 4628
Mansfield, Mr. William, dismissal, qu. 4512
Maritime provinces generally, 1022, 4614
Military hospitals, 4629
Montreal ordnance stores, 1022
Moose Jaw, 1023
New Brunswick, 4613
Nova Scotia, 4612
Ontario
Haileybury, 4615
Hamilton, 4628
Ottawa government workshops, 4616
Rideau hall, 4627
Royal Military college, 4628
Toronto, 4624
Casualty clearing station, 4621
Seed branch building, 4621
Ottawa, 1716
Daly building purchase, 1023
Departmental buildings, 1729, 4617
Compensation to architects, 4633
M. (Mr. Beland) to strike out, 1729 agreed to, 1730
Dominion archives, 1730
Parliament buildings, 1716. *See also that title*
Printing bureau, improvements, 1022
Policing, 778
Power for running elevators, 1025
Prince Edward Island, 4614
Quebec, 4614
Terrebonne, 2690, 4615

Public Buildings—*Con.*
Rents, 1025
Rockhead hospital, Halifax, 4613
St. John quarantine building, 1021, 1457, 4613
Sackville, 4613
Saskatchewan, 1023, 4629
Souris, 4614
Sussex, N.B., 4613
Tracadie lazaretto, 4613

Public Debt. *See also* Address; Budget; Debt; Finance; Immigration; Loans
Additions to, 2641, 2985, 3078. *See also under this title,* Increase
Budget, particulars of, 2898
Canadian National Railways, fixed charges, qu. 3323
Deficit, 3028
Increase of, 23, 91, 2814, 3072
From 1896-1922, 1173
From 1914–1923, 2842
Inheritance of present government, 2831
Interest, 2963, 2967, 3061
Magnitude of, 2963
Maturing obligations, 3822
Net debt and estimated additions, 2926
New York loan, 1922, 630, 649
Per capita debt, 2797, 2814, 2956, 2986
British Columbia, 2941
Problem of, 2784
Production cost and, 640
Reduction of, 2825, 3064
Responsibility for, 2920
Tariff reduction and, 2857
Taxation and, 2964
War burden, 2967, 2985
Years 1896, 1911, 1922, qu. 914

Public Expenditure. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget; Canadian National Railways; Estimates; Government, Economy
Administration, cost of, 2785
Apportionment of, 1072, 4560
Audit. *See* Board of Audit Bill
Civil government, cost of, 2968
Demand for, 3076
East and West, 3436
Economy. *See* Ministers, Salaries
Estimate for 1923-24, 2642
Expenditure, 1896-1922, qu. 914
Extravagance, 3043
Immigration, on, 1208
Increase, 1913-23, 2842
In excess of revenue, 1230
Profitable and productive, 3005
Public Works on, 2785
Railways, appropriation by Parliament, 4397

Public Expenditure—*Con.*
Reduction of, 2986, 3064
Responsibility for, 2920
Retrenchment, 2784
Special bills instead of estimates, 4304
Supplementary estimates, 4420
Taxation and, 3001
Total of $548,750,714, 4554
War, 2920
1914-1922, qu. 914

Public Harbours. *See* Harbours and Rivers

Public Health. *See* Health

Public Lands. *See* Dominion Lands; School Lands

Public Libraries
Postal rates, 1809
Sales tax, 1870

Public Life
Integrity of,3021
Rewards of, *See* Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner)

Public Ownership, 4190. *See also* Address; Budget; Canadian Government Merchant Marine; Canadian National Railways; St. Lawrence River Waterway
Canadian National Railways, 1614, 1618
Coal mines, 2727
Elevators, 2956
Proportional representation and, 426
Public utilities and large-scale industries, 2728
Railways, 1770, 2727, 2859, 2905, 2956, 3007, 3056, 3622, 4190
Radial, 2475
Tariff taxation, 2905
Toronto street railways, 2475

Public Service. *See also* Civil Service
Militia pension to retired officers in. *See* Militia Pensions

Public Service Retirement Act Amdt. Bill
(Extension of Calder Act for one year)
Res. 3323, 3402; 1r., 3403; 2r., com., 3r., 3977

Public Utilities. *See also* Public Ownership
Industrial disputes, 1703

Public Works. *See also* Public Buildings; Supply
Applications for, 2830
Bridges. *See that title*
Commitments, 961, 962

Public Works—*Con.*
Department
Chief Architect's branch, qu. 2517
Engineering branch, salaries, 1017
Engineers' reports, 4571
Morrison claim, on, 4723
Estimates, 941, 993, 1009, 1716, 2671, 2684, 4554, 4594
House of Commons furniture, qu. 1138
Hunter, Mr. J. B., deputy minister, salary, 4671
Paymaster, qu. 1257
St. Laurent, Late Mr. A., appreciaton, 1006
Salaries, 2684
Sullivan, Mr. A. W., 381
Dredging, 1009, 4590
British Columbia, 1014
Manitoba, Alberta, Saskatchewan, 1012
Maritime provinces, 1009, 4591
Ontario and Quebec, 1011
Plamondon, Alberta, 1012
Port Burwell, 1012
St. Lawrence ship channel, 3339
Dry docks. *See also* Dry Dock Act Amdt. bill
Champlain, 2681
Esquimalt, 2671
Prince Rupert, qu. 1664
Vancouver, 2671
Expenditure, 3073, 3076
By provinces, qu. 3387
Graving docks, locks, etc., 2681
Harbours and rivers. *See that title*
Local improvement taxes
Calgary, 1023
Kitchener, 1022
National gallery, 1018
National monument, Connaught place, 2685
Public Works Act, tender and contract, 950
Roads and bridges, 1014. *See also* Bridges; Highways
Rugs for departmental offices, qu., 1486
Surveys and inspections, 1020
Telegraph and telephone lines, 1017, 2682, 4590. *See also that title*
Wharves. *See also* Harbours and Rivers
St. John river, statement of Premier Veniot, qu. 1488
Wireless stations, 3337

Publication of Evidence. *See* Criminal Code Amdt. bill

Publications. *See* Government Publications

Publicity. *See also* Immigration; Press
Advertising, United States firms. *See* Magazines, M. (Mr. Hocken)
Agent in London, Cranfield, Mr. W. T., 2927, 2983, 4707

Publicity—*Con.*
Racing information. *See* Race Track Betting

Publishers. *See* Copyright Act Amdt. bill

Pugsley, Hon. William
Alien enemy property, 3823
Appointment, under Inquiries Act, qu. 1486, qu. 1993, 2498, 2494, 2710, 3043
Meighen, Right Hon. Mr., and, exchange of compliments, 2503
Reparation claims, investigation, qu. 4753
Salary, 3043

Pulp and Paper. *See also* Export Act Amdt. bill; Forests and Forestry; Lake of the Woods bill; Labour; Lumber; Magazines and Periodicals, M. (Mr. Hocken); Natural Resources; Timber
Fort Frances Pulp and Paper Company, 2572
Gaspe, 1242
Hudson Bay region, possibilities, 1072
Kipawa Pulp and Paper Company, 1402
Manitoba Pulp and Paper Company lease, 3254
Newsprint. *See also under this title,* Paper
Exemption from sales tax, 2979, 2999, 3046
Ten per cent duty proposed, 1267
Paper
Book paper, price in Canada and United States, 829
Control, 2572
Cost and sales tax, 2888
Magazine paper, prices, Canada and United States, 829
Manufacturers, payment of sales tax, 4415
Products, French treaty, 1981, 1987
Powell River Paper Company, labour organization, 2886
Pulpwood
Destruction by spruce bud worm, 818
Export of, 2711, 2950
Duty on, 2828
Freight rates, 3036
Permit to cut, 4206
Prices, 3036, 4345
Prohibition of export, 2648, 2750, 3416, 4012
See also Export Act Amdt. Bill
Royal commission to inquire into, 2648, 2711, 2948, 2950, 3412, 3413, 4709
Settlers and farmers, 4513
Riordan Company, business profits tax, qu. 1974, 4490

Pulpwood. *See this title* under Pulp and Paper

Purchasing Commission, 114, qu. 1385, 1674
Authority for, qu. 2699
Beer, Mr. L. H., 4704
La Fleche, Col. L. R., 4001
Salary, 3950
Salaries and contingencies, 4704
Supervision, government purchases and sales, 3950, 4001

Purchasing Power, 629, 637, 2928. *See also* Address; Budget; Civil Service; Cost of Living; Combines; Credits; Imperial Economic Conference; Money: Prices
Dollar, 3024
Europe, depreciation of, 1859
Farmers, 1408, 1851
Lack of, 4053
Limitation of, 2716
Money, 1168, 4067, 4666
Reduced, 2737, 2812
Tariff and, 2737
Unemployment and, 2725
Work and saving, necessary to increase, 2743

Pure-Bred Cattle. *See* Live Stock, accredited herds

Putnam, Mr. Harold (Colchester)
Address in reply, mover, 9. Visit of their Excellencies to West; deceased members, 10; beauty and history of Maritime provinces, 10-11; natural resources; new leader of Progressive party, 11; Vimy Ridge site donated by France; trade relations with France and Italy; Near East crisis, 12-13; Canadian National Railways, new board of directors; Moncton Intercolonial headquarters, 13; Sir Henry Thornton, 13-14; pension rights of Grand Trunk employees; Great lakes shipping investigation, 14; cattle embargo; diminution of unemployment; improved economic conditions; member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Rheaume) 15
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4061
British preference, attitude of Mr. Senn, 2959
Canadian national parks and historic sites, 3440
Canadian National Railways
Grand Trunk, Portland terminal, 1769
New board of directors, 13
Cheque tax, 3034
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 525
Civil Service appointments, 376

Putnam, Mr. Harold—*Con.*
Combines bill, 2597, 2618, 2626
Registrar, inquiry, 2626
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 2382
Farmers' earnings, 2813
French treaty bill, 2248
Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia, 4561
Lack of confidence, M. (Mr. Irvine) 242
Liberal party pledges, 3035
Macphail, Miss, members and party funds, 4238
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2437, 2445, 2457, 2463
Judges, 2464
Nationality, dual, 2445
Secretary of State
Administration, 2464
Power of, 2457
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3515, 3569
Patents of Invention bill, 2071
Reciprocity agreement of 1854, 2918
Renovated butter, 4268
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4238
Trade commissioners, 856
Truro
Park, 3440
Subway, 4454

Quarantine. *See* Health

Quebec (city)
Arsenal, 884, 1740
Bonus to employees, 1751, 1772
Champlain market station, 4446
Civil Service employes, 387
Demers, Mr. A., mail contractor, qu. 1868
Immigrants, supplies, 496
Immigration dept. employees, qu., 2517, qu. 3141, qu., 3144, qu., 4302, qu.,4752
Quebec battlefields commission, 3432
Historic sites, 3406
Riots, 893

Quebec (port)
Cattle shipments, 2807
Champlain graving dock, 2675, 2682
Cold storage, 2055
Grain
Congestion, 3765
Diversion to, 3765
Elevator, 3768
Shipment, 4233
Wheat, qu. 3820
Harbour commissioners, names and salaries, qu. 1136
Lorne graving dock, 2682
St. Charles river improvement works, 4446
Transcontinental railway and, 3681

Quebec (province)
Agricultural conditions, 1908, 2764
Bankruptcy. *See* Bankruptcy Act
Bonded liquor warehouses, 2404
Canadian Air Force, 1748
Civil Code. *See* Bankruptcy Act
Community of property, 2880
Dairying industry, cold storage, 2764
Dredging, 1011, 4590
Emigration to United States, 1404, 2834
Experimental farms, 459
Harbours and rivers, 950, 1008, 4588. *See also that title*
Highways, 814, 2341, 3180. *See also* Canada Highways; Highways
Immigration, 1085, 1104, 1198, 1200
Indians, 2124
Labelle county development, 4199
Legislature , Bankruptcy Act, 3091
Northern, conditions, 3037
Protection sentiment, 2852
Public buildings, 4614
Railways, 4189
Repatriation of Canadians, 1085

Quebec Conference, 2348

Quebec-North Shore St. Lawrence steamship service, 2175

Quebec Savings Bank Act, 4405

Quebec Savings Bank Act Amdt. Bill
1r., 4183; 2r., com., 3r., 4392

Queen Charlotte Islands, 150

Questions. *See their several titles.* For rulings, *See* Deputy Speaker; House of Commons; Speaker

Questions Passed as Orders for Returns
Agriculture dept. officials attending fairs (Mr. Leader) 285
Arctic expedition (Mr. Parent) 4012
Bacon imports and exports (Mr. Kennedy, Edmonton) 938
Canada Temperence Act, correspondence (Mr. Stevens) 1032
Canadian National Railways
Coal purchases (Mr. Hanson) 4303
Doctors, employment (Mr. d'Anjou) 814
Dorchester employees (Mr. Cannon) 2088
Fixed charges (Mr. Euler) 708
Hotels, (Mr. Coote) 938
Mileage (Mr. Tobin) 914
Statistics, (Sir Henry Drayton) 207
Canadian Pacific Railway, (Mr. Kellner) 626; (Mr. Lucas) 625, 3704
Civil Service
Inside and outside (Mr. McQuarrie) 3264

Questions Passed as Orders for Returns— *Con.*
Civil Service—*Con.*
Quebec city and district, (Mr. Cannon), 387
Returned soldiers (Mr. McKillop) 386
Statistics (Mr. Crerar) 207
Temporary employees, (Mr. Archambault) 1385
Made permanent (Mr. Archambault) 814
Customs and excise duties (Mr. Black, Huron) 814
Customs officials, Halton county (Mr. Anderson) 914
Dominion lands, pre-emption area (Mr. McTaggart) 1032
Dorchester penitentiary, (Mr. Michaud) 494
Exports and products, agricultural (Mr. Garland, Bow River) 814
Fuel
Joint Peat Com. (Mr. Irvine) 387
Lignite Utilization board (Mr. Irvine) 387
Grain and grain trade
Elevator overages (Mr. Millar) 494
Terminal elevators (Mr. Stevens) 3821
Highways
Dundas street (Mr. Anderson) 708
Projected, Ontario (Mr. Wilson) 624
Quebec, (Mr. Prevost) 814
Immigration, staff transfer, (Mr. Lavigueur) 2517
Income tax collections (Mr. Black, Huron) 733
Indian reserves, grain production (Mr. Evans) 1139
Levis
Dry dock, (Mr. Archambault) 1261
Postmasters (Mr. Bourassa) 519
Montreal, grain shipments, (Mr. Coote) 1974
National Defence, payments (Mr. Boys) 386
Oleomargarine, butter and (Mr. Sutherland) 386
Purchasing Commission, (Mr. Kennedy, Edmonton) 1385
Railway grades, etc. (Mr. McBride) 625
Railway statistics (Sir Henry Drayton) 207
Sales tax exemptions (Sir Henry Drayton) 708
School lands (Mr. McTaggart) 1032
Soldiers' Settlement Board, Edmonton, (Mr. Boys) 3506
Soldier settlement, Missisquoi and Brome (Mr. Kay) 4012
Valcartier camp grounds (Mr. Delisle) 2298

Race Equality. *See* Immigration, Oriental; Naturalization

Race Track Betting, 3059. *See also* Criminal Code Amdt.
M. (Mr. Good) 494, 709-764, neg. on div. 766

Radial Railways. *See* Canadian National Railways

Radiotelegraphy, 3337. *See also* Telegraphs and Telephones; Wireless
Licenses, 3338
Revenue, 3337
Manitoba, arrangement with, 3338
Military signal service, 3338
Post office and, 1780
Radio-direction finding, qu. 3820
Radiotelegraph regulations tabled, 3045
Radiotelegraph service, 3374
Wireless service, etc., 3374

Radiotelegraph Act Amdt. Bill (License fees)
Res. 2086, 2284; 1r., 2287; 2r., 2467; com., 2468; 3r., 2468
Sections and substitutes discussed:
Apportionment of fees, 2468
Broadcasting stations, 2468
Licenses, 2467

Railway Act 1919 Amdt. Bills
1. Freight rates, discrimination (Mr. Stevens) 1r., 54
2. Return tickets (Mr. Jacobs) 1r., 615
3. Rates, equalization of; grain movement. (Mr. Kennedy, Edmonton), 1r., 730

Railway Commissioners, Board of. *See also* Crowsnest Pass Agreement; Freight Rates; Railways
Appeal from to Privy Council, 1284, 1307, 1912, 1926, 1936
Branch lines, approval of, 4327
Canadian National Railways, and, 666
Carvell, Hon. F. B.
Alleged statements, 1869, 1910
Appeal to Privy Council, 1912
Calgary speech, 3191
Letter to boards of trade, British Columbia, 1915, 1945
Letter from Vancouver Board of Trade, 3189
Motherwell, Hon. Mr., alleged statement, 3188
Removal of, 3188
Commissioners
Addresses and occupations previous to appointment, qu. 1973
Names, salaries, etc., qu. 1260
Establishment of board in 1903, 1929
Estimates, 3188
Judgment, June 30th, 1922, 1914
Lake grain rates, 4218. *See also that title*

Railway Commissioners—*Con.*
Langley, Hon. Mr., statement, 3190
Maclean, Mr. S. J., pamphlet, 3194
Manitoba—Canadian Northern agreement, 1932
Parliamentary interference with, 1762
Rates, fixing, 1761
Report, eighteenth annual, 1659
Rutherford, the late Dr., 3192
Shipping rates, control of, qu. 2611
Subsidized steamboats, rates, 2174, 4003
Western Canada, representation, 3192

Railway Mail Service. *See* Post Office

Railways. *See also* Address; Budget; Canadian National Railways; Freight Rates; Hudson Bay Railway
Accidents, 3957
Annual statement by Minister of Railways, 1558
Appropriations, statement, 2926
Baltimore and Ohio, promotion, 2828
Branch lines, 1568, 1735, 3006. *See also* Canadian National Railways
Expenditure, appropriation of, 4339, 4344
Gaspe, 1243
Calgary & Edmonton Railway Company, qu. 624
Canadian National Railways. *See that title*
Caraquet and Gulf Shore, purchase, qu. 1258, 2938, 2939
Construction, 1440
Co-operation of, 1965
Deficits, 2747
Department. *See* Railways and Canals
Drayton-Acworth commission, 1761
Earnings, flour transportation, Buffalo-New York, 2960
Electrification, 3422
Excursion tickets, qu. 1485
Express charges, 2876
Freight rates. *See that title*
Gaspe-Edmundston, 1243
Gaspe peninsula, 4186
Grades, rates, qu. 625, 1917
Grain shipments, diversion, 2898. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade
Great Britain, 1618
Highways and motors, 1619
Immigration and land settlement, 1180, 1193, 2801, 1337
Interstate Commerce Commission, 3059
James Bay railway, 1036-49, 1073, 1402
Labour, organized, 126, 1426. *See also* Labour
Land grants to, 1353
Lands, purchases, sales, 1739
Late Minister of. *See* Kennedy, Hon. W. C.

Railways—*Con.*
Maritime provinces, 4186
Michigan Central bridge, Niagara Falls, qu. 1864
Minister of, appointment, Hon. Mr. Graham, 2295
New York Central, promotions, 2828
Pacific-Great Eastern, 4700
Peace River district, 1433, 3006. *See also that title*
Pennsylvania, promotions, 2828
Pools and running rights, 3058
Prince Edward Island, car ferry claim, 4676
Problems of, 1880. *See also* Address; Budget; Freight Rates
Public ownership, 2956. *See also* Canadian National Railways
Quebec and Saguenay railway, 4190
Radial, 3056
Railway labour, wages, 2876, 3190
Railway mail service, 4529. *See also* Post Office
Payments for, qu. 3143
Railway rates, equalization. *See* Freight Rates
Railway subsidies, 2902, 4303
St. John valley railway, 4311
Settlement, western provinces, 2833
Settlements far removed from, 3431
Shipping facilities. *See* St. John; Vancouver
Statistics, 207
Strikes. *See* Labour
Surveys and inspections, 4691, 4698
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario, 1071, 3056
Ties
Freight rates, 3036
Prices, 3036
Transfer charges, 2876
United States, 1618. *See also that title*
Company-owned, 3057
Winnipeg-St. Croix across Maine, 2902

Railways and Canals. *See also* Canals; Railways
Canadian Government Merchant Marine. *See that title*
Canadian National Railways. *See that title*
Canals. *See that title*
Department
Bell, Major Graham A., deputy minister, salary, 3195, 4557
Canada Highways Commission, 2489. *See also* Highways
Contingencies, further amount, 3377
Estimates, 1619, 2489, 3173, 3188, 3195, 3376, 3650, 3610, 3676, 3760

Railways and Canals—*Con.*
Department—*Con.*
Graham, Hon. George P., appointed minister, 2295
Intercolonial-Prince Edward Island pensions, 3195
Minister, appointment of, 519, 2295
Inquiry, 1081
Printing and stationary, outside service, 3197
Railway surveys and inspections, 3648
Salaries, 3195
Water powers, 3421
Wedge, Mr. George, employment, qu. 2697
Expenditure by provinces, qu. 3887

Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines Committee
Change in personnel, 2252
Report, 2252

Rainbow Shingle Mills, strike. *See* Labour, Strikes

Raisins and Dried Currants. *See* Budget; Customs Tariff; Fruit

Ralph Connor, writings, immigration, 1181

Ralston Commission. *See* Pensions, Royal Commission

Ralston, Col. J. L. *See* Disallowance of Nova Scotia Statute

Raney, Hon. W. E. *See* Ontario

Rates. *See* Freight Rates

Raw Materials, free trade in, 2858

Rawding, Mr., Clementsport, N.S., postmaster, 1795

Raymond, Mr. W. G. (Brantford)
Address in reply, 160. Conditions in West as portrayed by western members, 160; congratulations to Mr. Forke; tariff for revenue, 161; the amendments; redistribution; Near East crisis, 162; attitude of Prime Minister, 163-164; status of Canada and foreign policy of Great Britain, 165; Canada's participation in wars of 1763 and 1812, 165-166
Budget, 2741. Cheerful sentiments of member for Skeena; tribute to Minister of Finance; budget acceptable to country; "standing pat"; "tariff stability" 2741; British preference; sales tax; beet sugar tax; wines; criticism of Sir Henry Drayton; French treaty; comparison of Canadian and United States catalogue prices, 2742; emigration to

Raymond, Mr. W. G.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
United States; cost of living; Canadians coming back; election of 1921; tariff issue; tariff concessions to Progressive party; an unresponsive attitude; wealth, levy upon; national debt; banks; widows and orphans; stockholders; capital and labour, 2743; purchasing power; natural resources, valuable only when developed; capital and capitalists, antagonism to; communists, socialists, anarchists, Bolshevists; property, protection of; Russia, example of; sugar, reduction of duty; postal war tax; postal rates, comparison Canada with United States, 2744; tariff, more important questions than, 2745; grain and grain trade; transportation; immigration and tariff go hand in hand; revenue proposals of Progressive party; income tax, proposal to increase; luxuries, taxation of; land tax; free trade, 2745; United States, trade with; tariff not a theoretical question; no surrender of Canadian market, 2746
French treaty bill, 2245
Agricultural implements, 2246
Agricultural products, 2247
Luxuries, 2742
Postage, war tax, 2744
References to speech on budget, 2747, 2756, 2787
Secession, 2244

Raymond and Talbot, Messrs., Rimouski harbour claim, 4588

Readjustment of Representation. *See* Redistribution Bill

Rebellion of 1837, 1365

Receipt Tax. *See* Special War Revenue Act; Taxation

Reciprocity with United States, 85, 1196, 1223, 1246, 2243, 2810, 2948, 2966, 3049. *See also* speeches on Budget; Markets; Trade; Treaties, French Treaty; United States
Agricultural implements, 3017
Amdt. (Mr. Forke) 3016
Authority to negotiate, 3016
Blaine, late Hon. James G., statement, 2922
Boots and shoes, 3016, 3499
Building brick, 3017
Cattle industry and, 3082. *See also Live* Stock; Markets

Reciprocity with United States—*Con.*
"Clear-cut" issue, 3081
Coal, anthracite and lignite, 3493
Commercial union, 3906,3907, 3911
Commission of 1897, 3014
Fetish of, 2952
Fishing interests and, 2906, 3082, 3906
Goods on free list, 3017
Great Britain-France, 3050. *See also Treaties,* French Treaty
Herschell, Lord, 3014
History of, 2842
Leather, 3017
Markets for manufactured products, 2856
Natural and manufactured products, 2910
Natural resources, interchange, 2910
"Noble Eighteen," 2908
Offer to negotiate, 2649, 2650, 2806, 2829, 2831, 2838, 2843, 2847, 2854, 2909, 2910, 2917, 2922, 2934, 2937, 2958, 2972, 2977, 2992, 3011, 3013, 3016, 3060, 3078, 3454, 3473, 3901, 3905
Fruits and vegetables, 2977
New York Times, 2968
Permanency, 3017, 3079
Reciprocity agreement of 1854, 2842, 2910, 2918, 3013
Reciprocity agreement of 1911, 2718, 2778, 2832, 2931
Campaign, 2734, 3014
Defeat of, 1233, 2851, 2922, 2924, 2931
Conservative alliance with Nationalists, 2924
Evidence of attitude, Liberal party, 3010
Herring drawn across trail, 3013
Letter, Hon. Messrs. Fielding and Paterson, 3081
Liberals who opposed, 2851
"No truck or trade with the Yankees," 3015, 3075, 3080
Omissions from proposed agreement, 3902
Western provinces, opposition to, 2854
Screen for failure to implement tariff pledges, 2951
Sentiment towards, 3082
Standing offer by Canada and United States, 3016
Termination of recent arrangement, 2993
Treaty of 1818 weapon in dealing with United States, 2906
Use of Canadian ports by fishing vessels, 2906

Reclamation. *See* Dominion Lands; Interior; Lands

Reconstruction in Europe, 3003. *See also* Germany, Reparations

Recreation Grounds. *See* Canadian National Parks and Historic Sites; National Parks and Reservations

Red Cross Society
Grant to, 2169
Vetcraft shops, 694

Red Deer
Hebridean immigrants, 3584. *See also* Immigration
Valley, Coal Operators' Association, 1275

Red River, Manitoba, wharf, 1000

Redistribution, 27, 40, 162. *See also* Proportional Representation; Redistribution Bill
Delay, 2400
Electoral reforms. *See* Proportional Representation
Intention of government, inquiry, 4250
Ivel, Mr. W. M., reported employment, 733
Marshall, Mr. Duncan and, 3313
Nova Scotia, and, 73
Opportunity for discussion, 4593
Welland, Lincoln, Haldimand counties, 667

Redistribution Bill (Readjustment of representation in the House of Commons)
1r., 250-254; 2r., 436; ref. to Special Com., 487, 572-574
Special Committee, 2979
Leave to report, 857, 937
Number of members, 488-9
Privilege, Mr. Sutherland, 1660
Reference to, 487, 572-4
Reports, qu. 2612
First, 857
Second, 3399
Third, 4510, 4593, concurred in, 4736-42

Reed, Mr. William S. (Frontenac)
Budget, 2830. Tribute to Ministers of Finance and Railways; rural mail system; immigration; public works; Canadian National Railways; public debt; national problems; natural resources; oriental immigration, 2830; western provinces, conditions Ontario and Quebec, industrial development and agricultural depression; Maritime provinces, commercial disadvantage due to remoteness of market; equitable treatment of all provinces; educational opportunities, 2831

Re-Establishment. *See* Pensions; Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment

Reforestation. *See* Forests and Forestry

Reform of Senate. *See* Senate

Regimental Funds. *See* National Defence

Regina Photo Supply Company, sales tax, qu. 518

Registrars. *See* Admiralty Act Amdt.; Bankruptcy Act

Reid, Capt. John, Hudson Bay railway, 1046

Reindeer in "Barren Lands", Mr. Stefansson's statement, 1073

Rejected Immigrants. *See* Immigration

Relief of distressed Canadians, 1456

Relief Work. *See* Unemployment

Renfrew postmastership, qu. 205

Renovated Butter. *See* Dairy Industry Act Amdt. bill

Rents. *See* Cost of Living; Public Buildings

Reparations, 2498, 4653. *See also* Germany, Reparations; Pugsley; War Claims

Repatriation. *See* Immigration; Naturalization Act

Repentigny, Que. wharf, 977

Reports Tabled, 3, 8-9, 33, 54, 74, 99, 122, 202, 250, 331, 574, 812, 767, 911, 936, 986, 1080, 1156, 1307, 1361, 1384, 1539, 1631, 1659, 1686, 1910, 2204, 2252 2611, 2837, 2885, 2926, 4075, 4510

Representation. *See also* Proportional Representation; Redistribution
Irreducible minimum of, qu. 285
Readjustment of. *See* Redistribution

Research. *See also* Mines and Minerals
Central research institute, 788
Helium, discoveries in, 703, 4439
Medical discoveries, 1287. *See also* Banting, Reward for. *See titles,* M. (Mr. Ladner)
Scientific and industrial research
Discoveries, 4439
Honorary advisory council
Expenditure, qu. 731
Oil shale deposits, 2514
Patents of invention, 2082

Reservations. *See* National Parks and Reservations

Reserves. *See* Indians

Resignation of Government. *See* Lack of Confidence

Resolutions, The Ninety-Two. *See* Senate, M. (Mr. Denis)

Resources. *See* Natural Resources

Responsible Government. *See* Lack of Confidence

Restaurant. *See* Parliamentary Restaurant

Restaurants, profiteering, 2586

Retail Merchants' Association of Canada
Oleomargarine, 3551

Retired Officers. *See also* Militia Pension Act Amdt. Bill
Indian Army officers, settlement in British Columbia, 1096

Retirement Act. *See* Civil Service; Public Service

Returned Soldiers. *See* Civil Service; Labour, Unemployment; Soldiers; Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment

Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act Amdt. Bill,
(Application in force though applicant died before delivery of policy; decision to be reviewed)
Res. 3582, 3743; 1r., 3745; 2r., com., 3r., 3892; Senate amdts. 4734, 4750

Returns. *See* House of Commons

Reuters' News Service, 4712

Revenue. *See also* speeches on Budget; Customs and Excise; Imports and Exports; Revenue Bills; Taxation; Trade
Amdt. (Mr. Forke), 3016
Collected during war, 2985
Direct taxation, 2836
Estimate of, 3074
1923-24, 2642
Expenditure and, 3064
French treaty and, 1983. *See also* Treaties, French Treaty
Income tax, 2858
Unearned income, 3026
Luxuries, tax on, 2858
Methods of raising, 2784, 3016. *See also* Taxation
New sources, 2828, 2909
Progressive policy and, 2817
Revenue, 1896-1923, qu. 913
Tariff, 2745, 3025
Reduction and, 2857
Taxation and, 3301
Unearned income, 2954, 3026

Revenue Bills
1. Customs Tariff Act, 1907, Amdt. bill
Res., 2650, 3963; 1r., 3963; 2r., com., 4408; 3r., 4409
2. Income War Tax Act, 1917, Amdt. bill
Res., 4440, 4491; 1r., 4502; 2r., com., 4504; 3r., 4505
3. Inland Revenue Act Amdt. bill
Res., 2655, 3229; 1r., 3242; com., 4392; 3r., 4393
4. Special War Revenue Act Amdt. bill
Res., 2656, 3922, 4181, amended, 4363; 1r., 4183; 2r., com., 4409; 3r., 4435

Revenue Stamps. *See* Post Office

Revised Statutes, procedure in criminal matters, qu. 1974

Rheaume, Mr. J. T. (Jacques Cartier)
Address, in reply, seconder, 16; late Mr. Lafortune, 16; Canada's financial condition; marked progress in industry; necessity for increased immigration, 17
Introduced, 3

Rhineland. *See* Germany

Rice, freight rates, 1915

Richmond and Wolfe Counties
Accredited herds, qu., 813
Soldier settlement, 913

Rideau Canal. *See* Canals

Rideau Hall, expenditure, 4627

Right of Appeal. *See* Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt.

Right, Petition of. *See* Petition of Right

Riley, Mr. E. T., 60

Riley's Army, transportation, 3042

Rimouski Harbour
Claim of Messrs. Raymond and Talbot, 4588
Wharf, 977

Rinfret, Mr. Fernand (St. James)
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4145
Canadian National Railways, branch lines bill, 4195
Canadian Press, Limited, 2587
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 539
Combines bill, 2587
Copyright Act, 2343
M. for amendment of, 495
Deputy Ministers, French language, 1805-08
Deputy Postmaster General, appointment, 1805

Rinfret, Mr. Fernand—*Con.*
Emigration to the United States, 1173
Farm labour, 1174
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1175
Empire settlement scheme, 1175
Policy, 1172
Restriction of, 1174
Newspaper postage, 4535
Population, net increase, 1173
Post offices, number in Montreal, qu. 3135
Public debt, increase, 1896-1922, 1173
Public ownership of railways, 4195
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good), 720
Royal Academy of Arts bill, 281
Rural depopulation, 1174
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4185
Wine and beer excise taxes, qu. 518

Riordon Pulp and Paper Company
Business profits tax, 4490
Arrears, qu. 1974

Riots, Aid of militia in. *See* National Defence; Troops

Rivière du Lièvre wharf, 978

Roads and Bridges. *See* Bridges; Highways; Public Works

Robb, Hon. J. A. (Minister of Trade and Commerce)
Agricultural conditions, 1837, 1846
Agricultural implements, standardization, 796
Australia
Trade treaty with, 1848, 3475, 3476
Visit to, 1848-49, 2815, 3017, 3474, 3475
Belgian exposition, 496
British and foreign news service, 4712
British preference
Canadian ports, direct importation, 3457
Woollen goods, 3459
Business conditions, review of, 1837, 1846
Canada-West Indies treaty, 3378
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, steamship services, 3385
Canadian travelling exhibition in France, 4712
Coasting regulations, suspension of, 4290
Copyright Act Amdt. bill, 487, 2139, 2287, 2343, 2436, 3154
Amdt. clause 2, 2291
Cost of living, 1812
Credit and industry, M. (Mr. Irvine), 651
Dairying industry, 1839
Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 788

Robb, Hon. J. A.—*Con.*
Electric power, exportation, M. (Mr. Deslauriers) 663
Farm mortgages, 1839
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4271, 4549
Fiji islands, trade with, 1848
French treaty bill, 2239
Balance of trade, 2239
Boots and shoes, 2240
Bronze powder, 2017
Favoured nation, 2242
Fuel supply, 796
Gasoline and oil pumps, inspection, 811
Government publications, 811
Grain and grain trade
Adulteration of grain at United States ports, 3649, 3961
Canada Grain Act
Administration, 781, 4709
Litigation, 2045
Validity, 782
Dockage, 783
Elevators
Edmonton, 4718
Government
Grain passing through, 2037
Value, 2037
Halifax, 4714
Lethbridge, 4718
Mixing, 2036
Montreal, short weights, complaint, 2037
Ontario, 2037, 2039
Quebec, grain shipment, 4233
Screenings, 2039, 2041, 2254
Vancouver improvements, 2033
Weights, difference in, 2037
Grain commissioners, board of, 2036
Salaries, 4709
Grain Inquiry Commission, 1764, 4710, 4711
Manitoba Court of Appeal decision, 1210
Rates, 4290
Royal commission to inquire into, 1210
Screenings, 2254
Shipments, congestion, 3767
Transportation, insurance, 3764
Harbours and rivers, New Brunswick, 4587
Immigration Act Amdt. (Mr. Neill) 507
Lake Grain Rates bill, 3960, 4218-35, 4276, 4285, 4290
Lake grain rates, royal commission, 4710
Report, 2885, 3045
London Corn Exchange, complaint, 3649
Oil bounty, Alberta, 2510
Oil companies, stock selling, 781
Oil, fuel and lubricating, standardizing, 809
Oriental immigration, 507
Patents of Invention bill, 331, 2064, 2083, 2087, 3154

Robb, Hon. J. A.—*Con.*
Patents of Invention—*Con.*
Appeal to Exchequer court, 2080
Commissioner, duties and powers, 2065, 2128
Domicile, election of, 2070
Foreign patents, 2068
Petroleum bounties, 780
Raisins and dried currants, 3476. *See also under this title,* Australia
Russian trade mission, 987
Shipping combines, prosecution, 4228
Steamship services, 2171, 3377, 4701
Canada-Newfoundland, 3377
Canada-West Indies-South America, 3377
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 3385
Contracts, 2172
Inspection, 2178
Mackenzie river, 2176
Magdalen islands, 2174
Mediterranean, proposed, 1637
Northern Alberta, 2176
Pictou-Magdalen islands, 2174
Railway Commission and, 4004
Rates, control of, 2174
Subventions, 2171
Victoria-West Coast-Vancouver island, 4003
Toronto seed branch building, 4625
Trade. *See also under this title,* Australia, French Treaty
Annual report, 1910
Commissioners, 1837
Exports, 1838
Oriental, 507
West Indies-Col. Amery, 3392
Trade and Commerce dept.
Canada Grain Act, 2035
Commercial intelligence service, 1837
Estimates, 780, 1837, 2031, 2033, 2171, 3377, 4003, 4701
Patents and Copyright branch, 2035
Salaries and contingencies, 2031
Staff, 2031
Trade Marks and Designs bill, 331, 2063, 2293
Weights and measures, inspection, 810
Wheat board legislation, 2696
Extension by order in council, 3045
Woollen industry, protection, 930

Roberge, Mr. Eusèbe (Megantic)
Introduced, 3

Roberts, Mr. J. H., imprisonment, 1660

Roberts, Hon. W. F., secession, 3145

Roberval, Que. wharf, 978

Robichaud, Mr. J. G. (Gloucester)
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4120
Budget, 2935. Congratulations to Finance Minister; Progressive party; policy futile and action ill-advised, 2935; economic conditions and remedies; "blue ruin" speeches; confidence in future; remedy proposed worse than disease; conditions prior to 1896; return of Liberal party under Sir Wilfrid Laurier; revival of business; depression following war; country again on road to prosperity; trade revival shown by import and export figures, 2936; Banking and Commerce committee, inquiry; British preference, increase of; direct importation; reciprocity with United States; Canadian seaports, 2937; Bay of Fundy; Shippegan; Hudson Bay railway; wheat shipment, facilities of eastern ports; Sir Sandford Fleming, report, 2938; Caraquet and Gulf Shore railway; comparative mileages, 2939; National railway policy; fishing industry; disabilities under United States tariff; legislation; modus vivendi; secession talk, 2940
Canada-West Indies steamship service, 3394
Coastal regulations, suspension of, 2960
Deep sea fisheries, development, 3365
Fish, express rates on, 3365
Introduction, 3
Pensions, 3710
Vimy Ridge memorial, 184
Wharves, revenue, 976

Robinson, Mr. E. W. (King's, N.S.)
Address in reply, 72; redistribution, effect on Nova Scotia; immigration campaign; condition of European markets, 73
Boy Scouts, 879
Cadet services, 879
Magazines and periodicals, M. (Mr. Hocken) 834

Robitaille, Mr. Clement (Maisonneuve)
Montreal post office, daylight saving, qu. 3143

Robson, Judge. *See* Combines

Roche, Hon. W. J., 354-5. *See also* Civil Service Commission

Rockefeller Foundation, hospital standardization, 2934

Rocky Mountain Park. *See* Canadian National Parks and Historic Sites
Stipendiary magistrate, 1739

Rodin's Statue of France, 2832

Rods. *See* Copper Bars or Rods; Steel

Roentgen, discoverer of X-rays, 1287

Rogers, Hon. Robert, St. Croix harbour, 2900

Rombough, Mr. R. M., 387

Rondeau, Ont. pier, 983

Root Vegetables. *See* Vegetables

Root Vegetables, Sale and Inspection, Bill (Inspection certificate evidence of grade and condition). Mr. Caldwell. 1r., 937

Rosoman, Mr. Cyril E., postmaster, Mara, B.C., qu. 1489, qu. 1739

Ross, Mr. George. *See* Post Office

Ross, Mr. A. E. (Kingston)
Annual drill, 4636
Biological Board Act Amdt. bill, 3974
Breakwaters, appropriations for, 4563
British preference, woollen industry, 3462
Budget, 2932. Amendment; Finance Minister's statement unsatisfactory; Liberal platform of 1919; European unrest and dissatisfaction; British navy best guarantee of peace; exodus; reasons for the movement; preference of British immigrants for Australia and New Zealand, 2932; proposals to disband mounted police, discontinue military training and curtain naval service; pre-election promises and pledges; food prices not going down; tuberculin test; special delivery letters, cost of; military training expenditure and results; cabinet ministers—are they required?; income tax, widows' exemption; reciprocity; domination of United States; educational system; medical course; standardization of hospitals;political and social system; weighing and measuring babies; moral influence; Canada's favourable position; not advisable to open door to United States, 2934; chief reliance upon British stock; confidence in courage and bravery of French-Canadian race, 2935
Cadet services, 879
Canadian offices in London, 4630
Certified milk, 3300
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 540
Grant, Dr., civil service, 541

Ross, Mr. A. E.—*Con.*
Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia, 4563
Hebridean immigrants, treatment of, 3594
Hector celebration, 4636
Immigrants rejected, 706, qu. 1992
Medical advisory boards, 697
Military hospitals, qu. 282, 669, 673
Maintenace cost, qu. 812
Sydenham, qu. 386, 626
Militia Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3975
Milk pasteurization, 3300
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3869
Pensions
European war and active militia, 3724
Pension commissioners, salaries, 3743
Portsmouth postmaster, 1832
Shipping rates, 3783
Soldiers' Civil Re-establshment
Hospitals. *See under this title,* Military hospitals
Salaries, 669
Soldier settlement, 2030
Board, qu. 2180
Ontario, qu. 492
Salaries, 2017
Tuberculin test, 2933, 3284, 3300
Welland canal construction, 3782

Ross, Mr. Thomas E. (North Simcoe)
Canadian National Express, qu. 707
Collingwood harbour dredging, 4578
Feeding Stuffs Act, conference, 606
Great Northwestern Telegraph Company, qu. 707
Millfeeds conference, 606
Postal appointments, 1801
Rural mail carriers
Compensation for loss, 1833
Remuneration, 1792

Roumanian Loan, qu. 623, 2010

Rowell, Hon. N. W., 318

Royal Academy of Arts, Bill respecting, (Mr. Rinfret) 1r., 281

Royal Assent, 1809, 1818, 3829, 4755

Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 866. *See also* Narcotic Drugs; Naturalization
Cape Sabine, post, 3944
Cost and estimates, 1148
Duties, seven day week, 4514
Enforcement of federal statutes, 699, 777
Espionage, 1142
Estimates, 774, 1163
Fitzpatrick, Mr. F. J. E., article in Maple Leaf, 1140
Force and officers, 1141

Royal Canadian Mounted Police—*Con.*
Investigations and convictions by, 1144-5
Legal adviser, Mr. Donald Downie, 777
Motions for disbandment of, 2933
M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 816, 1139, neg. on div, 1152
Naturalization, 779. *See also that title*
Nelson district withdrawal from, 2943
Opium and Narcotic Drug Act, enforcement, 697
Ottawa departmental buildings, policing, 778
Pay, 777
Pensions, 774, qu. 1362
Reorganization, 776
Scrip, qu. 1362
Seizure of books and property, 1142
Strength and work of force, 1144

Royal Canadian Navy. *See* National Defence, Naval Service

Royal Commissions. For individual commissions, *see their titles*
Appointments to, 2710. *See also* Judges Act Amdt.
Federal and provincial jurisdiction, 1209-1212
Judges and, 3604
Lake grain rates. *See* Freight Rates, Shipping

Royal Mail Steam Packet Company. *See* Steamship Services

Royal Military College, 4628

Royal Naval College. *See* Esquimalt

Royal Northwest Mounted Police. *See* Royal Canadian

Rugs, for departmental offices, qu. 1486

Ruhr District, invasion. *See* Germany, Reparations

Rules of the House. *See* House of Commons

Rulings. *See* Deputy Speaker; Marcil; Speaker

Rural Constituencies. *See* Proportional Representation

Rural Credits. *See* Bank Act Amdt. bill; Credits

Rural Depopulation, 35, 1126, 1165, 1174, 1182, 1189, 1234, 1394, 1406, 1432, 1844, 1860, 1906. *See also* Emigration; Farmers; Labour; Population
Causes of, 1133
Economic conditions, 1856

Rural Depopulation—*Con.*
Great Britain in, 1854
United States, 2829
Wealth, production of, 1856

Rural Mail. *See* Post Office

Rural Postmasters. *See* Post Office, Postmasters

Rush-Bagot Treaty. *See* Treaties

Russell, Mr. James, employment, qu. 1868

Russia
Bolshevism, 2744
Immigration, 1340, 2845
Relations with, 44-45, 3401
Russian trade mission, 986, 987

Rutherford Commission. *See* Race Track Betting

Ryckman, Mr. E. B. (East Toronto)
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4140
Budget, 2912. Budget disappointing; accounts not balanced, currency depreciated, exchange unfavourable; trying to satisfy too many factions; incidence of taxation; summer trade; stability not finality; sales tax; pyramiding; passing on to farmer, housewife and labourer, 2912; cigarette tax; income tax; production and revenue lessened; based on fallacy that taxation of rich relieves poor; Mr. Otto H. Kahn; income tax reduction in United Kingdom and United States, 2913; capital diverted from industry to tax free bonds; immigration and investment discouraged; graduated income tax; alternative between new taxation or economy, 2914; ministers' salaries and members' indemnities; aristocracy of spending; civil service; finances complicated; ordinary and war expenses should be specially provided for, 2915; substitution of turnover for sales tax; farmers and the tariff; price comparison between Canada and United States; William Henry Seward on United States tariff, 2916; not enough protection; reciprocity in tariff taxation; imports of agricultural products; farmers' national policy; reciprocity proposals, 2917; reciprocity agreement of 1911; United States out for themselves; war debts; United States would "crash through any agreement"; 2918; Fordney-McCumber tariff, 2919

Ryckman, Mr. E. B.—*Con.*
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill, 2668
Canadian National Railways
New positions and salaries, 2701
Paris offices, 3631, 3680
Cheque tax, 3933
Combines bill, 2630
Appointments, 2665
Technicalities, 2665
Government elevators, value, 2037
Labour dept., economies, 1624
Masters and mates, 2668
Patents of Invention bill, 2070
Domicile, election of, 2072
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3864, 3881
Radiotelegraph Act Amdt. bill, 2468
Toronto harbour improvements, 984, 2678, 4578

St. Alexis wharf, 980

St. Andrew's Dam fishway, 1000

St. Andrew's harbour, 2899

St. Andrew's lock, 2682

Ste. Anne de la Pocatière
Experimental farm, 460, qu. 1028

Ste. Anne des Monts wharf, 979

Ste. Anne's lock, Isle Perrot bridge, 3646

Ste. Anne-St. Charles telegraph line, qu. 3138, qu. 3262

St. Barnabe Nord postmaster, 1830

St. Bruno postmaster, dismissal, qu. 3140

St. Charles wharf, 980

Ste. Claire postmaster, qu. 1031

St. Croix
Harbour, 2899, 2938
River, bridges, 2342

St. David postmistress, 1489

St. Jean d'Evangeliste, postmaster, qu. 2698

St. Jean d'Orleans wharf, 980

St. John, N.B. (city)
Employment office, 3453
Immigration building, 1457, 1464, 1908
Martello tower, 3444
Members of Parliament, visit to, 2503
Quarantine station, Partridge island, 1021, 4613
Water supply, 1022
Station, 2481, 3188, 3645, 4310, 4445
Terminals, train shed, 3188, 3645
Warehouse facilities, 308

St. John, N.B. (port), 2676
Canadian National Railways, 1767
Grain shipments, 261, qu. 1484
Harbour commissioners, qu. 911
Importation through. *See* British Preference; Treaties, French, Italian
Improvements, 109, 4610
Courtenay bay, 109, 2676
Pilots, 3358
Wharfage tolls, 975

St. John and Quebec Railway Bill
(Extension of time)
Res. 3145, 3403; 1r., 2r., com., 3405; 3r., 3406

St. John-Bay of Fundy steamship service, 2176

St. John-Bear River steamship service, 2176

St. John-Digby steamship service, 2176

St. John River
Bridges, 2342
Sawdust pollution, 701, 3362
Wharves, taking over of, qu. 1488

St. Joseph d'Alma postmaster, qu. 3140

St. Laurent, late Mr. Arthur. *See* Public Works

St. Lawrence Ship Canal, surveys, 3647
Hydrographic, 3336

St. Lawrence River Ship Channel, 3339
Dredge No. 12, Capt. Bilodeau, qu. 1487
Maintenance and dredging, 3375, 3339
Sorel shipyard, 3374. *See also* Sorel

St. Lawrence River Waterway, 2979. *See also* Address; Budget; Canals; Hudson Bay railway; Lake Grain Rates; Vancouver Harbour bill; Water Powers; Welland canal
Aerial survey, 1776
Expenditure, 3076
Federal and provincial jurisdiction, 665
International Joint Commission, 3427
Parliamentary discussion of project, 2807
Power
Development, qu. 490, 2682
Dominion Power Board, investigation, 3427
Exportation, 658
Power canal, qu. 204
Water powers, 3782
Shipping rates. *See also* Freight Rates, Shipping
Grain, 3343
United States
Agreement with, 3705, 3762
Negotiations with, 665, 3208, 4513

Ste. Marie, Mr. L. T., appointment, qu. 1028

St. Mary's Cape, N.S., breakwater, 941

St. Michel de Bellechasse wharf, 980

St. Moïse, Que., agent, 1489

St. Omer, Que., wharf, 980

St. Père, Mr. E. C. (Hochelaga)
Civil Service Commission, 1188
Emigration to United States, 1188
Immigration
Agents, appointment, 1188
Farmers and farm labourers, 1188
Labour, attitude, 1186, 1187
Policy, 1186
Labour, unemployment, 1187
Repatriation, 1188

St. Peter's, N.S. postmaster, qu. 1488, 1795

Ste. Petronille wharf, 4588

St. Stephen, N.B. industrial centre, 2901

Saar Valley. *See also* League of Nations
Administration, 3995, 4000
Commission, 4653

Sackville public building, 4613

Safety League. *See* Canadian National

Sailors. *See also* Immigration Act Amdt. bill
Distressed. *See* Canada Shipping Act; Marine
Institutions for assisting, 2167

Sale and Inspection of Fruit and Fruit Containers Bill
Res. 193; 1r., 195; 2r., 277; ref. to Agriculture Com. 277; com. 2105; 3r., 2131; Senate amdts. 3150

Sale and Inspection of Root Vegetables. *See* Root Vegetables

Sales, Mr. Thomas (Saltcoats)
Agricultural conditions, 1841
Binder twine, price, 4386
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4549, 4550
Government telegraphs, qu. 383
Grain
Dockage and screenings, 786
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4225-34
Marketing of, M. (Mr. Millar) 304
Hudson Bay railway, 3647
Labour, hours, 1841
Penitentiaries, 773
Railway department, printing, 3197
Saskatchewan Co-operative creamery, 185

Sales, Mr. Thomas—*Con.*
Union bank, 4225
Vancouver harbour bill, 269
Vancouver terminal elevator, qu. 517
Addition to, cost, qu. 621
Yorkton income tax office, qu. 384

Sales Tax. *See* Special War Revenue Bill; Taxation

Saline Lake Deposits, Western Canada, 3198

Salmon Canning. *See* Fish and Fisheries

Salvage Cases. *See* Soldier Settlement

Salvation Army
Immigration, 1430, 1476, 1480-1
Canada Colonization Association, 1093
Child, 1470

Sample Market. *See* Grain, Marketing of

Sanctuaries, Birds and Wild Animals. *See* National Parks and Reservations

Sardine Fisheries. *See* Fish and Fisheries

Saskatchewan. *See also* Western Provinces
Agricultural conditions, 2766
Automobiles in, 82, 148. *See also* Automobiles
Canadian Air Force, 1748-51
Co-operative creameries, 2779
Co-operative Elevator Company, 2779
Dairying industry, production, 1921, 2744
Debentures, sale of, 2770
Dominion forest reserves and parks, 2061, 3942
Dredging, 1012
Dunning, Premier, statement regarding budget, 2770-1
Farm loan bonds bought by farmers, 2770
Hail Insurance Commission, 2770
Harbours and rivers, 1001, 4589
Highways, 3185. *See also* Canada Highways; Highways
Immigration, domestic servants, 1099, 1476
Indians, 2145
Lands
Reclamation, 1065
Southwestern, 1353
Mennonites, 1229
Mixed farming, 2773
Public buildings, 1023, 4629
Resources, report of Mr. Crean, 1060
Saskatchewan Co-operative Elevator Company, Calcutta trade commissioner, 1840
Settlers' relief, 3447
Sunset lake postmaster, claim, 1832

Saskatchewan—*Con.*
Telegraph and telephone lines, 2683
Wheat board, res. of legislature, 3045

Saskatoon post office, 1785

Sastri, Right Hon. V. Srinivasa, Hindu franchise, 508, 4641-65. *See also* Hindus

Saturday Night, statement, labour shortage, 1125

Saturday Sittings. *See* House of Commons, Sittings

Sayabec postmistress, dismissal. *See* Post Office; Boulay

Scandals. *See* War

Scandinavia, immigration from, 1085

Scarfe Varnish Works, qu. 1485

Schofield, Rev. Dr., res. Pension Board, 3399

Scholarships. *See* Students

Schools. *See also* Education
Attendance age, 1179
Capitalistic system and, 2725
Closed for lack of money, 1202, 1342, 1388, 2836
Lack of in the West, 1390
Lands, 3398. *See also* Dominion Lands
Reversion of, 3445
Sections reserved for. *See* Dominion Lands Act Amdt. bill
Unpaid balance of purchase price, 1385, 3982, 4202
New, opening of, 1889
Oriental children, 2326, 2485
Segregation, 1896
School homes for immigrants, 1227
Taxes, unpaid, 3256

Scientific and Industrial Research. *See* Research

Scientific Men, neglect of, 1294. *See also* Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner)

Scientific Research. *See* Research

Scotland, immigration from, 1876. *See also* Immigration, Hebrideans

Scott, Mr. D'Arcy, Grain Inquiry Commission, 4711

Scott, Mr. Frank. *See* Canadian National Railways, Grand Trunk

Scottish Aid Society, immigration, 1876

Scottish Pioneer Association, Hector celebration, 4705

Screenings. *See* Grain and Grain Trade, Elevators

Scrip Frauds. *See* Criminal Code Amdt. bill

Seamen
Desertion of. *See* Immigration Act Amdt.
Distressed. *See* Canada Shipping Act; Marine

Seaports, Canadian. *See* British Preference; Treaties; Ports

Sears-Roebuck, Chicago, price comparison, 2737, 2742

Secession, 2940. *See also* Maritime Provinces; Nova Scotia; Western Provinces
British Empire from, 2244
Nova Scotia; 2057, 2177, 2243-4, 2977
Roberts, Hon. W. F., reported statement of, 3145
Talk of, 2977, 3067
Western provinces, 2808, 2814

Second Homesteads. *See* Dominion Lands Act Amdt. bill

Secondary Amendments. *See* House of Commons; Speaker

Secret Agreement, Japanese immigration, 1448

Secret Treaties. *See* Near East Crisis

Secretary of State
Canada Temperance Act, administration, 2495
Department
Estimates, 2392, 2494, 3985
Mulvey, Mr. Thomas, alien enemy property, custodian, 3823, 4671
Salaries and contingencies, 2392, 2494
Naturalization. *See also* Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill
Correspondence, Vancouver judges, 2199
Certificates, issue, 2182. *See also* Naturalization Acts Amdt.
Naturalization Acts, expenses under, 2495
Public archives, 3985
War claims adjustment, 2495. *See also* Aliens; War

Securities, Issue of. *See* Canadian National Railways Bills

Sedition. *See also* Criminal Code Act Amdt. Bill; Immigration Act Amdt. Bill;
Royal Canadian Mounted Police and, 1142

Seed. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade
Fairs, 599, 600
French treaty, 1984
Purchasing Commission, qu. 279, 599, 601
Seed and fertilizer control, 599
Seed grain advances, 3444

Seed Testing and Inspection, Bill
(Grading and qualities of seed)
Res. 195; 1r., 198; 2r., and ref. to Agriculture Com. 277-8; com.. 2304; 3r., 2308
Sections and subjects discussed:
Agricultural or garden vegetable seeds or plants, 2307
Clark, Mr. George H., 2304
New varieties, registration of, 2307
Noxious weeds, 2305
Primary, 2305
Plant, definition of, 2304
Registration through Canadian Council of Horticulture, 2307
Sale of seeds for export, 2307
Samples to be taken in presence of witness, 2308
Seed commission, 2304
Time limit for complaint, 2308

Seeds, Noxious, 2305, 4378. *See also* Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill

Seizures. *See* Customs and Excise; Fish and Fisheries

Select Standing Committees. *See* House of Commons

Selkirk, Man. wharf, 1000

Senate
Abolition of, 1376
Amendments concurred in:
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4508
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 4201
Board of Audit Act, 4733
Canadian National Railways (Securities) bill, 4754
Chinese Immigration Act Amdt. bill, 4536
Combines bill, 3504
Companies Act Amdt. bill, 4736
Copyright Act Amdt. bill, 3154
Criminal Code Amdt. bill, 4733
Fruit Containers bill, 3150
Immigration Act Amdt. bill, 3981
Inland Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 4528
Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill, 3150
Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. bill, 3149

Senate—*Con.*
Amendments concurred in—*Con.*
Northwest Territories Act Amdt. bill, 2050
Patents of Invention bill, 3154
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 4744-50
Returned Soldiers Insurance bill, 4734, 4750
Senate and House of Commons bill, 4734
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment bill, 4750
Amendments, non-concurrence
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 4732
Industrial Disputes Investigation bill, 4357, 4592
Baker, the late Col. G. H., M.P., Joint committee, 730
Canadian National Railways, branch lines bill, 4688, 4689, 4694
Rejection of, 4753
Divorce proceedings, publicity. *See* Criminal Code Amdt. bill
Elective, 2908
M. (Mr. Denis, Joliette) 1364
Estimates, salaries and contingencies, 2694, 3949
Fowler, Hon. Senator, remarks on immigration bill, 3032
Grain-carrying trade, committee report, 2899
Hudson Bay railway report. *See* Hudson Bay Railway, M. (Mr. Knox)
Joint committee. *See* Senate and House of Commons
Lougheed, Senator, remarks on Immigration bill, 3032
Members of House of Commons appointed to, 2710
Progressive party and, 1378
Reform, 2908
Senators
Age limit, 1376
Attendance, 4007, 4008
Indemnity, 4008
M. (Mr. Leader) for reduction of, 1153
Pensions, 1376
Vested right of, 1376

Senate and House of Commons
Joint Committee on matters of common interest, 4007
Appointment, 2794
Message from Senate, 2611

Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. Bill (Indemnity; attendance)
Res. 4184; 1r., 2r., com., 4185, 4236; amdt. (Mr. Gardiner) six months' hoist, neg. 4246; amdt. (Miss Macphail) to refer back, neg. 4247; 3r., 4247; Senate amdts. 4734

Senate and House of Commons—*Con.*
Sections and subjects discussed:
Attendance of senators and members, 4007
Deduction for non-attendance, 4242
Personal explanation—Mr. Gervais, 4249
Sessional allowance, 4185, 4236
Amdt. (Miss Macphail) to reduce, 4240, neg. 4242

Senn, Mr. Mark C. (Haldimand)
Accredited herd system, qu. 492
Agricultural Instruction Act, renewal of, qu. 490
Budget, 2957. Protection, adequate; tariff proposals and Liberal pre-election pledges; need of profitable markets; British preferential tariff, 2957; mistake to penalize Canadian industry; woollen industry affected by increased preference; competition from other countries; artificial silk duty; knitting factories threatened with ruin; petition against increase of British preference and alteration of sales tax; copper and hemp bounties; reciprocity; Canadian and United States duties on agricultural products, 2958; imports; home market for manufactured and agricultural products; unbalanced budget; economy; high standard of living, 2959
Pure-bred sheep, qu. 3141
Seed inspection, 198
Six Nation Indians, 1307

Sergeant-at-Arms. *See* House of Commons

Sessional Indemnity. *See* Senate and House of Commons Act

Settlement. *See* Immigration; Soldier Settlement

Settlers. *See also* Soldier Settlement
Land for. *See* Immigration
Relief, Alberta and Saskatchewan, 3447
Transportation facilities, 2172

Sevres Treaty. *See* Near East Crisis

Sexsmith, Mr. Edward J. (Lennox and Addington)
Budget, 2784. National debt, revenue; methods of raising; deficits; taxation; increase in national business; expenditure; retrenchment; immigration 2784; natural resources; retrenchment, public works, civil service, superannuation; taxation and extravagance, 2785; taxes—income, business, consumers, sales; national policy based on special privilege; tariff, downward revision;

Sexsmith, Mr. Edward J.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
labour unions; strikes; high cost of living; prices, control of; agriculture, condition of; farmers in Parliament; partisan politics, cost of; prices of agricultural and manufactured products, 2787; combines; spread between producer and consumer; disappointing budget; protective feature of tariff; the amendment
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 743

Seymour Narrows, obstruction, 3333

Shale Deposits. *See* Oil

Shareholders. *See* Bank Act Amdt. bill; Banks and Banking

Shaw, Mr. Joseph T. (Calgary West)
Address in reply, 66. Gift from France of Vimy Ridge, 66; Parliament and economy; administration of national parks; four cardinal principles of taxation, 66-67; agriculture essential industry of Canada, 67; financial and economic depression in farming industry, 67-68; cost of grain production, 68; high transportation and insurance rates, 68-69; western grain route, 69; cattle industry and embargo; co-ordination of branches of Agriculture department; revision of Bank Act, 70; government immigration policy, 70-71; Near East crisis, government's action, 71; General Smuts at Imperial Conference of 1921; personal standing and obligation to constituents, amdt. to amdt., 72
Annual training, 864
Banff national park
Electric plant, 3436
Power rights, 496, 3750
Calgary Power Company, 3938
Springs and cave, 496
Water powers, 3420
Banff-Windermere highway, 3437
Bank Act, revision, res. Alberta legislature, 2084
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4089-4105; 4134-4160; 4509
Bank mergers, 4134, 4150
Interest at 7 per cent, 4103
Maximum rate, amdt. 4148, neg. 4148
Shareholders' audit, amdt. (Mr. Woodsworth) 4089
Bankruptcy Act M. (Mr. Casgrain) 1495, 1505

Shaw, Mr. Joseph T.—*Con.*
Brenner, Meyer, release from penitentiary, 1975
Business of the House
Rules, M. (Mr. Johnston) 1302
Supply, amdt. to amdt., 1302
Business profits tax, 4491
Cadet services, 877
Calgary
Power Company, privileges, 3750
Unemployment relief, 1681-3
Canada Grain Act, administration, 781, 4709
Canada-West Indies steamship service, 3377, 3389, 3397
Canadian Forestry Association grant, 3410-13
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, combine, 1395
Canadian national parks, automobile admission fee, 3943
Canadian National Railways
Coal, purchase of, qu. 4437
Alberta, qu. 1363. 4752
Employees' pensions, 288
Paris offices, 3650-74
Transportation combine, 1395
Canadian National Safety League, 3953
Canadian Press, Limited, 4712
Subsidy, 4728
Canadian representation in United States, 4664
Cheque tax, 3934
Chilled beef, 464
Civil Service Act
Grazing inspectors, appointment, 3253
Homestead inspectors, 3252
M. (Mr. Power) for repeal, 363, 382, 519
Special committee, 937
Civil Service bonus, 1664
Cost of living, increase, 1814
Civil Service Commission, 346
Combines
Bill, appointments, 2665
Transportation, 1395
Cost of living. *See also* Civil Service bonus
Freight rates and, 1958
Reduction, 1394
Criminal Code Amdt. bill
Betting information, 2282
Guessing competitions, 2282, 2283
Customs and excise, salaries, 3276
Dairy Industry Act Amdt. bill, 4253
Deputy ministers' salaries, increases, 4668
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 2360
Dominion lands and parks.
Automobile admission fee, National parks, 3943
Salaries, 3250

Shaw, Mr. Joseph T.—*Con.*
Egypt, British policy, 4662
Emigration to United States, 1393
Empire Forestry Conference, 3410
Grant, 3413
Experimental farms, 464
Freight rates, 1394
Crowsnest pass agreement, 1958
Railway rates, equalization, M. (Mr. Clark) 1956
Grazing inspectors, 3253
Halibut treaty, 4132
Harbours and rivers, 1001
Hayes, Mr. John J., dismissal, 1690
Hindu immigrants, franchise, 4645, 4664
Hoppe and Isenberg leases, cancellation, 3130, 4442
Hudson Bay railway, McArthur claim, 4690
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1396
Advances to, qu. 517
Results, 1105
Child, 1472
Estimates, 1387
Policy, 1392
Imperial Conference, 4645-63
Constitutional changes, 4664
Policy, 4662
Publicity, 4665
Indemnity of members, 4009, 4247
International Labour Conference, 1645-6
Interest rate. *See under this title,* Bank Act
Labour
Coal miners' strike, district 18, 1629
Industrial disputes investigation, 1629
Labour Gazette, 1622
Lack of Confidence vote, Mr. (Mr. Irvine) 213
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4225
Land speculation, 1395
Macphail, Miss, members and party funds, 4238
Merchants' Bank failure, 4150
Military properties, maintenance, 889
Morrison claim, Little Anse, 4724
Narcotic Drugs bill, 2123
Northwest Territories Act, procedure, qu. 1974
Oil-well drilling machinery, duty, 3917
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3572
Penitentiaries, 773
Pensions
Appeal boards, 683
European war and active militia, 2167, 3723
Legislation, 2519
Officials, conduct of, 4703

Shaw, Mr. Joseph T.—*Con.*
Pensions—*Con.*
Old age, 1649
Royal commission reports
Interim, 2167
Printing, 3401
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3401
Permanent force, 892
Petition of Right Act Amdt. bill, 3130
Physical training, 877
Political patronage, 3347
Postal rates, public libraries, 1809
Prince Edward Island car ferry claim, 4679
Privilege—Grain Growers Guide, 987
Public buildings, Saskatchewan, 4629
Public expenditure, East and West, 3436
Purchasing Commission, 3950
Authority for, qu. 2699
Railway rates
Attorney General, B.C. vs. C.P.R., 1917
Railway commission judgment, 1917
Redistribution, 4741
Renovated butter, 4253
Rideau canal, 4691
Riordan Pulp and Paper Company, taxes, qu. 1974
Rocky Mountain park
Hudson Bay Company claim, qu. 2418
Stipendary magistrate, 1739
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 778
Rural depopulation, 1394
St. Lawrence ship channel, 3340
Sales tax, public libraries, 1870
Scholarships, international, provision for, 878
Screenings, purchase of, 785
Senate and House of Commons bill, 4185, 4238-4247
Soldiers Civil Re-establishment bill, 3747, 3894
Soldier Settlement Board, extension, 1128
Sorel shipyard, dismissals, 3346
Speaker's rulings, discussion of, 4077
Tariff, high protection cost, 1394
Taxation, burden of, 1394
Tourist traffic, 3437
War, Canada's participation, 4663
Water powers, 3420. *See also under this title* Banff
Western provinces, conditions, 1396
Wolvin, Mr. Roy, Standard Shipping Company, 1704
Wrangel island, ownership, 3948
Yukon territory, administration of justice, 705

Sheard, Mr. Charles (South Toronto)
Grain dockage, qu. 3505
Port Arthur elevator, qu. 2612
Renfrew postmastership, qu. 204
Toronto harbour dredging, 1011

Sheep-Raising Industry. *See* Agriculture; Live Stock; Wool

Shells. *See* National Defence, Ammunition

Sherwood, Mr. H. Crossley, letter, 519

Shippigan, port, 2938

Ships. *See* Vessels

Shipping and Shipbuilding. *See also* Canadian Government Merchant Marine; Freight Rates, Shipping; Harbours and Rivers; Marine; Naval Service; Ports; St. Lawrence River Waterway; Steamship Services; Vessels
All-Canadian routes between East and West, 3273
Canada Steamship Lines, Limited. *See also that title.*
Shipping combine, 4278
War claims, qu. 3142
Canadian shipyards, closing, 1338
Cattle boats. *See also* Live Stock
Alleged unsanitary condition, 2613
Space, 2133
Certificates
Certificated masters on coasting vessels, 3971
Steamship. *See* Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bills
Dollar Shipping Company, 3273
Great Britain, 3072
Great Lake Transportation Company, lease of freighters, 3848
Harling, Thomas & Son, shipments via Panama canal, 3273
Hirtle, Schooner Carrie L., seizure, qu. 3323
Kirkwood line, 2175, 3846
Imperial Shipping Committee, qu. 3137
London Guarantee & Accident Company, qu. 1138
Ocean ports, 2898. *See also* Ports
Pacific Salvage Company, qu. 1763
Prince Rupert Dry Dock Company, bonds, qu. 1138
Rates. *See also* Freight Rates, Shipping; Immigration
Tramp steamers, 2127
Registrar. *See* Canada Shipping Act Amdts.
St. Lawrence river channel, 3343

Shipping and Shipbuilding—*Con.*
Shipping associations. *See* Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill
Shipping combines, 3845. *See also* Combines; Freight Rates
Ships purchased from foreigners, 3972
Standard Shipping Company, 4278
Steamboat inspection, 3360
Steamship services. *See that title*
Strikes. *See* Labour

Shire Horses, gift to Canada, 2207, 2253

Shortages. *See* Grain

Shorts. *See* Feeding Stuffs Act

Sick Mariners' Dues. *See* Health

Sifton, Sir Clifford
Coal supply, 1265
Clyde, the, mechanics from, 1204
Fuel supply, 788
Hudson Bay railway, 1047
Immigration, 1181-3
Importation of British workmen, 1186
"Man with sheepskin coat" 1204
Industrial and scientific research, 788
Lake grain rates, 4285
Standard of living, 1168

Silesia, partition of, 3995

Silks. *See* Custom Tariff; Treaties, French Treaty; Textiles

Siloam, schooner. *See* Vessels

Silver. *See* Mines and Minerals

Simpson, Mr. T. E. (West Algoma)
Murray Stewart, purchase of, 3356
Navigation, safeguards, qu. 812

Sinclair, Mr. John A. *See* Canadian National Railways, Directors

Sinclair, Hon. J. E. (Queen's, P.E.I.)
References to, 2996, 3012

Sinclair, Upton, press, capitalistic control, 2726

Singapore Naval Base, 2469, qu. 3506, qu. 3820, 3822, 4654

Single Member Constituencies. *See* Proportional Representation

Single Tax. *See* Land; Taxation

Single Transferable Vote. *See* Proportional Representation

Six Nations. *See* Indians

Skeena River. *See* British Columbia, Fishing Licenses

Sloan, Hon. William, Asiatic immigration, 1901

Smart, Mr. Bogue. *See* Immigration

Smith, Mr. A. H. *See* Drayton-Acworth Commission

Smith, Goldwin, protection, 3071

Smuggling. *See* Budget; Customs and Excise; Taxation

Smuts, General, 31, 72. *See also* Germany, Reparations; Imperial Conference

Snider, Judge, report, 1714

Snowden, Mr. Philip, British labour party, 2722

Social Agencies. *See* Labour, Unemployment

Social Service Council. *See* Race-Track Betting

Social Standards, work, popular attitude, 1189

Socialism, 123, 631, 2727. *See also* Labour
Macolm island Finnish settlement 1247

Society of Chemical Industries, 2069

Soft Drinks, tax on. *See* Confectionery and Beverages; Special War Revenue; Taxation

Soldier Advisers. *See* Soldiers Civil Re-establishment Bill

Soldier Settlement. *See also* Soldier Settlement Board
Carleton county, farms sold, qu. 1013
Fire insurance, 496
Lands
Reversion of, 3257
Taxation, 3256, 3260
Loans
Black, Mr. W. J., 2019
Expenditures and, qu. 2207
Missisquoi and Brome counties, 4012
Ontario, qu. 492
Questionaire sent out by Miss Macphail, 1845
Richmond county, farms sold, qu. 913
Wolfe county, farms sold, qu. 913

Soldier Settlement Board, 51. *See also* Immigration
Advances under act and cost, 1910, 2017
Advertising, 2023
Amounts due Dominion government, qu. 814

Soldier Settlement Board—*Con.*
Advice and assistance to immigrants, 1126
Edmonton, insurance, 3506
Estimates, 1910, 2017-30
Expenditure, 2986
Field supervisors, location of immigrants, 1089
Hebridean immigrants, 3252, 3596
Immigration, 170, 1179, 1255, 1406
Indian army officers, settlement in Canada, 1096
Land sales, alleged attempt to bribe supervisors, 1091
Legal expenses, 2018
Loans, 2018
Members, salaries and expenses, qu. 2180
Moss, Mr. H. H., illegal arrest, 2030
Peace river district, 1185
Salaries, 1910, 2017
Salvage cases, qu. 206, 2018
Staff, 2018

Soldiers. *See also* National Defence; Pensions; Returned Soldiers Insurance Bill; Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment
British soldier, deportation, 2254
Burial of destitute, 693, 695
Hospitals, 669. *See also* Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment
Imperial and foreign, treatment of, 691
In distressed circumstances abroad, 1456
National monument, Ottawa, 2685
Official advisers. *See* Soldiers Civil Re-establishment
Regimental funds, qu. 4010
Returned soldiers
Blake, Mr. Charles, Brandon, 4513
Branch banks and, 4122
Canadian legion, Victoria, B.C., res. 2942
Civil service. *See also that title*
Appointments, 1795
Dismissals, 1772
Employment, 1772
Clearing land, 1185
Deaths from tuberculosis, qu. 3134
Naturalization, 1379
Pensions, 2942. *See also* Pensions
Postmasterships and, 1799
Sheltered employment, 694
Vetcraft shops, 694
Treatment of, 2942
Unemployment, 2168
Relief, 689, 1679, 1681, 2168
Vocational training, 686

Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment
Department of, 113, qu. 282, 3893, 4075. *See also* National Defence; Pensions

Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment—*Con.*
Department of—*Con.*
Amalgamation with National Defence, 3893
Boyer, Dr., appointment, qu. 2418
Employers' liability compensation, 691
Estimates, 668
Expenditure, 2967, 3893
Reduction of, 23, 2032, 2987
Hospitals, 668, qu. 812. *See also that title*
Brant, closing, 1995, 4075, 4303
Euclid Hall, Toronto, closing, 4075, 4303
Imperial and foreign soldiers, treatment, 691
Interest, war service gratuity, 689
Joint industrial council, 1654
Medical advisory and appeal boards, 677, 696
Medical treatment and examination, 670, 687
Meighen, Right Hon. Mr., alleged statement, 670, 708, 2013
North Essex election, 2013
Operating expenses and working capital, 690
Pay and allowances, 687
Pensions, 3707. *See also that title*
European war and active militia, 2166. *See also* Pensions; Returned Soldiers
Salaries and contingencies, 668, 687
Toronto Soldiers' Comforts branch, qu. 3506, 3507
Mrs. Van Koughnet, 4726
Training, 687
Unemployment relief, 689, 1681, 2168
Vancouver office, appointments and dismissals, qu. 2297, 3085, qu. 3137, 3822
Vocational loans, 687

Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment Department Act Amdt. Bill
(Review and appeal tribunals; official soldier advisers; evidence on oath)
Res. 3648, 3745; 1r., 3748; 2r., com., 3892; 3r., 3895; Senate amendments, 4750
Sections and subjects discussed:
Appeals, review and appeal tribunals, 3892
Official soldier advisers, 3894
Power to take evidence on oath, 3895
Regulations, medical and appeal boards, 3892

Soldiers' Comforts Branch, Toronto, qu. 3506, 3507, 4725

Solicitor General. *See* Justice

Sorel
Postmaster, appointment of, qu. 1487

Sorel—*Con.*
Shipyard, 3343
Dismissals, 3344, 3374
Maintenance and operation, 3374

Souris, Man., public building, 4614

South Africa
Immigration policy, 1474, 1882
Senate, constitution, 1370

South America
Senates, constitution, 1373
Steamship service, 3377

Southampton, Ont. breakwater, 984

Soviet. *See* Russia

Spain
Senate, constitution, 1373
Trade with, 2397
Treaty with France, 2219

Spanish River Pulp and Paper Company, aerial forest patrol, 1776

Speaker, Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux. *See also* Deputy Speaker; House of Commons; Marcil
Rulings and statements of:
Acoustics of chamber, 4594
Adjournment
To await action of Senate, 4754
To discuss, etc., 1540, 2886
Against rule, unless urgent, 3589-90, 4441
Debate to be confined to matter at issue, 3599, 3601
Must not revive former discussion, 4296
No right of reply, 3595, 3603
Except by consent, 2896
Amendments. *See under this title,* Motions
Baker memorial, Joint commttee, 730
Bills
Drafting by law officers of House 494
First reading, explanation brief, 487
Not alterable except by authority of House, 3326
Reference to Private Bills Com. 4308
Second reading
More elaborate explanation, 487
Notice in writing, 3399
Principle only to be discussed, 3091
Third reading by consent, 4141
Time fixed for consideration, 4236
To be preceded by res. 4248
Trade, 331
Urgent and pressing, 4392

Speaker, Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux—*Con.*
Rulings and statements of—*Con.*
Business of the House, to-morrow, 3750
Chair to be addressed, 2921
Committees
Discussion of questions not referred, 3267, 3270
M. for not debatable, 4013
M. to print proceedings, 3399
Notice of motion to go into, 3582-3
Reference in anticipation of report, 3574-6
Reports, concurrence by unanimous consent, 1739, 1991
Special
Appointment, two days notice necessary, 572
Membership limited to fifteen, 937
Redistribution bill, reference, 488
Consent, unanimous, 3326
Conversation, 1872
Debate
Anticipated or repeated, 1271, 3326-30
Closed if mover answers question, 2523
Decorum, 406
Irregular, 1668
Matters under consideration by committees, 2930
Member
May not speak without consent after mover has closed, 1080
Must address Chair, 2921
Mover closes, 393, 421, 568, 1210, 2523, 4474
Notice of M. to go into com. 3582, 3583
Peace and tranquillity, 3557
Previous, references to, 1687
Reference should be in third person, 2921
Relevancy, 3327
Debates, official report of, bulky returns, 940
Duke and Duchess of York, congratulations on wedding, 2251
Acknowledgment of, 2338
Industrial group of Great Britain, message, 4436
Interruptions, 323, 406, 3557
Only by consent, member speaking, 3518, 3587
House of Commons
Estimates, 2691
Staff, 2691
Organization, 4592
Kennedy, the late Hon. W. C., letter from Mrs. Kennedy acknowledging sympathy, 281
King, His Majesty the, introduction of name in debate, 728

Speaker, Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux—*Con.*
Rulings and statements of—*Con.*
Lafortune, the late Mr. D. A., letter from Madame Lafortune acknowledging sympathy, 281
Language
"False" 3269
"Unmannerly" 3269
Leaders, latitude allowed, 3401
Legislation, anticipating, 667
Letters, reading, 2181
Library of Parliament, 2693
Members
May ask further question on orders of day by leave, 287
May not anticipate report of com, 3574-6
May speak only once, 2r. of bill, 273, 277
Moving res. exhausts right to speak, 1210
Must address Chair, 2921
Must not impute motives, 2573
New, introduced, 2837
Recognition of by Speaker, 1159
Referring to another, must use third person, 2921
Right of reply, 2896
Right to speak, 3589
Sitting may not interrupt without consent, 1546-9, 1996
To be fair to member speaking, 1155
Minister of National Defence, correct title, 495
Moose Jaw controverted election, 515, 615
Johnson, Mr. R. M., status, 202
Motions
Adjournment to discuss. *See under this title,* Adjournment
Amendments
Expanded negative, 3521
To be consistent with principle involved, 643
Anticipatory, 3267, 3326, 3870
Changing membership, special com., 2417
Debate closed, member may not speak without consent, 1080
Dropped, 3264
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 320, 341-42
Mover
Closes debate, 277, 393. *See also under this title,* Debate
Has no right to amend, 1528
Leave to withdraw, 1911
Right to speak exhausted, 1210
Non-debatable
For Com. of Whole, 4013, 4185
That Speaker leave chair, 3185, 4013, 4076

Speaker, Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux—*Con.*
Rulings and statements of—*Con.*
Motions—*Con.*
Non-debatable—*Con.*
That com., rise, 4185
When made by consent, 3326
Notice, 4295
In writing, 3399
Not given, M. must stand, 3084
Not in writing, put by consent, 1538
Not substantive, no right of reply, 3595
Objection, too late, 3981
Questions sub judice, not debatable, 1284, 1307, 1912
Redrafting, 816
Seconder, 1308
Special order, 3271
Sub-amendments, 3573
Substantive, right to reply, 2896, 3595, 3603
Unanimous consent, 345, 435, 572, 1739, 2047, 2639
When vote is taken, Speaker bound to read, 3580
Newspaper articles
Irrelevant, 4143
Reflecting on House, 4142
Orders of the day
Debate not permissable, 859, 3650, 4441
Members speaking twice, 3401
Press statements not to be quoted but synopsized, 667
Questions permissible but not debate, 734, 1309, 1925, 2898, 3400-01
Order paper
Errors, 487, 519, 4437, 4457
Not available on account of long sitting, 4744
Petitions
Irregular, 2885
Presentation by unanimous consent, 4525
Point of order, member speaking to, 322
Privilege, questions of
Committees, discussion of questions not referred, 3267
Contradiction of members' statements from outside, 3649
Matter properly before House, 3268
Remarks out of order, 709
Statement by consent only, 708
Questions
Allowed only by consent of member having floor, 212
Already answered, 2419, 2795
Answered by member speaking, 2523
Answered verbally to be preceded by asterisk, 3506

Speaker, Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux—*Con.*
Rulings and statements of—*Con.*
Questions—*Con.*
Asking, does not exhaust members' right to speak, 3589
Cost of living (Mr. Church) out of order, 3704
Excessive length, 622
Oral, without notice, 734
Orders of the day on, 734
Passed as orders for returns, 344, 939, 1139, 1386
Sub-judice, 1912
To be asked in third person, 3589
Railway Commission, appeal from, 1284, 1912
Relevancy, 309, 427, 1553, 3557
Restaurant, expenditure, 2692
Returns
Every member entitled to copy of, 940
Royal assent, 1809, 1818, 3829, 4755
Rules of the House, 3330
Rule 17A, debatable motions, 3583, 4014
Rule 17C, Thursdays and Fridays, 2640
Rule 115, urgent and pressing, 4308, 4392
Special com. on, 1299
Rulings
Appeals from, 4076
Senate amendments, 4592
Senate and House of Commons Joint Com. 2611
Sitting
Hour of, opening day of session, 1
Wednesday, unanimous consent, 99
Statements, indirect presentation of, 3649
Stewart, late Hon. J. A., letter from Mrs. Stewart acknowledging sympathy, 435
Supply, M. for, Rule 17C, 2640
Vacancies, 1763. *See also under this title,* Moose Jaw
Nicolet, 2178
Vimy Ridge Memorial
Letter from President of French Republic, 1538
Message from Governor General, 1631
Vote
May be taken if wish of House that Speaker do now leave chair, 4014
Method of taking, 434
Ways and Means Com., rule 17C, 2640

Speakman, Mr. Alfred (Red Deer)
Agricultural Conditions Com., report, printing, 2181
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4017
Charters, extension for one year, amdt. 4014

Speakman, Mr. Alfred—*Con.*
Business of the House
M. to adjourn, 3584
Rules, M. (Mr. Johnston) for Special Com. 1302
Calgary customs warehouse, 1023
Co-operative buying and selling, 1253
Copper bounty bill, 3236
Copyright Act Amdt. bill, 2287
Credit and industry, M. (Mr. Irvine) 639
Credits
Rural, 639
System, 1252
Dominion steamers and icebreakers, 3160
Economic conditions, 1250
Emigration to United States, 1253
Esquimalt dry dock, 2673
Hebridean immigrants, 3252
Treatment of, M. 3584
Homestead inspectors, 3252
Immigration
Hebridean, 3252, 3584
Policy, 1250
Selected, 1254
Soldier Settlement Board, 1255
Inland Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 4207
Institutionalism, excessive, 1251
International Institute of Agriculture, 599
Montreal Harbour Commissioners bill, 4508
Party system of government, 1254
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 4703
Protection, suggested remedy for conditions, 1253
Public buildings and local improvement taxes, 1022-3
Railway mail service, 1804
Railway rates, equalization, 1252
M. (Mr. Clark) 1966
Redistributon, 4741
Roads and bridges, 1014
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 777
St. John quarantine building, 4614
Sales tax, consumer and, 4423
School lands, purchase price, unpaid balance, 4204
Seed, purity of, 601
Settlers' relief, 3448
Soldier settlement, 2022-25
Steamship services, 2173
Tariff, more equitable to producers, 1252
Western provinces, conditions in, 1250
Winter trips, California, 1252

Special Delivery Letters. *See* Post Office

Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill. *See also* Budget; Taxation
Res. 2656, 3181, 3922, amended 4363; 1r., 4183; 2r., com., 4409; 3r., 4435

Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill—*Con.*
Sections and subjects discussed:
Books, failure or refusal to keep, 4434
Carbonic acid gas in cylinders, 2656, 3938
Cheque tax, 2656, 4363, 4409
Amdt. (Sir Henry Drayton) 3933; neg. 3934
Amdt. (Mr. Forke) 3934, ruled out of order, 3935
Amdt. (Mr. Neill) 3935, ruled out of order, 3936
Limitation of maximum, 3922
Confectionery and beverages, 2656, 3046, 3938
Duty paid value, definition, 4425
Excise stamp taxes, payment with postage stamps, 3938, 4435
Receipt tax, 2656, 4409
Exemption, 4423
Sales tax, 4181, 4409, 4425
Collection at source, 2656, 3938, 4411
Exports, 4364, 4418
Government or provincial sales, 4435
Imports, 4409, 4417
Licensed manufacturer, 4410
Producer or, 4364
Lumber, 4418
Magazines and periodicals, 4414-21
M. (Mr. Stevens) for com. of inquiry, 245, 915
Refund
Goods sold to provinces, 4435
To licensed manufacturers, 4418
Tinplate, 4418
Wholesale or jobber, 4410
Wines, excise tax on, 2656, 3937, 4425

Spectacle and Eyeglass Frames, 2653

Speech from the Throne. *See* Address; Governor General

Spence, Mr. David (Parkdale)
Audibility of debate,4572
Budget, 2976. Erratic and wasteful discussions; a business man's standpoint; amendment, 2976; tariff reduction and free trade; reciprocity; protection for tiller of the soil; oleomargarine duty; western conditions; "calamity howling"; secession talk, 2977; comparison of present and past conditions; improvement in agricultural position; cold storage, federal and provincial encouragement and assistance, 2978; St. Lawrence river waterway; water transportation; Welland canal; government by committee; avoidance of responsibility; committees of the House, cost of; redistribution; soft drinks, tax on; cigarette duty; income tax penalties; Post Office department; postage stamps, use for special war revenue purposes; cheque tax; sales tax; newsprint; duty-free goods; banana trust; fruit, competition of foreign fruits; importation of, 2979; tariff commission; potato duty, 2980

Spence, Mr. David—*Con.*
Canadian National Railways, hotels, manager, qu. 1257
Cold storage, 187, 2978
Cold Storage Act Amdt. bill, 275-6
Experimental farms, 472, 473
Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill, 2200
Mediterranean steamship service, qu. 1488, 1636
Military expenditure, 876
Nova Scotia wharves, expenditure, 4572
Toronto
Customs house, 3282
Harbour improvements, 986
Viaduct and union station, 4449

Spencer, Mr. Henry E. (Battle River)
Agricultural instruction grant, 608
Alberta
Destitution, 1440
Natural resources, revenue, qu. 2515
Sales tax collections, qu. 2417
United Farmers of, 1440
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4057, 4083-4102
Bankruptcy Act administration, 780
Burrard Inlet bridge, 4708
Canada Grain Act, administration, 782
Cattle shipment to Great Britain, 4675
Central experimental farm, building, 4631
Credit and industry, M. (Mr. Irvine) 634, 635
Amdt. to extend bank charters for twelve months, 638
Canadian National Railways
Branch lines construction bill, 4199, 4323
Toronto office building, qu. 814
Davidson commission, war contracts, qu. 812
Emigration to United States, 1439
Freight rates and, 1440
Flax, cultivation of, 4378
Hebridean immigrants, 4706
Hector celebration, 4706
Immigration
Advertising, 1084
Canada Colonization Association, 1439
Grant, 1092
Estimates, amdt. to reduce, 1441

Spencer, Mr. Henry E.—*Con.*
Immigration—*Con.*
Organizations asking for increased, 1111
Policy, 1438
Population, loss of, 1439
Settlement in colonies, 1100
Income tax collections, western provinces, qu. 2206
Industrial disputes, settlement of, 1705
Interest rates in West, 1440
International Institute of Agriculture, 599
Justice, administration of, 4674
Labour Gazette, Mr. Ronald Hooper, 1626
Liberal platform of 1919, 3003
Live stock condemnation insurance, qu. 1972, qu. 2699
Mixed farming, 2773
Naturalization, mounted police and, 779
Old age pensions, 1649
Oliver-St. Paul branch railway, 4323
Opium and narcotic drugs, 700
Peace river district, railways, 1440
Public works, surveys, 1020
Railway construction, 1440
Rural mail, western provinces, 1802
Scales, inspection of, 810
Taxation, indirect, 1440, 3027
Toronto seed branch building, 4627
Vermilion town lots
Purchase, qu. 489, 1307
Rental, qu. 2417
West Ukrainian republic, M. (Mr. Campbell) 656
Western provinces, conditions, 1439
Wrecks, investigation, 3160

Spirituous Liquor. *See* Canada Temperance Act; Liquor

Sponagle, Col. J. A., port physician, Margaretville, N. S. qu. 2697

Sporting Mountain mail service. *See* Post Office

Spray Lakes lease. *See* Calgary Power Company

Spruce Bud Worm. *See* Forests and Forestry

Stability. *See* Tariff

Stamps. *See* Post Office; Taxation

Standard Shipping Company. *See* Freight Rates

Standard of Living, 1168. *See also* Cost of Living; Immigration

Standard Oil Company
Dividends, 2601

Standard Oil Company—*Con.*
Prosecution and fines, 2585

Standardization. *See* Agricultural Implements

Standards
Bureau of, 788
Canadian Engineering Association, 788

Stansell, Mr. J. L. (East Elgin)
Agricultural conditions, 1846, 3064
Agriculture, sacrifices, 3065
Budget, 3062. Congratulations to Finance Minister, 3062; sales tax, exemption drain tiles; cheque tax; stamp tax, notes and cheques; tariff policy of Conservative party; "out-Heroding Herod"; stability; definition of protection tariff and tariff for revenue, 3063; new Liberal doctrines; source in Montreal; failure of budget to balance; expenditure, increase of; expenditure and debt reduction; agriculture; condition of; speech of Minister of Agriculture; accredited herd system, 3064; tuberculin test; agriculture, needs of; sympathetic consideration of other interests; extreme attitude of Progressives; spirit of compromise; sacrifice, 3065; farmers and the tariff; provision for long-term loans; market facilities; Liberal party and tariff; failure to implement pledges; tariff reduction offset by increase in sales tax, 3066; disappointment of Progressive party; National Policy; problems of East and West, 3067
Cadet services, 878
Dairying industry, 1846
Emigration to United States, 1414
Farm mortgages, 1846
Immigration
Policy, 1412
Progressive party and, 1413
Ministers' and officials' travels, qu. 283, qu. 343
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3558
Proportional representation, M. (Mr. Good) 400
Rural mail carriers, remuneration, 1787
Sales tax, drain tiles, 3046, 3063
Tariff, immigration and, 1413
Western provinces, conditions in, 1415

Stationery. *See* Printing Bureau

Statistics. *See also* Immigration; Population; Trade

Statistics—*Con.*
Census figures, 43
Dominion bureau of, 788, 2032, 2034
Annual report tabled, 1539
Cost of living statistics, 1684
Staff
Temporary employees, qu, 938
Transfer from Labour dept, 1671, 2032
International labour office, 1631
Production, statement of, 2720
Wealth of Canada, estimated, 2719

Statutes, Quebec provincial, 1660

Steamship Combines. *See* Agricultural Conditions Com. report; Combines; Freight Rates, Shipping

Steamship Companies. *See also* Steamship Services
Immigration, 1201, 1462

Steamship Services, 3377. *See also* Canadian Government Merchant Marine; Shipping and Shipbuilding; Trade and Commerce
Advertisement for tenders, 3382-3
Canada-Great Britain, qu. 937
Canada-Newfoundland, 2171, 3377
Canada-West Indies, qu. 937, 3377. *See also* Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Charlottetown-Pictou, 2171
Extension to Great Lakes suggested, 2175
Freight rates. *See also* Freight Rates, Shipping
Control of, 2174
Railway commission and, 4003
Grand Manan and mainland, 2172
Halifax-Louisburg-St. Lawrence, 4701
Halifax-Newfoundland, 2173
Halifax-West Coast-Cape Breton, 2173
Inspection of, 2178
Mail carriage, 2172
Mainland and islands of Miscou-Shippegan, 2173
Mediterranean to, qu. 1488, 1636
Mulgrave-Canso, 2173
Mulgrave-Guysboro, 2173
Pelee island and mainland, 2174
Pictou-New Glasgow-Antigonish, 2174
Pictou-Souris-Magdalen islands, 2174
Port Mulgrave-Bras d'Or ports, 2174
Quebec-Natashquam-Harrington, 2175
Quebec or Montreal and Gaspe, 2176
St. John-Bay of Fundy-Minas Basin, 2176, 4004
St. John-Bear River, 2176
St. John-Digby, 2176
St. John-Westport-Yarmouth, 2176

Steamship Services—*Con.*
Sydney-Whycocomagh, 2178
Tariff and, 2923
Vancouver ports on Howe island, 4003
Vancouver-Northern ports British Columbia, 4003
Victoria-West coast Vancouver island, 4003

Steedsman, Mr. James (Souris)
Budget, 2835. Congratulations to Finance Minister; protective tariff, little relief; protected interests, nothing to fear; disappointment and discontent in West; agricultural conditions; cost of living and production;prices of farm products; lack of purchasing power; cost of transportation and distribution, 2835; Crowsnest pass agreement; Wheat Board; Manitoba legislature, attitude of; royal commission on freight rates and grain trade; rural credits and farm loans; natural resources; municipal taxation, prices in Canada and United States; tariff and prices; agricultural implements; protection unsound; revenue; direct taxation, 2836; inheritance tax; graduated income tax; amendment
Experimental farms, 469
Lake Killarney improvement, 999
Live stock industry, 468
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 1146
Seed inspection, 198
Taxation, direct, 2836
Turtle Mountain reserve, reforestation, 3413

Steel, the L. R. Company, Limited, qu. 1994

Steel. *See* Iron and Steel

Stefansson, Mr. Vilhjammer
Coal resources of Hudson bay, 1073
Reindeer and muskox in Barren Lands, 1073

Stenographers, members' qu. 518

Stevens, Hon. H. H. (Vancouver Centre)
Australia, trade treaty with, 1848
Bank Act, reference to speech on, 4031-4
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4032, 4081, 4089, 4099, 4125
Bank of Vancouver, qu. 4011
Beckett, Matt C., appointment and dismissal, 816
British Columbia
Claims against federal government, 708
Liquor. *See under this title* Canada Temperance; Liquor
Oil companies, 2505

Stevens, Hon. H. H.—*Con*
British preference
Canadian ports, direct importation, 3454
Goods imported via Suez canal and Hong Kong, 3454
Bureau of Standards, 788
Business of the House, private bills, posting, 4248
Canada Highways bill, 2338
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill, coasting regulations, 4235
Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, 2983
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2407-13, 2424. *See also under this title,* Liquor Act of 1922, 2407
Correspondence with Attorney General, British Columbia, 1032-38
Exceptions, 2409
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Expenditure and earnings, 1868
Vessels, earnings, 3324, 3399
Canadian National Railways
Advance, $73,000,000, 3610
M. to reduce by $2,000,000, 3681
Branch lines construction bill, 4186, 4341
Appropriations, 4342
Liquor transportation, 1868, 3324
Management, responsibility and powers, 3628
Paris offices, 3618, 3627, 3681
Amdt. that item stand, 3664; ruled out of order, 3667
Ruling, reference to, 3670
Securities, 4525
Canadian representation in United States, 4001
Cattle embargo, correspondence, 4184
Chinese Immigration Act Amdt. bill, 2308-37, 4537
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 529
Civil Service, salaries and bonus, qu. 204
Combines bill, 2524
Combines Investigation Act, 1910, prosecutions, 2575
Companies Act Amdt. bill, 4208-4217
Contrecoeur wharf, 950
Corruption-liquor purchases, 2410
Customs duty, goods passing from one Canadian port to another, 3272
Dairy Industry Act 1914 Amdt. bill, 4265, 4344
Deadman's island, qu. 1362
Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 788
Dominion Lands Act Amdt. bill
Homesteads, 4201
Pulpwood, permission to cut, 4206
Estimates, civil government, form of, 612, 780

Stevens, Hon. H. H.—*Con*
Exchequer court judgeship, 2500
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4271, 4541
Fiji islands, trade with, 1848
Freight rates
Railway Act Amdt bill, 54
Railway rates, equalization, M. (Mr. Clark) 1940
French treaty
Canned salmon, Japanese packed, 453
Favoured nation, 448
Fuel supply, 793
Geological survey, 2504
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 322
Grain and grain trade, 3821
Elevators
Dockages, qu. 1484, qu. 1661
Earnings, 2042
Overages, 2043
Screenings, 2041, qu. 2697, qu. 3131
Revenue from, 2042
Grain Act, licenses, 2299
Marketing of grain, M. (Mr. Millar) 293, 304, 305
Shipment and handling, 2044
Granville island, taxation, qu. 1485
Grondines wharf, 959
Harbours and rivers
Expenditures in different provinces, 947
Nova Scotia, 941
Chimney Corner wharf, 942
Quebec, 950
Highway construction grants, 623
Hindu immigrants, franchise, 513
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1315
Endorsation of Imperial government and railways, 1328
Chinese, 2311-12. *See also under this title,* Chinese
Contingencies and general expenses, 1873
Lands
Orientals to, 511
Thirty-two year agreements for sale, 1317
Policy, 1315
Taxation and emigration, 1319
Immigration Act Amdt. bill, (Mr. Neill) 511, 857
Income War Tax Act Amdt. bill, 4495-98
Indemnity of members, 4241
Indians, 2124-5
Kitsilano reserve, 383
Industrial and scientific research, 788
Inland Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 4207
Interest rate, 4110
Irrigation Act Amdt. bill, 2138

Stevens, Hon. H. H.—*Con.*
Iron ore deposits, British Columbia, 2505
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4281
Lake of the Woods
Control board, expenses, 4001
Regulation bill, 4173-75
Liquor. *See also under this title,* Canada Temperance
British Columbia
Administration, 2410, 2424
Bootlegging
Attorney General and, 2407
Execution of murderers of policeman Lawson, 2407
Export, 2407
Warehouses, 3144
National railways, transportation on, 3324
Lowe, Dr. A. M., capture and maltreatment in China, 2695
Manitoba Pulp and Paper Company lease, 3256
Marine hospitals, 701
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, trip to Great Britain, 3290
Masters and mates, 2610
Narcotic Drugs bill, 2114-23
National Defence, pay of staff, 891
New York, appointment Canadian customs officer, 3272
Northern Pacific Halibut Fishery Protection bill, 4484
Officers, military, retired, 891
Opium and Narcotic Drugs Act, administration, 697
Ordnance lands, 3444
Ore-testing plants, 2506
Ostrea lake wharf, 943
Patents of Invention bill, 2066-77-87, 2131
Appeal to Exchequer Court, 2080
Domicile, election of, 2070
Pensions
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 774, qu. 1362
Unemployed pensioners, relief, 2169
Petroleum and Naphtha Inspection bill, 4248
Point Grey sandhead leases, 3671
Preston, Mr. W. T. R., report, 248
Prince Rupert civic employees, 2086
Proportional representation, 405
M. (Mr. Good) 416
Public Works Act, contract and tender, 951
Public Works, estimates, explanation, 961
Pugsley, Hon. William, appointment, 2500-02
Purchasing Commission, 4002
Renovated butter, 4265 ,4344
Rombough, Mr. R. M., 387

Stevens, Hon. H. H.—*Con*
Royal Canadian Mounted Police
Pensions, inadequacy, 774, qu. 1362
Scrip, qu. 1362
Sales tax, 4181, 4429, 4431
Drain tiles, 3183
Exemptions, 4431
M. for com. of inquiry, 245, 915, 928
Nursery stock, 4432
Tomato plants, 4432
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4241
Settlers' relief, 3448
Special War Revenue Act, M. for com. of inquiry, 245, 915, 928
Sponagle, Col. J. A., qu. 2697
Steamship services, 2171
Interprovincial trade, 2177
Terminal elevators and grain trade, 3821
Timber permits, qu. 203
Trade commissioners, 1847
Unemployment, order in council No. 220, 436
Vancouver harbour bill, 255-9
Vancouver harbour board, 387
Venereal diseases, 705
Yukon Act Amdt. bill, 4247
War claims, amdt. to reduce, 2502
Waterton lakes highway, qu. 2085

Stevenson, Mr. John A., article on immigration, 628

Stewart, Hon. Charles (Minister of the Interior; Minister of Mines; Superintendent General of Indian Affairs; Acting Minister of Immigration and Colonization)
Agriculture, depressed condition, 1083
Alberta Liberal convention, 2995, 2797
Alpine Club grant, 3414
Arctic explorations, 3944
New ship for, 4702
Banff National park, water powers, 3420, 3939
Banff-Windermere highway, opening, 3584
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4102
Barnjum, Mr. Frank J. D., 3412
Bienfait briquetting plant, 789, 2509-12, 3206. *See also under this title,* Fuel
British Empire exhibition, 1910
Appropriation, 3950
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, 4704
Budget, 2795. Tribute to Finance Minister, 2795; science of government; responsibilities and difficulties; promise and performance; tariff reduction; war debt, expenditure and taxation, 2796; inflation; agricultural conditions; depression of 1890-96; extravagance, ex-

Stewart, Hon. Charles—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
penditure and debt; per capita debt; natural resources, 2797; protection of industries; artificial silk; business depression, 2798; changes of government in Alberta and Manitoba; tariff reduction not warranted; difficulties due to other causes; world competition; moving in direction of tariff reduction; tariff stability does not mean finality, 2799; immigration; freight rates; railway labour, wages; deflation; emigration; co-ordination of immigration work; land settlement; unemployment, 2800; labour; unemployment; co-operation of government with railway companies; agricultural conditions in United States; immigration from United States; taxation, apportionment of; taxation of capital, 2801; necessary to attract capital as well as labour; natural resources, development of; mineral wealth, conservation of; coal and oil production; inheritance tax; balanced budget; railway debt and deficits; revenue from coal and oil in Alberta, 2802; amendment; income tax; land tax; inheritance tax; agriculture, condition and prospects, 2803
Buffalo, slaughter of, 3435-39, 4702
Burrard Inlet bridge, 4708
Calgary Power Company, application, 3939-40
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2413
Canadian Forestry Association grant, 3409
Canadian National parks and historic sites, 3406, 3432, 3939. *See also under this title,* Dominion Lands
Automobile admission fee, 3942
Water powers, leases, 3420, 3442, 3939
Cattle embargo, effect of removal, 1101
Chinese Immigration Act Amdt. bill, 768, 2308-2337, 2481, 4536. *See also under this title,* Immigration
Children, 2484
Immigration confined to certain classes, 2482
Merchants, 2482
Students, 2317
Wives, 2484
Civil Service Commission, appointments, 1086
Coal. *See also under this title,* Fuel
Alberta
Freight rates on, 1269

Stewart, Hon. Charles—*Con.*
Coal—*Con.*
Alberta—*Con.*
Production and revenue, 2802
Shipments to Ontario, 1163
Coal lands and mining rights, 2639, 3149
Hudson's Hope, 3203
Coast Range Steel Company, assistance, 2508
Commodity and agricultural products, prices, 1083
Conscription of fire fighters, 3410
Deflation, inequality of, 1407
Dominion Forest Reserves and Parks bill, 1256, 2060-86
Dominion lands
Contingencies, 3408
Pre-emptions and purchased homesteads, 1354
Reclamation by drainage, 3430
Dominion Lands Act, Amdt. bills
Coal lands and mining rights, 2639, 3149
Homesteads, 3982, 4201, 4364
Second, 3398
Dominion lands and parks, 3249. *See also under this title,* Canadian National Parks and Historic Sites
Estimates, 3406
Medicine Hat office, 3250
Taxes unpaid, 3257
Dominion Power board, 3427
Emigration to United States, 1082-93, 1322-30
Empire Forestry Conference, 3410
Estimates, preparation of, 3242
Exhibitions, 1454
British Empire, 1910, 3950, 4704
Exhibits for, 1468-9
Expenditure, 1468
Immigration, attracting, 1466
Staff and salaries, 1455-65
United States in, 1465
Farmers' credits, 1088
Forest protection, 3409-20
M. (Mr. Michaud) 820
Freight rates, 2799
Reduction of, 1101
Fuel Supply. *See also under this title,* Coal
Coal prices, control of, 3198
Coke ovens, 789
Fuel testing, 789
M. (Mr. Church) 1269-81
Peat experiments, 790, 3199, 3206
United States, 3203
Geodetic survey, estimates, 3245
Geological survey, estimates, 2504, 3197
Georgia pine, importation of, 3411
Grain, marketing of, M. (Mr. Millar) 309
Grazing inspectors, appointment, 3253

Stewart, Hon. Charles—*Con.*
Grazing leases, 3426
Hebridean immigrants, treatment of, 3591
Hindu immigrants, franchise, 503
Historic sites, 3406, 3432, 3939
Fort Edward, 3432-5
Homesteads. *See also under this title,* Dominion lands
Improvements, 3251
Inspectors, 3251
Hoppe and Isenberg leases, cancellation, 3146, 3227
Howat, Mr. Alex., detention at border, 2297, 2393, 2419, 2469, 3159
Hudson Bay railway, McArthur claim, 4687
Hudson's Hope, coal possibilities, 3203
Immigration, 2800. *See also under this title,* Chinese Immigration
Advertising, 1103, 1218
Alleged campaign against, 332
British Columbia, 1327, 1096
Canada Colonization Association, 1089, 1386, 1479, 1877
Agreement, signing, 1976
Terms, 1102, 1320
Endorsation of Imperial Govt. and railways, 1328
History, 1102
Minister's statement, 1089
Further statement, 1320
Officers, 1172
Directors and, 1327
Proposals of, memo, 1877
Railway contributions, 3400
Reorganization, 3400
Subsidy of $10,000 per month, 1092
Willison, Sir John, 1164, 1323, 1328, 1429
Child, 1099, 1469
Agencies, 1470
Domestic servants, conductresses, 1477-8
Empire settlement scheme, 288, 688, 1096, 1464, 1469, 1473, 1480
Grant, division of, 1475
European, 1170, 1316
Farm labourers, 1100
Winnipeg, 1976
Foster homes for children, 1099
Germany and Hungary, from, 1094
Great Britain, from, 1084, 1346
Officers in, 1879
Hebridean, 3591
Indian army officers, settlement in Canada, 1096
Interest rates on land purchases, 1088
Labour, restriction of, 1104
Leased land for American settlers, 1101
Literature, 1428
Maritime provinces, 1086

Stewart, Hon. Charles—*Con.*
Immigration—*Con.*
Minister's statement, 1082
Movement of population to United States, 1082
New Brunswick, 1200
Nominative system, 1360, 1478
Norway and Sweden, from, 1192
Ontario, 1085
London office, 1428
Oriental
Chinese, 1443. *See also under this title,* Chinese Immigration bill
Admission of, 1446
Children, 1445
Estimates, 1443
Legislation, forecast of, 502
Japanese
Japanese freighter with stowaways, 1454
Passages
Assisted, from Great Britain, 1100
Immigrant's family or friends, 1100
Loans, 1475
Prepaid, agreement with Imperial government, 2611
Policy, 1317, 1386
Propaganda embracing all Canada, 1098
Provincial government and, 1327
Publicity work, 1874
Quebec, 1085, 1104
Restriction of, 1170
St. John immigration building, 1457, 1464, 1908
Agreement with Canadian Pacific, 1458
Scotland from, 1095
Settlement in colonies, 1100
Statistics, 1881-1922, 1094
Swedish representative, visit of, 1095, 1192
Ukrainians, 1397
Western provinces, natural resources and policy, 1093
Immigration Act Amdt. bill, 502, 514
Immigration and Colonization dept.
Black, Mr. W. J., deputy minister
Appointment, 2664
Visit to Europe, 1476, 2084
Estimates, 1082-1110, 1317, 1386
Details of, 1482
Ingram, Mr., appointment of, 2664
May, Mr., appointment of, 2663
Outside service, salaries, 1082
Salaries and contingencies, 1873, 1909
Indians, 2124
Agents, 2146
Burke, Mr. J. Garry, appointment of, 2151
New Brunswick, 2154

Stewart, Hon. Charles—*Con.*
Indians—*Con.*
British Columbia, 2163
Cattle, beef production, 2159, 2162
Chieftainship, 2148
Condition of, 2126
Education, 2126
Appropriations for, 2164
Increased, 2145
Church organizations, work of, 2146
Edmonton school, 2149-2165
Morley reserve, 2150
Farming, 2156
Greater production, 2155
Indian Affairs, dept
Estimates, 2124, 2145, 2153, 2165, 4702
Reorganization, 2162
Salaries and contingencies, 2165
Medical service, 2160
Minister, statement of, 2145
Northern Ontario and Manitoba, hunting grounds, 2146
Nova Scotia, 4702
Potlatching, 2163
Reserves
Blackfeet, 2148-9
Caughnawaga, expulsion of halfbreeds, 2163
Grain production, 2156
Highways, 2153
Kitsilano, 383
Land, lease of, 2150
Hay, 2153
St. Lawrence river islands, 2164
Sioux, 2160
Treatment of, 2158
Tuberculosis, 2153
Interior, dept. of
Estimates, 1904, 3406, 3939, 4702
Salaries and contingencies, 1909, 3949
International boundaries, surveys, etc. 3246
Iron ore
Alberta, 2512
British Columbia, 2505, 2514
Reported discovery, lake Athabasca, 2513
Irrigation Act Amdt. bill, 1992, 2138, 2204, 2428-36, 2668-71, 3981
Irrigation, surveys and inspection, 3428
Kootenay flats, reclamation, 3431
Labour. *See also under this title,* Immigration
Cheap, 1118
Delegates from United States, detention *See under this title,* Howat
Northern Ontario and Quebec, 1086
Labrador gold discovery, reported, 2611
Gold rush, 1995
Lack of confidence, M. (Mr. Irvine) 238

Stewart, Hon. Charles—*Con.*
Lake of the Woods Regulation bill, 4172
Land. *See also under this title,* Dominion lands; Immigration
American immigrants, for, 1093
Free, available for settlement, 1087, 1090
Speculation, 1395
Taxation of, 1105
Larkin, Mr. James, detention, 1163, 1213, 1309
Liberal platform of 1919, 2994
Lignite Utilization Board, 2515. *See also under this title,* Bienfait
Live stock prices in West, 1101
Mackenzie river district, halfbreed claims, 3409, 3444
Manitoba Pulp and Paper Company lease, 3254
Maps, preparation of, 3443
Meyerscough, Mr. Thomas, detention, 2469. *See also under this title,* Howat
Migratory Birds Convention Act, 3443
Military hospitals, mental cases, 671
Mines department
Estimates, 2504, 3197
Explosives division, 2514
Salaries, 3207
Moose Mountain pleasure resort, 3408
National Parks and Reservations bill, 3131
Northwest territories
Administration, 3944, 4702
New ship, purchase and maintenance, 4702
Wireless telegraph system, 3944, 3948
Oil, 2802
Coutts Sweet Grass Company, 2508
Fuel, shale deposits, 2513
Oil companies, British Columbia, 2505
Southern Alberta, 2508
Ordnance lands, salaries and expenses, 3443
Ore-testing
British Columbia, plants, 2506
Machinery, 2509
Shipment to Ottawa, 2505
Peat. *See under this title,* Fuel
Printing, Interior department, 3443
Promissory notes, tax, 3924
Publicity agent in London, 4707
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 3413
Quebec Battlefields Commission, 3406
Reforestation, Turtle mountain reserve, 3413
Relief of distressed Canadians, 1456
St. Lawrence river waterway, 3427
Saskatchewan, national parks, 3942
School lands. *See also under this title,* Dominion lands
Reversion of, 3445
Unpaid balance of purchase price, 4203
Seed grain advances, 3444, 4367

Stewart, Hon. Charles—*Con.*
Settlers' relief, 3447
Soldier Settlement Board
Advances and salaries, 1910, 2017
Advertising, 2023
Estimates, 2017-30
Expenditure, 2018
Land sales, supervisors, alleged attempt to bribe, 1092
Legal expenses, 2018, 2020
Loans, 2028
Moss, Mr. H. H., compensation, 2030
Telegraph and telephone lines, 4590
Topographical surveys, 2509, 3245
Towers, 2512
Tree-planting on prairies, 3412
Triplets, bonus for, inquiry, 3146
Water powers
Administration of, 3420
Banff National park, 3420, 3939
Dominion forest reserves and parks, 1256
Highwood river, 3427
Leases, 3422
Provincial jurisdiction, 3421
Publicity, 3421
Wheat, price of, 1101
Wrangel island, ownership, 3948
Yukon territory
Administration, 3943
Mining fees, 1636

Stewart, Mr. C. Wallace (Humboldt)
Air service, insect pest control, 597
Branch lines, construction bill, 4311-22
Cheque tax, 3934
Destructive insect pests, 597
Hudson Bay railway, M. (Mr. Knox) 1060
Income tax, fines, remissions, 3507
Labour, department
Annuities branch, 1677
Staff, 1677
Merchants' Bank inquiry, 3990
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2459, 3984
Noxious weeds, 2305
Paddle, Mr. J. W., claim of, 1834
Penitentiaries, 771
Rural mail carriers, compensation, 1833
Seed testing bill, 2305
Thunderhill branch line railway, 4311, 4315, 4322
Weights and measures, Peterborough, 810

Stewart, Mr. H. A. (Leeds)
Address in reply, 169. Near East crisis, 169; increase in commerce; trade conventions; removal of cattle embargo; immigration; Bank Act revision, 170; shipping rates combine inquiry; re-

Stewart, Mr. H. A.—*Con.*
Address—*Con.*
distribution; proportional representation, 171; Mr. Hoey's reference to Mr. Meighen, 171-172; Conservative party not dead or sleeping, 172
Bankruptcy Act, M. (Mr. Casgrain) 1527
Brockville rifle range, 889
Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, Sir Henry Thornton, 2983
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, lease of freighters, 3848
Canadian National railways, ties, qu. 516
Cornwall canal employees, qu. 3135
Hudson Bay railway, 4684
Immigration, medical inspection, 703
Income tax convictions, qu. 3582
Labour, jurisdiction, 1650
Military properties, maintenance, 889
Morrisburg-Waddington ferry, qu. 1029
Murray Stewart, steamer, qu. 386
National monument, Connaught place, 2685-88
Naturalization Act Amdt. bill, 2439-40
Old age annuities, 1639
Peat experiments, 3206
Public Works, salaries, 2685
Rideau canal, water power leases, qu. 622
Telegraph and telephone lines, 2683
Troops for Sydney strike, qu. 624

Stewart, the late Hon. J. A., 5, 7, 8, 166
Letter from Mrs. Stewart acknowledging sympathy, 435

Stewart, Mr. James, qu. 205

Stewart, Mr. Dan W., qu. 205

Stewart, Mr. T. J. (Hamilton)
Petawawa camp and Ontario elections, 3976

Stipendiary Magistrates. *See* Northwest Territories Act Amdt.
Rocky Mountain park, 1739

Stock. *See* Live Stock

Stock Growers' Protective Association, grant, 587

Stockyards. *See* Live Stock

Stornoway. *See also* Hebridens
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, speech, 2181

Stork, Mr. Alfred (Skeena)
Address in reply, 149. Skeena pioneer constituency, 149-50; Yukon telegraph lines; Queen Charlotte islands, 150; natural resources of Skeena; halibut fisheries;

Stork, Mr. Alfred—*Con.*
Address—*Con.*
Prince Rupert port, 151; railway traffic; visit of Montreal Board of Trade, 152; Grand Trunk Pacific, 153
British Columbia fishing licenses, 1550
Budget, 2733. Congratulations to Finance Minister; reciprocity, reception of announcement in Canada and United States; Chicago Tribune, comment; sugar, 2733; sales tax; copper bounty; machinery for manufacture of fish offal; British preference; direct importation; Canadian ports; Prince Rupert; reciprocity campaign in 1911; Fordney tariff, 2734; fishing industry and United States markets; use of Canadian ports by United States fishermen; collection of duty on purchases in Canada; United States wharf on Canadian soil; Canadian representative at Washington, 2375
Labour, right to organize, 2888
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2460
Orientals, 2461
Powell River Paper Company, 2888

Strikes. *See* Industrial Disputes; Labour

Stuart, Mr. John Cameron, qu. 2179

Students. *See also* Schools; Universities
Chinese. *See* Chinese Immigration bill
Medical, summer employment, 704
Scholarships, 878
Federation of Canadian students, res. 2486

Stumping Machines. *See* Customs Tariff Items

Sub-Judice Questions. *See* Speaker

Subsidies. *See* Bounties; Cold Storage Act Amdt. bill; Dry Dock Subsidies Act; Steamship Services

Suez Canal, Goods imported via Hong Kong 3454

Sugar. *See also* Budget; Customs and Excise; Customs Tariff Items
Beet, excise duty, abolition of, 2644, 2706, 2742, 2989, 3229, 4393
British preference, 2651
British tax on, 2754
Canada-West Indies steamship service, 3390
Combine, 2563, 2576, 2584, 2586, 3069
Women and, 2576
Customs drawbacks, 2655, 3502

Sugar—*Con.*
Customs duty, 2820, 2825, 2981, 2987, 3017, 3034, 3060, 3069, 3082, 3479
Dumping clause, 2646, 3046
Reduction of, 2645, 2646, 2744, 2968, 3049
Refiners' protection, 2987
Gambling in, 3058
Jam manufacturers, 3477
Price, increase of, 2646, 2734, 2889, 2933

Sullivan, Mr. Arthur W., 381

Superannuation. *See* Canadian National Railways, Grand Trunk, Gratuities, Civil Service; Judges; Pensions

Supplementary Estimates. *See* Estimates

Supreme Court, general rules and orders, 1659

Supply. *See also* Interim Supply
Committee of, 456, 575, 668, 859, 941, 993, 1082, 1163, 1213, 1315, 1386, 1443, 1464, 1538, 1619, 1637, 1668, 1694, 1740, 1764, 1811, 1837, 1873, 2017, 2124, 2145, 2392, 2489, 2494, 2610, 2671, 3160, 3272, 3330, 3406, 3610, 3706, 3760, 3798, 3824, 3830, 3938, 3985, 4554, 4594, 4638

Supply Bills. *See* Appropriation Acts

Supply, Committee of
Bills. *See* Appropriation Acts
Concurrence, 4732, 4735
Estimates. *See that title*
Subjects and items discussed:
Agriculture
Agricultural instruction grant, 607
Agricultural produce marketing agent, 4675
Cattle
Shipment to Great Britain, 4675
Embargo, expenses, 3989
Dairying, 609, 3283
Dehydration of fruits and vegetables, 4674
Destructive Insect and Pest Act, 595, 3988
Experimental farms, 456
Fruit, 598
Health of animals, 575, 587, 3989, 4675
International Institute of, 599
Publications, 598
Salaries and contingencies, 610, 3303, 4674
Stockgrowers' Protective Association grant, 587
Suppression of foul brood in bees, 4675
Alpine Club of Canada, 3444
Auditor General, 3897, 4003

Supply, Committee of—*Con.*
Subjects and Items discussed—*Con.*
Air Force. *See under this title,* National Defence
Annuities. *See under this title,* Labour
Banting, Dr. F. G., annuity, 4676. *See also under this title,* Insulin
British and Foreign news service, 4712
Burrard Inlet Tunnel and Bridge Company, 4708
Business Profits War Tax Act, 3949
Canada Grain Act, administration, 781, 2035, 4709
Canada Highways Commission, 2489, 3173
Canada Temperance Act, administration, 2495
Canadian Athletic Team, Olympic games, 4706
Canadian Engineering Standards Association, 788
Canadian Forestry Association, 3409
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 3798, 3824-30
Canadian National parks and historic sites, 3406, 3432, 3938, 3948,
Canadian National Railways, 1764
Advances
$73,000,000, 1619, 3610, 3676, 3789
$13,099,493.34, 1752, 3376
$ 1,700,000, 3376
$ 1,550,000, 4692
Branch lines, purchase of, 3646
Peace river railway survey, 4698
Prince Edward Island car ferry claim, 4676
Transcontinental, Fortin & Moffat claim 3646
Canadian National Safety League grant, 3953
Canadian representative in United States, 4001
Canadian Press, Limited, 4735
British cable service, 4727
Canadian telegraph service, 4727
Canals. *See also under this title,* Railways and Canals
Isle Perrot bridge, St. Anne's lock, 3646
Rideau, 4691
Trent, improvement, 3647, 4691
Welland, construction, 3760, 4690
Chief electoral officer, 4001
Civil Service
Bonus, 1664, 1811
Commission, salaries and contingencies, 668, 3986
Commissioner of Taxation, 3949
Customs and Excise, 3272
Debates, Official Report of, 2691

Supply, Committee of—*Con.*
Subjects and Items discussed—*Con.*
Deputy ministers' salaries, increases, 4667
Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 788
Dominion lands and parks, 3406, 3938, 4702
Dominion lands, contingencies, 3408
Outside service, salaries, 3249
Dominion Power Board, expenses, 3427
Dominion statutes, revision, 779
Edmonton elevator, 4716
Empire Forestry Convention, 3410
Exhibitions, 1910, 1454
British Empire, 3949, 4704
Canadian traveling exhibition in France, 811, 4711
External Affairs, salaries, 3987
Finance, charges of management, 3987
Fuel supply
Advisory fuel committee, 4691
Fuel and power resources, investigation, 3427
Geodetic survey, 3245
Geological survey, 2504
Government publications, 1712
Governor General's cars, repairs, 4691
Gratuities to Grand Trunk officials, 1664
Halifax grain elevator, 4713
Harbours and rivers, 941, 993
Alberta, 1001, 4589
British Columbia, 1002, 2671
Manitoba, 993, 4589
New Brunswick, 945, 4587
St. John, 2676, 4610
Nova Scotia, 941, 4554, 4635
Morrison, Mr. T. D., claim, 4722
Ontario, 981, 2690, 4588, 4594
Port Arthur and Fort William, 2675, 4610
Toronto harbour improvements, 2678, 4610
Prince Edward island, 945, 4586
Quebec, 950, 4588
Champlain dock, 2675
Health, department of, 697, 2167
Marine hospitals, 701
Medical examination of immigrants, 702
Medical research laboratories, 703
Opium and Narcotic Drugs Act, 697
Proprietary or patent medicines, 700
Quarantine, 702
Salaries and contingencies, 2170
Hector celebration, 4705
Highways. *See under this title,* Canada Highways
Housing, loans to provinces, 4704
Hudson Bay railway
Construction, 4680

Supply, Committee of—*Con.*
Subjects and Items discussed—*Con.*
Hudson Bay Railway—*Con.*
McArthur, J. D. & Company, refund, 3647, 4686, 4689
Port Nelson terminals, 3647
Hydrographic survey, 3336
Immigration and Colonization, 1082-1135, 1163, 1213, 1315, 1386, 1443, 1464, 1873, 1909
Imperial Conference, 4638
Imperial Economic Conference, 4638
Expenses of delegation, 4666
Income War Tax Act Amdt. bill, 3949
Indians, 2124, 2145, 2165, 4702
Industrial and scientific research, 788
Insulin, discovery and supply, 703
Insurance branch, salaries, 3987
Interior, department, 4702
Cory, Mr. W. W., deputy minister, 4667
Dominion Astrophysical observatory, 3242
Dominion observatory, 3242
Engraving maps, etc., 3443
Irrigation, surveys and inspections, 3428
Ordnance lands, 3443
Reclamation of Dominion lands by drainage, 3430
Salaries and contingencies, 1098, 1909, 3949
Interim Supply. *See that title*
Justice, department, 4667
Administration, 705, 4674
Bankruptcy Act, administration, 780
Litigated matters, expenses, 779
Penitentiaries, 706, 768
Salaries, 780
Labour, 1621
Annuities Act, administration, 1639
Canada Gazette, 1707
Employment offices, 1630
Industrial Disputes Act, 1627, 1702, 1716
Joint industrial councils, 1654
Salaries, etc., 1668, 1694
Technical Education Act, 1637
Lake Grain Rates Commission, 4710
Lake of the Woods Control Board, 4001
Laurier, Sir Wilfrid, monument, 1017
League of Nations
Canada's contribution, 3990
Expenses, Canadian delegates, 3989
Legislation
House of Commons, 4674
Committees, expenses, 2691, 4674
Sergeant-at-Arms, 2691
Senate, salaries, etc. 2694, 3949
Library of Parliament, 2691
Lord Selkirk Association, grant, 4704

Supply, Committee of—*Con.*
Subjects and Items discussed—*Con.*
Mackenzie river district, half-breed claims, 3444
Marine and Fisheries
Agencies, rents and contingencies, 3351
Building fishways and clearing rivers, 3362
Canned and pickled fish, inspection, 3375
Deep sea fisheries, development, 3364
Detroit river traffic regulation, 3357
Distressed seamen, relief, 3332
False Creek bridge, 3375
Fish culture, 3367
Fishery officers and guardians, 3361
Fisheries protection service, 3361
Hopper barge construction, 3350
Ice-breaking, Thunder Bay, 3359
Life-saving service, 3335
Lighthouses and lightkeepers, salaries, 3351
Live Stock inspection, 3334
Maintenance and repairs of lighthouses, 3353
Marine biological board, 3371
Marine signal service, 3358
Meteorological service, 3360
Navigation
Construction of lights and aids to, 3357
Obstructions, navigable waters, 3332
Schools, 3331
Ocean and river service, 2610, 3375
Maintenance of steamers, 3160
Wrecks, investigation, 3160, 3330
Patrol of northern waters, 3360
Pickled fish, inspection, 3367
Pilotage
Administration of, 3358
Pensions to pilots, 3359
Radiotelegraph service, 3337
River St. Lawrence ship channel, 3375
Salaries and contingencies, 3373, 3375
Sorel shipyard, 3343, 3374
Steamboat inspection, 3360
Tidal and current survey, 3338
Unforeseen expenses, 3334
Wireless stations, 3337
Wrecking plants, subsidies, 3334
Merchants Bank inquiry, expenses, 3990
Migratory Birds Convention Act, 3443
Mines and Minerals
Assay office, Vancouver, 3207
Explosives division, 2514
Mines and Geological Survey, 2504, 3197
Salaries and contingencies, 3207

Supply, Committee of—*Con.*
Subjects and Items discussed—*Con.*
National Defence, 1740
Ammunition, 884
Annual drill, 4635
Arsenals
Lindsay, 803
Quebec, 884
Bonus, 1751, 1772
Cadet service, 877
Canadian air service, 1748, 1774
Clothing and necessaries, 883
Desbarats, Mr. G. J., acting deputy minister, 4673
Engineer services and works, 4638
Grants to associations, 889
May, Miss H. M., grant, 900
Military properties, maintenance, 889
Militia services, annual drill, 859
Naval Service, Royal Canadian navy, 900, 902
Northover, Major, H. R., 4635
Ordnance lands, arms, etc., 890
Pay of staff, 890
Permanent force, 892
Salaries and wages, 900, 901
Schools of instruction, 900
War claims, adjustment, 900, 1745
Warlike stores, 900
National Gallery of Canada, 1018, 2688
National monument, Connaught place, 1020, 2685
Naturalization Act, administration, 2495
Northwest territories
Administration, wireless, etc., 3449, 3948
Wireless station, Mayo, 4702
Paradis, Mr. Telesphore, claim, 4691
Paris agency, expenses, 4001
Pecuniary Claims Convention with United States, 779
Penitentiaries, 706, 768
Pensions
District boards of review, 4703
European war and active militia, 3706
Fenian raid, 3742
Northwest rebellion, 3742
Pension Commissioners, salaries, 2168, 3742
Port Colborne elevator, 4690
Post office
Mail service, 1778
Miscellaneous, 1832
Salaries and contingencies, 1814
Prince Rupert Dry Dock Company, claim, 4708
Printing, publications, 811
Printing bureau, 1710, 1730
Miscellaneous printing, 1716

Supply, Committee of—*Con.*
Subjects and Items discussed—*Con.*
Public printing and stationery, retiring allowances, 3949
Public archives, bonus, 4707
Public buildings, 1022
Archives, 1730
Law, late Bowman B., tablet, 1020
Manitoba, 4628
Maritime provinces, 4614
Montreal ordnance stores building, 1022
New Brunswick, 4613
Nova Scotia, 4612
Ontario, 1022, 4615
Ottawa, new departmental, 1729
Architects, compensation, 4633
Parliament buildings, 1716
Prince Edward Island, 4614
Printing bureau, new building, 1730
Quebec, 4614
St. John immigration building, 1457
Quarantine station, Partridge island, 1021
Water supply, 1022
Saskatchewan, 4629
Terrebonne, Quebec, 2690
Public Works, 4594
Dredging, 1009, 4590
Graving docks, locks, etc. 2681
Harbours and rivers. *See under this title,* Harbours and Rivers
Roads and bridges, 1014, 4589
Salaries, 2684
Telegraph and telephone lines, 2682, 4590
Pulpwood Commission, 4709
Purchases, government, supervision of, 3950, 4001
Purchasing Commission, 4704
Radiotelegraph service, wireless stations, 3374
Railway Commissioners, Board of, 3188
Railways and Canals, 3650. *See also under this title,* Canals
Arbitration, litigation, etc. 3195
Contingencies, 3377
Intercolonial pension allowances, 3195
Printing and stationery, 3197
Prince Edward Island railway, pensions, 3195
Salaries, 3195
Surveys and inspections, 3648, 4691
Relief of distressed Canadians abroad, 1456
Roof coverings, investigation, 4703
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 774, 1163
Royal Canadian Navy, 900-2

Supply, Committee of—*Con.*
Subjects and Items discussed—*Con.*
St. Lawrence ship channel, 3339
Sorel shipyard, 3374,
Surveys and investigations, 3647
Secretary of State
Public archives, 3985
Salaries, 2392, 2494
Seed, feed and fertilizer control, 599
Seed grain advances, 3444
Settlers' relief, Alberta and Saskatchewan, 3447
Soldier Settlement Board, 1910
Advances and salaries, 2017
Moss, Mr. H. H., compensation, 2030
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 668, 4703
Department, salaries, 687
Interest, war service gratuity, 689
Medical advisory and appeal boards, 696
Medical examination of pensioners, 670
Operating expenses and working capital, 690
Pensions, European war and active militia, 2166
Sheltered employment, burial expenses, etc., 693
Treatment, 687
Unemployment relief, 689, 2168
Vocational loans, 687
Vocational training, 686
Steamship services, 2171, 3377, 4003, 4701.
Topographical surveys, 3244
Trade and Commerce, 3377, 4701
Bounties, petroleum, 780
Canada Grain Act, 781, 2035, 4709
Commercial intelligence service, 1837
Mail subsidies and steamship subventions, 2171
Patent and Copyright branch, 2035
O'Halloran, Mr. G. F., salary increase, 4673
Salaries and contingencies, 2031
Steamship services. *See under this title,* Steamship Services
Terminal elevators, maintenance, 810
Treaties, negotiation of, expenses, 3989
War claims, adjustment, 2495
Water powers, surveys, etc. 3420
Weights and measures, inspection, 810
Yukon territory, government of, 3943

Surveys. *See also* Dominion Lands; Geodetic Survey; Water Powers
Base lines, townships, lakes, rivers, qu. 1866
Prairie provinces in, qu. 1866
Public works, 1020
Railway, 4691. *See also* Railways
Peace River district, 4698

Surveys—*Con.*
Topographical, 2509, 3244
Boundary posts and towers, 2512
Expenditure, qu. 1865

Sutherland, Mr. Donald (South Oxford)
Agriculture department
Deputy minister's salary, 611
Estimates, 3284
Salaries and contingencies, 611
Agricultural conditions com. 3271
Agricultural instruction grant, 607-8
Administration, 3284
Agricultural products, imports, qu, 617, 1426
Alderson claim, 584
Ammunition, 887
Anglo-Saxons, a colonizing race, 1426
Bacon, grades of, 593
Bayfield harbour, 981
Business of the House
Chair, ruling of, 4720
Questions passed as orders for returns, 940
Canada Grain Act, administration, 785
Canadian National Railways, Paris offices, 3693
Cattle. *See also under this title,* Live Stock
Embargo, removal, correspondence, 4133
Shipment, 3317
Civil Service
Hours, 1427
Reduction of expenditure in Great Britain, 1803
Political partisanship, 286
Cold storage, 188
Warehouses, 191
Cost of living statistics, 1684
Dairying industry, 609
Dairy produce graders, appointment, 3289
Restrictions, 3153
Dairy Industry Act Amdt. bill, 3153
M. to discharge order, 3325
Daylight saving, farmers and, 1427
Debates, official report of
Missing pages, 887-8, 1081
Supply, undiscussed items, 3292
Emigration to the United States, 1431
Exhibitions, 1468
Experimental farms, 464-486
Ontario, 465
Farm labour, 1427
Feeding stuffs
Adulteration, 604
Conference, 604
Feeding Stuffs Act, 604
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4538
Halifax grain elevator, 4716
Hamilton-Brantford highway, 2494

Sutherland, Mr. Donald—*Con.*
Health of animals, 584
Compensation for slaughter, 486
Hog grading, 593
Government publications, agriculture, 1428
Grain, dockage, 785
Group government, 1427
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1102, 1104, 1428, 1478
Financial support, 1429
North Atlantic Trading Company, 1092
Child, 1472-5
Domestic servants, and, 1100
Empire settlement scheme, 1474
Literature, 1428
Ontario, 1098, 1428, 1475
Policy, 1425
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1630, 1716
Labour
Department, statistics, 1682, 1684
Organized, dictation of, 1426
Technical Education Act, 1637
Lindsay arsenal, 883
Live stock. *See also* Cattle
Breeding at experimental farms, 465
Export trade, 193
Visit of Canadian commissioners to South America, 1213
Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill, 192
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, qu. 384
Activities of, 3292, 3308
Address to South Oxford Liberals, 594, 3292, 3309
Agricultural instruction grant, 608
Appointment, 3308
Order in council, 3294
Political patronage, 3316
Salary, 3286
Trips
Florida, 3309
Great Britain, 3308
Matane harbour improvements, 972
Mill feeds, adulteration, legislation, 2795. *See also under this title,* Feeding Stuffs
National Defence, ammunition, 1744
Naval service, 909, 1744
Nova Scotia miners' strike, 84, 1716
Oleomargarine. *See also under this title,* Dairy Industry Act
Butter and, 386
Manufacture of, 3153
M. (Mr. Carroll) 3575
Sub-amdt. (Mr. Good), 3572
Ontario grain elevators, 4716-20

Sutherland, Mr. Donald—*Con.*
Order in council, P.C. 223, 815
Peat experiments, 790
Penitentiaries, 772
Port Burwell harbour works, 983
Dredging, 1012
Post office
Political patronage, 3316
Rural mail delivery, 1803
Remuneration, competitive system, 1803
Privilege, Redistribution Com. 1660
Pulpwood, export, royal commission, 4709
Quebec arsenal, 887
Reciprocity agreement of 1911, 2975
Redistribution, special committee, 1660
Privilege, 1660
Report, 4740
Welland, Lincoln and Haldimand, 667
Sales tax, 1427
M. (Mr. Stevens) for com. of inquiry, 927
Tariff changes, 1427
Tuberculin test, 3302
War loans, delivery of dividend cheques, 1804
Warner, Mr., reference to, 1425

Swan, Mr. E. C., St. Croix harbour, 2900

Sweden
Immigration from, 1095, 1191, 1216
Senate, constitution of, 1373

Switzerland
French treaty, 3035. *See also* Treaties, French Treaty
Immigration, 3591
National Council, constitution of, 1373
Silks, export to Canada, 2397
Trade with, 2397
Watches and clocks, imports from, 2214

Sydenham Hospital. *See* Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment

Sydney Strike. *See* Labour, Strikes

Sydney-Whycocomagh steamship service, 2178

Taché, Mr. J. de L., General Librarian, Debates, missing pages, 1081

Taché, Sir E. P., Senate, elective, 1367

Tadoussac, Que., postmaster, qu. 3139

Taft, Hon. Howard G., payments to, qu. 1157

Tagore, Mr. Rabindranath, civilization, 2729

Talbot, Mr. Onésiphore. *See* Canadian National Railways, Directors

Tampa Exhibition. *See* Exhibitions

Tank Cars, transportation of, qu. 1361

Tariff. *See also* Address; Agriculture; Budget; Customs Tariff; Reciprocity; Trade; Treaties, French Treaty, Italian Treaty; United States. *For items discussed see* Customs Tariff Items
Aggregate tax paid in 50 years, 2793
Agricultural implements, 2743, 2756, 2975. *See also that title*
Industry, cost per employee, 2975
Agricultural conditions and, 1355, 1907
All countries increasing, 2819
Amdt. (Mr. Forke) 2717
Amdts. of Liberal opposition 1920 and 1921, 3020
Average rate, 22, 89, 2838
Bituminous coal, duty on, 1275-8
British preference. *See also that title*
Increase, 2718
Percentage of duties to general rate, 2776
Budget of 1922, net increase of duty, 3034
Canada not self-contained country, 3061
Canadian and United States, duties, comparison, 2958. *See also* United States
Changes in, 2702, 2853, 3488, 3895
Date on which effective, 3504
Under pressure of organized effort, 1427
Class privilege, 2728, 3069, 3074
Combines and, 2533, 2586, 2714
Anti-combine clause, 2534
Reduction of duties, 2522, 2528, 2561, 2583
Commission of 1920, 3028
Report voluminous, 3024, 3028
Conservative policy appropriated by Liberals, 2974
Consistency, 3072
Copper and creosoting industry, discrimination, 3231
Downward revision, 2786, 2831, 2945, 2907, 2968
Drawbacks, raw material, qu. 1864
Dumping clause, 2535, 3072
Duties, combines and, 2608
East and West, 2753
Economic warfare, 3053
Emigration and, 1093, 1440, 2737, 2823. *See also* speeches on Immigration
Equal to that of United States, 1246
Farmers, difficulties and, 2916, 3065
Favoured nation treatment. *See* Treaties, French, Italian
Finality, 2648, 2772, 2799, 2841, 2912, 3052. *See also under this title,* Stability
Fordney-McCumber. *See* United States
Goods shipped from one Canadian port to another, 2519

Tariff—*Con.*
High, 2924, 2980
Revolt against, 1859
Home markets, 2849
Immigration, effect on, 1113-4, 1119, 1133, 1222, 1413, 1416, 1424. *See also* speeches on Immigration
Implements of production, reduction, 2718, 2858, 2951, 2955. *See also under this title,* Agricultural Implements
Industries and, 3024
Intermediate and preferential. *See* Treaties, French
Investigation of industries, 2955
"Invisible tariff" 3000
Issue from 1878 to 1896, 2974
Items. *See* Customs Tariff Items
"Jacking-up," 3074, 3907
Labour, right to organize, 2893
Laurier-Fielding, 3030
Liberal party and, 2221, 3008. *See also that title*
Budget, protective, 2818
Platform, 1919, 2872
Pledges, 2951, 2952, 2994
Policy, 3007
Liberal and Conservative parties 2854
Joint product of, 2852
Not much difference between, 3018
Limitation to tariff income and turnover, 2859
Lower, competition, 2861
Luxuries, 2015
Macdonald, Sir John, of, 2756
Magazines and periodicals, 826
Manufacturers and, 2812
Minimum, 440
Minister of Finance, attitude on, 2838
Moderate, 2856, 2857
More equitable to producers, 1252
National policy, 2786. *See also that title*
Necessaries of life, 2955
Reduction of duties, 2718
No relief from, 2835
No surrender of Canadian markets, 2746
Not political but economic question, 2818
Oleomargarine, 3529
Ontario and, 1240
Other matters of greater importance, 2959
Parliamentary committee, 3028
Patents, Trade Marks and Copyright Act, 2293, 2294
Per capita tax, 3026
Permanent tariff commission, 2754, 2980, 2955, 3028, 3069
Portage la Prairie, district board, res., 3039

Tariff—*Con.*
Preferential. *See* British Preference; Imperial Conference; Treaties, French, Italian
Prices of agricultural and manufactured products, 1403. *See also* Prices
Production costs, 1394
Progressive party and, 2745
Prohibitive, 2850
Prosperity and, 2398
Protection, 2787, 2854. *See also that title*
Revenue and, 2778, 2835, 2957, 3048, 3063
Public ownership, 2905
"Purely and simply protective", 2908
Railway deficit and, 2905
Raw materials, free trade in, 2858
Reciprocity, 3080. *See also that title*
Reductions, 38, 100, 1420, 2813, 2944, 2972, 2976, 3048, 3066, 3077, 3082
Liberal party and, 2847
Recent, 3010
Resolutions, 2650, 3454, 3895, 3963
Changes in, 3046, 3082
McMaster, Mr., free food and implements of production, 2996
Revenue, 2839, 2850, 2854, 2905, 3063, 3069
"Same old", 2981
"Say-so" of beneficiaries, 2956
"Scientific" 3069
Seward, late William Henry, speech, 2916
Special committee, 2955
Special privileges, 2786
Specific duties, 2215
Stability, 2648, 2657, 2703, 2717, 2718, 2741, 2755, 2772, 2775, 2787, 2799, 2806, 2809, 2819, 2835, 2841, 2853, 2912, 2966, 3011, 3028, 3052, 3053, 3064, 3066, 3068, 3071, 3303, 4031
Genoa Conference, res. 3053
League of Nations, res. 3054
Steamship subsidies and, 2923
Substantial reduction in, amdt. (Mr. Forke) 2717
Tariff act of 1897, 3014
Tariff Commission, evidence, 2296
Tinplate industry, 2400
Trade commissioners and, 1840, 2923
United States and, 3010. *See also* United States
Unjust tax, 3062
Valuation of goods for customs, 90
War taxation, 2985
Weapon, 3477, 3907. *See also* Treaties, French
Western Canada and, 1887, 2747, 3062
Undue burden, 2781
Who pays? 2839

Tariff—*Con.*
Wood, Mr. H. W., Alberta, opinion, 2853. *See also* Budget
Wool, 2866
Woollen goods, reduction, 2990
Woollen industry, 3458
Protection, M. (Drummond) 928

Taxation. *See also* Agriculture; speeches on Budget; Customs Tariff; Customs and Excise; Income War Tax Act Amdt. bill; Inland Revenue; Protection; Special War Revenue; Tariff
Agricultural implements, 1850. *See also that title*
Apportionment of, burdensome to poor, 2789
Automobile, qu. 1993, 2841. *See also that title*
Banff hotel, 3435
Bank drafts, 3925, 3928
Beverages. *See under this title,* Confectionery and Beverages
Bill of exchange, 3923
Budget, failure to balance, 2831
Building prices and, 2165
Burden of, 1348, 1355, 1394, 1403, 1880, 2831. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget
Business profits, 2786, 2789, 2998. *See also* Business Profits War Tax Act Amdt. bill
Notes given in payment, 4489
Riordan Pulp & Paper Company, arrears, qu. 1974, 4490
Taxes collected, due and unpaid, qu. 1157
Unpaid, 4440, 4489
Business Profits War Tax Act 1916, administration, 3949
Cheque tax, 23, 121, 332, 2706, 2859, 2948, 3034, 3929, 4409, 4423
Embossed cheques regulations, qu. 492
Exemption up to $500, 2826
Inequality of, 3063
Maximum
Limitation of, 2847, 2877, 2979, 3922
Reduced to $1, 2656
Passed back to farmers, 3039
Payment with postage stamps, 1815, 3927
Responsibility for payment, 2877
Who pays? 3039
Cigarettes. *See* Customs and Excise
Collection, 89. *See also under this title* Income; Sales Tax
Methods, 2213, 2786
Commission, 4039
Commissioner of, salary, 3949, 4669
Confectionery and beverages, 2644, 2656, 2707, 3046

Taxation—*Con.*
Confectionery and beverages—*Con.*
Carbonic acid gas in cylinders, 3938, 4182
Soft drinks, tax on, qu. 624
Tax, revenue, qu. 624
Consumer, 2789. *See also that title*
Consumption tax. *See under this title,* Sales tax
Cost of living and, 2839. *See also that title*
Crude, 2788
Debt and, 2964
Depreciation and renewal allowance, 1711
Difficult and irritating, 2804, 2859
Direct, 2836, 2956, 3000, 3010, 3035
Results, qu. 281
Dominion lands, taxes unpaid, 3257
Dominion, provincial and municipal, 2641
"Enormous" 2963
"Excessive" 1345, 1391, 1394, 2712
Excise. *See* Customs and Excise; Inland Revenue; Special War Revenue
Use of postage stamps for. *See under this title,* Postage Stamps
Exemptions. *See under this title,* Income, Children; Sales Tax; Receipt Tax
Experiments in, 2788
Express money orders, 3923
Extravagance and, 2785
Farmers paying taxes, 4224. *See also that title*
Four cardinal principles of, 66-67
Granville island, qu. 1485
Great Britain in, 1854
Reduction of, 2712
High, 2583, 2747, 2857, 3010
Exodus to United States, 2823
Implements of production, 2718. *See also* Agricultural Implements
Income, qu. 281, 1195, 2859. *See also* Income War Tax Act. Amdt. bill
Agricultural forms, 4498
Based on fallacious doctrine, 2913
Bonds exempt from, qu. 342
Bonds, interest rate and, 4494
Burdensome to urban tax-payer, 2745
Capital, 3027
Diverted from industry by, 2914
Children, exemption for, 2128, 2880, 3038, 4502
M. (Mr. Archambault) 1382
Collections, 2658, 2998
Cost of, qu. 733
Total, 2825
Community of property, 2880, 3038
Convictions, qu. 3582
Deductions, for educational and charitable donations, 3954
Dividends, 2881
Duplication, 2859

Taxation—*Con.*
Income—*Con.*
Exemption. *See also under this title,* Children
Small incomes, 2728, 4493
Up to $5,000 for head of family, 3038
Widows, 2934
Farmers, payments by, qu. 1259, 1486, 2845
Federal, provincial and municipal, 2825, 2859
Fines, qu. 2180, 3507
Fox-breeding industry, 590
Graduated, 2706, 2788, 2837, 2914, 3073
Great Britain, 2788
Reduction, 2913, 3072
Income and investment discouraged, 2914
Incomes earned and unearned, 2745, 2788
Unearned, 2718, 2858, 2880, 2954, 2967, 3026
Dividends, 3038
Increase, 2658, 3010
"Intolerable nuisance," 2914
Moose Jaw office, qu. 2699
Penalties, 2979
Protest from people who do not pay, 2786
Revenue and production, lessening of, 2913
Revenue, cost of collection, farmers, qu. 1259, 4224
Rich not bearing fair share, 2788
Scale of, 2985
Steeply graded, 2728
Taxes collected, due and unpaid, qu. 1157
Total assesment, qu. 2393
United States, reduction, 2913
Vancouver offices, qu. 912
Western farmers, 1889
Western provinces, collections, qu. 2206
Yorkton office, qu. 384
Income War Tax Act, administration, 3949
Increase of, 1121, 1822, 1854, 2712, 2784, 2987, 2997
Indirect, 1440, 2789, 3027, 4423
Inequitable, 2728, 2788
Inheritance, 1383, 2728, 2788, 2792, 2802, 2803, 2810, 2825, 2837, 2909, 3026, 3073
Inland revenue, use of postage stamps for. *See under this title,* Postage Stamps
Land values, 1105, 1118, 1178, 1344, 2728, 2745, 2778, 2803
Unearned increment, 3016
Liberal platform, 2003
London Spectator, statement of, 1122
Luxuries, 915, 2003, 2706, 2710, 2718, 2742, 2745, 2789, 2853, 2858, 2989, 2997, 2999, 3073, 3910
Excise tax on, 2779
Tax collections, qu. 2393

Taxation—*Con.*
Manitoba
Agricultural production and, 1404
Unpaid taxes, 1251
Municipal, 426, 2641, 3445
Burdensome, 2836
Unpaid, 2768, 2769, 2953, 2961
Natural resources, 2729
Necessaries of life, on, 2710, 2728, 2736, 2754, 2789, 2999
New, 2857, 2997, 3078
Not wanted, 2914
Per capita, 1121, 3026
Post office money orders, 3923
Postal rates, 1780
War rate, 2745
Postage stamps, use for excise taxes, 1815, 1818, 1820, 2979, 3927, 3938, 4435
Prices, increase of, 2716. *See also* Prices
Promissory notes, 3063, 3923
Provincial amusement tax, 2826
Railway deficits and, 2905, 3006
Receipt tax, qu. 282, 2643, 2656, 2705, 3034, 3923, 3934, 3935, 3938, 4423
Evasion of, 2706, 2826
Exemption up to $500, 2826
Inequity of, 2826
Payment in postage stamps, 1815
Revison of, 4409
Reduction of, 2749
Relief from, 3038
Responsibility for, 2920
Revenue, 2745
Revenue and postage stamps, 1815, 1818
Revenue stamps, selling cost, 1819
Sales tax, qu. 281, 1427, 2656, 2742, 2789, 4181 4183, 4425. *See also* Budget; Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill
Alberta collections, qu. 2417
Amendment, 3031
Automobiles, qu. 1993
Books and book bindings 1870
Canadian National Railways, qu. 1157
Carbonic acid gas, 3938, 4182
Collection, qu. 285, qu. 938, 2840
At source, 2643, 2656, 2840, 2998, 3031, 3038, 3938, 4181
Change in method, 2734
Domestic goods, 2840
Foreign goods, 2840
Complexity of, 2642
Confectionery and beverages. *See under this title,* Confectionery
Contracts affected, 2750
Cost of living, 2839
Increase, 1813
Date of taking effect, 2657, 3046

Taxation—*Con.*
Sales tax—*Con.*
Domestic and foreign goods, 2804
Drain tiles, 2742, 3046, 3063, 4183
Duty-free goods, 2979
Exemptions, qu. 491, 2643, 2998, 3031, 3063, 4431
Drain tiles, 3046. *See also under this sub-title,* Drain Tiles
Newsprint, 2999, 3046
Raw wool, 2998
Rulings as to, qu. 708
Tomato plants, 4432
Exports, 4364
French treaty, 2279, 2280, 2299
Furs, 2742
Imports, 4409
Increase in, 2213, 2804, 3033, 3066, 3078
Jobbers, 4410, 4433
Licensed manufacturer or producer, 4364
Lumber, 4418
Magazines and periodicals, 4415, 4421
Manufacturers, licensed, 4410, 4433
Michigan Central bridge, remission, qu. 1257
Middleman, encouragement, 2805
M. (Mr. Stevens) for com. of inquiry, 915
Necessaries of life, 2999
Newsprint, 2979, 2999, 3046
Nursery stock, 4432
Origin of finished articles, 2840
Passing on, 2750, 2912, 4411, 4416
Prime Minister's speech in 1921, 2997
Profiteering, 2997
Proposed change, petition against, 2958
Public libraries, 1870
Pyramiding, 915, 2823, 2859, 2912, 2998, 3036, 3031, 3033, 4423
Regina Photo Supply Company, qu. 518
Simplification, 3082
Suggested abolition of, 1230
Summer trade, 2912
Tomato plants, 4432
Union Jack, 4514
Wool, 2742
Workability, 2786
School land taxes, 3445
Schools closed from inability to pay, 1388
Unpaid, 4205
Single tax on vacant land, 1105, 1344. *See also under this title,* Land
Sixty-seven per cent paid by consumer, 2789
Suggested conference on, 67
Tariff and, 2859, 2839, 3068
"Taxed to death," 2826, 4493
Taxes, banks' refusal to pay, 4099

Taxation—*Con.*
Tax reductions, 2642
Tax sales,
Alberta, 4062
Manitoba, 2961
Travellers' cheques, 3923
Turnover tax, 2841, 2859, 2916
Unpaid, 637, 1388, 3257, 3445, 4205
Unimproved land. *See under this title,* Land
War, 2788, 2985, 3028
War profits, 2788, 2985
War taxes, collection by Post Office dept. 1815
Western farmers unable to meet, 1202, 2781

Tax-Exempt Bonds. *See* Bonds

Technical Education Act. *See* Labour

Technical Positions. *See* Civil Service

Telegraphs and Telephones. *See also* Radiotelegraphy; Wireless
Battleford-Isle la Crosse, 1017
British cable service, Canadian Press, 4727
British Columbia-mainland, 1017
Canadian National Telegraphs, qu. 707, 2471
Fort Qu'Appelle-Humboldt, qu. 383
Great North Western Telegraph Company, qu. 707, 2471
Land and cable telegraph lines, 2683
Manitoba, 2285
Northwest territories, 3944
Nova Scotia, 4590
Prince Edward Island, 2682
Radiotelegraph service, 3337
Ste. Anne-St. Charles telegraph lines, qu. 3138, qu. 3262
St. Charles-Peribonka telegraph line, qu. 3262
Vancouver island district, 1017
Verrault, Mr. Gedeon, dismissal, qu. 3140
Wireless stations, 3337
Yukon telegraph system, 150, 3945
Revenue, qu. 2206, qu. 2417

Temiscouata forest fires, 4010

Temperance. *See* Canada Temperance Act

Temporary Employees. *See* Civil Service

Terminal Elevators. *See* Grain and Grain Trade

Terminal Facilities. *See* Canadian National Railways; St. John

Terrebonne public building, 2690, 4614

Territories Act Amdt. *See* Northwest Territories

Testing of Seed. *See* Seed Inspection

Textiles. *See also* British Preference; speeches on Budget; Customs Tariff Items; Treaties, French Treaty
Clothing, British preference, 3032
Collars and cuffs, duties 3048
Cottons
British preference, 3463
Cotton manufacturers, combine, 2534
Duty, 3035, 3048. *See also* Treaties, French
For manufacture of pneumatic tires, duty, 2654, 3487
French treaty, 1987
Dominion Textile Company
Combine, 2563
McSweeney, late Senator, statement, 3464
Securities and dividends, 3463
Stock, 1853
Embroideries. *See* Treaties, French Treaty
Freight rates, 1964
Knitting industry, artificial silk and, 2958
Laces, 3035. *See also* Treaties, French Treaty
Linen, 3897
Profits, 3464
Silks. *See also* Treaties, French Treaty
Artificial silk
Duty, 2820, 2990, 3017, 3035, 3489
Industry, 2658, 2703, 2798, 2853, 2931, 2958, 2964, 3069, 3075, 3492
Knitting industry and, 2958
Tops or waste or artificial fibre silk, drawbacks, 3896
Yarns and fabrics, 2654
Duty, 2704, 3046, 3488, 3489
Imports of, 445, 2397
Silk cloth woven in the gum, duty, 3489
Silk industry, 2397, 2853
Canadian, 2397
French treaty and, 1977
Textile industry, 3466
Velvets and velveteens, duty, 3035, 3488
Woollen industry, 3458. *See also* Wool
Blankets, duty, 3048
British preference, 2958, 2989, 3034, 3458, 3459
Clothing, 3048
Competition from Great Britain and France, 2958
Duties, 3048
Drawbacks and, qu. 1994
Legislation to assist, qu. 4184
Marking of, 2973
Penmans, stock quotations and dividends, 3463
Preferential tariff and, 3458
Prices, 2990, 3459

Textiles—*Con.*
Woollen industry—*Con.*
Protection of, M. (Mr. Drummond) 928
Woollen goods, manufacture of 2866
Yarn, 3489, 3896

Thetford Mines, strike, 2207

Thomas, Mr. A. J. *See* Canadian National Railways

Thomas, Mr. J. H., 46

Thomson Line, ocean freight rates, 2127

Thompson, Mr. F. G., Winnipeg, 856

Thompson, the late Right Hon. Sir John, copyrights, 2140

Thompson, Mr. T. H. (East Hastings)
Cold storage companies, 191
Cold Storage Act Amdt. bill, 2055
Field crop competitions, 600, 602
Montreal cold storage, qu. 1488, qu. 1633, qu. 2204
Welland canal construction contracts, qu. 1489

Thornton, Sir Henry Worth, 103, 126, 284. *See also* Canadian National Railways
Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, director, 2983, 3845
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Cattle shipments, space, 3040
West Indian service, 3379
Capital expenditure, 3811
Criticism of, 3640
Fuel supply, evidence, Senate com., 1919
Hudson Bay railway, 4683
Immigration, 1167
Reported statement, 2795, 2844
Western provinces, conditions, 2962

Thoroughbred horses. *See* Race Track Betting

Three Rivers Harbour Commissioners Bill
(Improvement and management of harbour)
Res. 3399, 3963; 1r., 2r., com., 3965; com., 3r., 4207

Thurston, Mr. John J. (Victoria, Ont.)
Canada Colonization Association, 1878
Dominion arsenal, Quebec, bonus, 1752
Lindsay market scales, 208

Tidal and Current Survey. *See* Marine

Tilley, Mr. W. N., K.C.
Grand Trunk arbitration, qu. 730, qu. 1029
Payments to, 1154, qu, 1661

Timber. *See also* Dominion Lands Act; Export Act Amdt. bill; Forests and Forestry; Lumber
Areas, limits of, 4206
Available supplies, 818
Creosoted, qu. 813, qu. 1137
Permits to cut on Dominion Lands, qu. 203, 3398, 4206. *See also* Dominion Lands Act Amdt. bill
Shortage, 2711

Timber Wolves, destruction of live stock, 597

Times, The, London, Hudson Bay railway, 1059

Timiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway, 1071, 3056

Tinplate Industry, 2751
Establishment in Toronto, 2819
Sales tax, 4418
Tariff uncertainty, 2819

Titles, Honours and Decorations
Abolition of, 210
Banting, Dr., 4645
M. (Mr. Ladner) 1285, neg. on div. 1299
Amdt. (Mr. Neill) 1292
Nickle resolution, 1286-98

Tobacco. *See also* Customs and Excise; Customs Tariff Items
Bootlegging in, 2989
Cigarettes
Bootlegging, 3230
Consumption, qu. 516
Customs duty, 2644, 2652, 2706, 2850, 2913, 2929, 2979, 2988, 4392
Excise duty, 2655, 2825, 3229
Tax on, 2657
Cigars, consumption, qu. 517
Duty, 2913, 2988
Experimental stations, 459, 465
Harrow, 466
Home-grown, 4209. *See also* Inland Revenue Act Amdt. bill
Imports, qu. 1258
Revenue, loss of, 2913

Tobin, Mr. E. W. (Richmond and Wolfe)
Accredited herd system, qu. 206
Richmond county, qu. 813
Wolfe county, qu. 813
Canadian National railways, mileage and cost 914
Haney, Mr. M. J., 3355
Lightkeepers' salaries and allowances, 3353
Public debt, 1896, 1911, 1922, qu. 914
Public expenditure, 1896-1922, qu. 914
Revenue, 1896-1923, qu. 913

Tobin, Mr. E. W.—*Con.*
Soldier settlement
Farms in Richmond county, qu. 913
Wolfe county, qu. 913
War expenditure, 1914-1922, qu. 914

Tobique Reserve. *See* Indians

Todd, Mr. Walter, decision, question not referred to com. 3267

Tolmie, Hon. S. F. (Victoria City)
Accredited herd, system, 578, 3302
Animal diseases, inspection, 2202
British Columbia liquor laws, 2411
Prices, 2411
British Empire exhibition, 1873
Budget 2861. Congratulations to Finance Minister; government coming round to protection; unfair to Canada to cut down tariff; United States and oriental competition; copper bounty; Trail smelter; amendment; inclusion of planks from Liberal platform of 1919; agricultural conditions; disorganized markets, 2861; profitable and unprofitable lines of agriculture; single-crop farming; mixed farming with live stock as basis; prices low and crops high; plugging up the leaks; marketing of live stock; policy and prices; no advantage in breeding scrub stock, 2862; dairying industry; unprofitable herds; yield and cost; Nappan experimental station; experiment with scrub cows; value of industry to country; export markets; Canadian butter in Great Britain, 2863; competition of Denmark, Holland and New Zealand, 2863; butter grading; hog and export bacon industry; types and weights; Wiltshire sides; Danish bacon, competition of, 2864; prices at Chicago and Toronto; bacon from corn-fed hogs; breeding, feeding and marketing, 2865; sheep and wool industry; woollen manufacturing industry; marketing of lambs, 2866; wheat screenings as feed for lambs; inferior stock, loss from; animal contagious diseases; tuberculosis; hog cholera; research work; internal parasites; tuberculin test, 2867; immunization from tuberculosis; human tuberculosis; work of Dr. Watson; glanders; agricultural products, distribution; cheaper transportation and equalization of freight rates; Pacific coast trade; Panama canal, 2868; export markets; oriental trade; co-operative selling; farm credits; agricultural education; better farming methods; Central experimental farm; immigration, exclusion of Asiatics; better understanding between farmer and city-man, 2869; no time for pessimism; pioneering; Bruce county in early days; summary of proposed policy
Buffalo
Slaughter of, 3440
Tuberculosis 3440
Business of the House, supply, relevancy, 4719
Campbell, Mr. Orin, claim, 626
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2411
Chinese immigration bill, 2316
Merchants, 2316
Cold storage, 186
Compensation for slaughtered animals, 485
Dairy Industry Act 1914 Amdt. bill
Butter substitutes, 3151
"Manna" 3152
Renovated butter, 4251, 4255
Dairying industry, 2864, 3296
Butter, pasteurization 3298
Deputy ministers' salaries, 4672
Deputy Minister of Agriculture, salary, 4672
Destructive Insects and Pests Act, 595
Exhibitions, 1454
Experimental farms, 476-485
Fishery cruiser, Victoria, 4708
Freight rates, equalization, M. (Mr. Clark) 1922
Fruits and vegetables, new varieties, registration, 2397
Health of animals, 578
Tuberculin test, 578, 2867
Tuberculosis eradication, 3989
Indians cattle, 2159
Iron deposits, Vancouver island, 2514
Liquor
British Columbia plebiscite, 2441
Prices, 2441
Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill, 193, 2202, 2292
Live stock industry, 476, 589. *See also under this title,* Health of Animals
Veterinary inspectors, 3989
Masters and mates, examination, 2610
Migratory Birds Convention, 3443
Nicomen island, protection, 626
Oleomargarine
Dairying industry and, 3296
M. (Mr. Carroll) 3510
Manufacture 3152
Paternal legislation, 727

Tolmie, Hon. S. F.—*Con.*
Pensions, European war and active militia, 3707
Prince Rupert Dry Dock Company, claim, 4708
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 723
Renovated butter, 3151, 4255
Seed testing bill, 278, 2305
Watson, Dr., chief pathologist, Agriculture dept., 579, 2868

Tomato Plants. *See* Customs; Taxation

Topographical Surveys. *See* Surveys

Toronto
Breakwater protection, 984
Canadian National Railways
Approaches and terminals, 4193, 4198
Electric lines, 2393
King and Yonge streets property, qu. 814, qu. 1663, qu. 1994, 2819, 2481, 3224, 3399, 3629, 3642
Casualty clearing building, 4621
Customs house building, 3277, 4621, 4624
Fuel supply, 3200
Harbour improvements, 984, 985, 1011, 2678, 3076, 3774, 4444, 4445, 4562, 4578, 4610
Level crossings, 2477
Penny bank of. *See* Penny Bank
Post office building, 1780, 3277
Postal receipts, increase, 2819
Postal revenue, 1779
Postal station "A" building, 4624
Restaurants, profiteering, 2586
Seed branch offices, 4621
Soldiers' Comfort branch, qu. 3506, 3507
Soldier Settlement board, 2029
Street railway system, 2475, 3056
Tin-plate industry, 2819
Toronto island breakwater, 984
Toronto Transportation Commission, 1703
Union station, 3620, 4325, 4335, 4442
University of, scholarships, 878
Viaduct, qu. 206, qu. 517, 2477, qu. 4011, 4306, 4325, 4441, 4442, 4447

Toronto Eastern Railway, 2475

Toronto Suburban Railway, qu. 280, 2181, 2475, qu. 2612, 3324

Tourist Traffic. *See* Canadian National Parks

Tower. *See* Parliament buildings

Tracadie Lazaretto, 702

Trade. *See also* Address; Customs and Excise; Imports and Exports; speeches on Budget; Tariff; Trade and Commerce; Treaties, French, Italian
Anglo-Canadian, fostering of, qu. 284
Annual report, 1910
Australia, with, 1848, 2964, 3476
Balance of, 2922
Bankruptcy, 648. *See also* Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill
Canadian representative at Washington, 2735
Canadian Trade Index, 2217
China and India with, 1840
Commercial rivalry and industrial war, 2717
Competition, Great Britain and Germany, 2752
Conditions, analysis, 2984
Cuba with, 308, 1840
Enlarged, advantages of, 2910
Export, 1838. *See also* Imports and Exports
Fiji islands, 1848
France with, 437. *See also* Treaties, French treaty
Grain. *See* Grain and Grain Trade
Great Britain, with, 437. *See also* British Preference
Increase in, 2784
International 2923
Interprovincial, 2177, 2748
Italy with, 2395. *See also* Treaties, Italian
Japan with, 1449
Pacific coast, 2868
Percentage of imports and exports, 2843
Oriental, 507. *See also* Vancouver Harbour bill
Potatoes in, 308. *See also* Vegetables
Reciprocity with United States, 2650. *See also that title*
Russian trade mission, 986
Spain with, 2397
Steamship services. *See that title*
Switzerland, with 2397
Trade commissioners, 1837
Tariff and, 2923
Trade returns, incomplete, 2269, 2301
United States with, 2649, 2746. *See also* Reciprocity
West Indies, 3382
World competition, 2799

Trade and Commerce Department
Bounties, administration 780
Canada Grain Act, 781, 2035, 4709
Commercial intelligence service, 1837
Trade commissioners, 1840
Commissioner of patents, duties, 2065
Consular and commercial agents qu. 284
Elevators, terminal, maintenance, 810

Trade and Commerce Department—*Con.*
Estimates, 780, 1837, 2031, 3377, 4003, 4701
Exhibitions, 1467
Mail subsidies and steamship subventions, 2171. *See also* Steamship Services
O'Halloran, Mr. George F., Commissioner of Patents, 4673
Patent and Copyright branch, salaries, 2035
Salaries and contingencies, 1837, 2031
Staff, 2031
Trade, annual report, 1910
Trade commissioners and agents, 856, 1837
Weights and measures, inspection, 810

Trade Mark and Design Act Amdt. Bill
(Registration of industrial designs)
1r., 331; 2r., 2063; com., 2293; 3r., 2294

Trades and Labour Council. *See* Labour

Trades Union Congress. *See* Labour

Trahan, Mr. Arthur (Nicolet)
Resignation of, 2178

Trail, B.C., smelter, 2861, 2944

Transportation. *See also* Canadian National Railway; Freight Rates; Hudson Bay Railway; Railways; St. Lawrence River Waterway
Coal, 1247. *See also* Coal; Fuel Supply
Equalization of rates, 1253. *See also* Freight Rates
Gaspe, 1243
Improvement of, 2745
Inadequate. *See* Vancouver Harbour Bill
Peace river district, 1433, 1440
Problems, 126. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget
Reduction, cost of, 1400
Shipping combine, 1134
Steamship companies, immigration and, 1193, 1201. *See also* Immigration
Water, 2979
Western Canada, 1440
Wheat, cost of, qu. 385. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade

Travellers' Cheques, tax. *See* Taxation, Cheque

Treaties. *See also* Conferences
Anglo-Japanese treaty, 1449, 2399
Australia, with, 245, 1848. *See also* Australia
Belgium, 246
Canada-West Indies, 3378
French Treaty, 9, 97, 436, 2657, 2815, 2832, 2964, 4457
Advantages and disadvantages, 2238

Treaties—*Con.*
French Treaty—*Con.*
Agricultural implements, 2001
Agricultural products, 1978, 2210, 2235
Aluminum, 1989
Analysis of, Mr. Chaplin, 1978
Anchovies and sardines, 2008
Automobiles, 1982, 1990, 1996, 2236
Bacon, ham and pork products 1978
Balance of trade, 2204, 2221
Boots and shoes, 1990
Bottles, 2218
Braids and cords, 2213
Brandies, 2643, 2742, 2999, 3478
Brass and copper ware, 1981
British preference, 2005
Bronze powder, 1979, 1998, 2002, 2006, 2016, 2270
Canadian Trade Index, 2217
Canadian Bronze Powder Works, Valleyfield, 1998, 2017
Cosmos Chemical Company, Port Hope, 2217
Brushes, 2214
Building materials, 1982
Butter, 2273
Buttons, 2214, 2234
Canadian Manufacturers' Association, 2209
Canadian ports. *See under this title.* Direct Importation
Cement, 1984
Cereals, 1984, 2006
Chemicals, 1980-5
Coal tar derivatives, 1986
Cobalt products, 2263, 2300
Competition, unfair, 2300
Condensed milk, 1984
Consumer, relief to, 3049
Consideration of
Inquiry, 1740
Postponed, 2128
Convention approved, 2255
Cotton manufactures, 1987, 2218, 2263
Cutlery, 1988
Dairy products, 1984
Direct importation, through Canadian ports, 1772, 2303, 2949
Duty, reductions in, 438, 2710
Eggs, 1978
Electrical apparatus, telephones, 2214
Electric lamps, incandescent, 1980
Embroideries, 2008, 2211, 2214, 2999
Engines and machinery, 1981-8
Favoured nation, 439, 443, 2005, 2007, 2014, 2210, 2213, 2219, 2232, 2234, 2241, 2271, 2395, 3035
Feathers and ornaments for hats, 3035
Fish, fresh and preserved, 1978, 2006, 2235

Treaties—*Con.*
French Treaty—*Con.*
Flour, 1978
France
Exports to, 2213
Friendly relations with, 2216
Trade with, 2209, 2255
French Consul General and, 2229
Furniture, 1982-9
Furs, 1981
Handkerchiefs, 2214, 3035
Hen feathers, 1978
Horses, 1978
Household necessaries, 441
Imports and exports, 1977, 2230
Inconsistent laws, 2303
Iron and steel, 1985-8, 2001
Japan, 2214
Trade concessions to, 450
Laces, 3035
Lard, 1978
Liberal platform, 2211
Linen yarns and thread, 1981
Live stock, 1983, 2211
Luxuries, 444, 450, 2003, 2011, 2014, 2213, 2221, 2259, 2742, 2989, 2999, 3035, 3910
Machinery and parts, 441
Manufacturers and, 2236. *See also under this title,* Canadian Manufacturers
Meats
Cured, 1978
Fresh, 1984
Preserved in tins, 1978
Millinery, 3035
Minimum tariff, 440
Modus vivendi of 1921, 2218
Musical instruments 1982
Pianos and organs, 1990, 2237
Neighbouring countries, concessions to, 450, 2131, 2215, 2219, 2273
Oleomargarine, 1984
Paper and paper products, 1987
Paper board, 1981
Perfumery, 3035
Potatoes, 1984
Poultry, 1983
Revenue, loss of, 2014, 2209, 2235
Ribbons, 3035
Rubber, manufactures of, 1990, 2237
Sales tax, 2279, 2299
Sewing machines, 2237
Silks, 448, 2209, 2215, 2221, 2255, 2264, 2266, 2300, 2397, 2398, 2742, 3035
Specific duties, 2215
Spelter, 1979
Summary of, 2232
Switzerland, imports from, 2213, 2255

Treaties—*Con.*
French Treaty—*Con.*
Tabled, 54
Tariff and, 438, 2710, 4074
Tariff weapon, 3907-10
Treaty of 1907, 2004-29
United States, 2011
Concessions to, 449
Trade with France, 1991, 1997, 2213, 2218, 2229, 2276, 2396
Treatment, Unnited States and Canada, 441
Velvets and velveteens, 3488
Watches and clocks, 2214
Wheat, 1978
Wines, 438, 442, 1977, 1997, 2010, 2209, 2225, 2302, 2643, 2710, 2999, 3035, 3937
Wood, manufactures of, 1982-9
Zinc, 1979
French Treaty Bill, res. 331, 436-456; 1r., 456; M. (Mr. Fielding) for 2r., 1910; withdrawn 1911; renewed 1977; discussion, 1977, 1995; 2r., on div. 2250-51; com. 2251-55-90-99; 3r., 2347
Halibut Fisheries Treaty with United States. *See also* Northern Pacific Halibut Fisheries Protection bill
Approval of, res. 4440, 4455; agreed to, 4480
Correspondence, 1032, 1212
Tabled, 1256
Joint res. of parliament, transmission, 4736
Lapointe, Hon. Mr., visit to Washington, 857-8
Procedure, 4437
Inquiry as to, 4132
Rider inserted by United States senate, 1308
Signing of, 734, 858, 1308, 4457, 4480, 4664
Italian Treaty, 9, 2394, 2701, 2815, 2832
Consideration postponed, 2304, 2347
Direct importation, 2401, 2949
Favoured nation treatment, 2394
Border states, 2395
France, 2395
Italy, trade with, 2395
Relief to consumers, 3049
Signing of, 2403
Tabled, 89
Italian Treaty Bill, res. 331, 2394; 1r., 2395; 2r., com., 2395; 3r., 2437, 2701
Negotiatiton of, expenses, 3989
Peace treaty
Enemy property custodian, qu. 1486
International Labour Conference, 1441
Light thrown on causes of war, 2725
Orders in council, 767
Postal Treaty with the United States, 2, 4529

Treaties—*Con.*
Rush-Bagot, negotiations, qu. 2700
St. Germain, 653
Switzerland, 2398
Trade, 437. *See also under this titlte,* Australia, French, Italian
United States. *See also* Reciprocity, United States
Treaty of 1818, 2906
Reciprocity treaty of 1854, 2910
Versailles, qu. 279, 1631-2, 3994. *See also* Germany, Reparations; War Claims
Labour, right to organize, 2889, 2895
Modification of, 4653

Tree Planting. *See* Forests and Forestry

Tremblay, General. *See* Quebec Harbour Commission

Trent Canal. *See* Canals

Trenton
Emigration from, 2823
Wool-combing industry, 2823, 2827, 3461

Trial by Jury. *See* Immigration Act Amdt. bill; Yukon Act Amdt.

Trials. *See* Justice
Eskimos, Hershell Island. *See* Northwest Territories Act

Triplets, bonus for, inquiry, 3145

Troops. *See* National Defence
Use of in labour troubles. *See* Labour

Trout-Fishing. *See* Marine and Fisheries

Trueman, Mr. W. H., K.C., Winnipeg, appointment, 1868

Truro park, 3440

Trustees. *See* Bankruptcy Act

Trusts. *See* Combines

Tsur, Hon. Chilien, 1447. *See also* Immigration, Chinese

Tuberculosis. *See also* Health; Hospitals; Live Stock; Pensions
Animals, 462-486. *See also* Live Stock; Animal Contagious Diseases
Tuberculin test, 2867, 3284, 3300
Attributable to military service, 3850
Bovine and human, 2868
Buffalo, 3439
Cattle, 2131-38. *See also* Live Stock, Health of Animals
Eradication, 3989
Dairy products, 3299

Tuberculosis—*Con.*
Immunization from, 2868
Indians, 2152
Live stock, 2867
Condemnation insurance, qu. 2699
Military hospitals, 670
Pension obligation and, 3850
Returned soldiers, deaths from, qu. 3134
Serum, 2868
Tuberculous Veterans Association, petition, 4536

Tugboats. *See* Vessels

Tupper, Sir Charles
French treaty, 1991
Title, 1295

Turkey, threatened war with, 2815. *See also* Near East Crisis

Turkeys, dressed, importation, qu. 1139

Turnover Tax. *See* Taxation

Turtle Mountain reserve, 3413

Tutankhamen, King, 755, 1761
Inheritance tax, 2788

Two Months' Supply. *See* Interim Supply

Typewriters. *See* Customs Tariff Items

Tyrrell, Mr. J. W., Hudson Bay region, 1072

Ukrainians. *See also* West Ukrainian Republic
Immigration, 1396, 1883
Settlement of, 1341

Uncleaned Screenings. *See* Grain, Elevators

Undesirable Classes. *See* Immigration Act Amdt. bill

Unearned Income. *See* Taxation

Unemployment. *See* Labour; Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment

Unification. *See* Canadian National Railways

Unimproved Land. *See* Land; Taxation

Union Act, 1364, 1365

Union Bank. *See* Banks and Banking

Union Jack, sales tax, 4514

Union Label. *See* Labour

Union Nationale Française, immigration, 1877

Union of South Africa. *See* South Africa

Unions. *See* Labour

Unit of Representation. *See* Redistribution

United Farmers of Alberta
Economic group organization, 3003
Freight rates, 3190
Immigration, 81, 1440

United Farmers of Manitoba, 1462

United Farmers of Ontario
Combines and trusts, 2584
Immigration, 1191
Proportional representation, 425

United Mines Workers of America. *See* Labour; Howat

United States. *See also* Reciprocity; St. Lawrence River Waterway
Administration, cost of, 1155
Agriculture
Economic organization, 1857
Encouragement of, 1390
Agricultural conditions, 642, 2829
Agricultural implements, duty free, 3017, 3062
Agricultural products, 2751
Markets for, 2810, 2869
Alien enemy property, custodian, 2496, 3823
American Expeditionary Force, mental tests, 1219
American legion, 2444
Annexation, 93
Asiatic immigration, exclusion, 1194
Banking system, 4083
Bankruptcy law, 3092
Bean-growing industry, 2981
Boots and shoes, duty, 2856, 3016, 3062, 3499
Borrowings from, 93-94
British debt, 2879, 2918
Budget, 3341
Building boom, 1129, 3004, 3017
Cabinet officers, number of, 3043
Canadian exhibitions in, 1454
Canadian grain, adulteration of, 3649
Canadian ports, use by United States fishermen, 3361, 4480
Canadian railways, ocean ports in, 1754-5
Canadian representation, 4001, 4664. *See also that title*
Canadian tariff policy and, 3010
Canadians in, 43. *See also* Emigration
Carrie L. Hirtle, seizure, qu. 3323
Cattle, export to, 1410, 2871
Chinese immigration, 2313, 4349
Coal, 3203. *See also that title*
Anthracite and lignite, duty, 3493
Embargo on, 1265, 1279
Exports from. *See* Coal
Purchased for railways, 1277
Strikes and labour unions, 2786
Supplies from, 1262

United States—*Con.*
Coloured population, 2316
Combines, grand jury system, 2585
Competition from, 2861. *See also* Treaties, French Treaty
Conditions following Civil War, 1122, 1232
Congressional library, 2693
Copyright, 2140. *See* Copyright Act Amdt. bill
Cost of living, 1812
Customs duties, per capita, 2738
Debt, per capita, 2956
Duties against, reduction by order in council, 2649
Emergency tariff, 2847. *See also under this title,* Fordney-McCumber
Effect upon Canadian export, 2847
Emigration of Canadians to, 21, 1082, 1085, 1975. *See also* Emigration
European reconstruction, 4654
Exports, 1838
Pulpwood to, 4347. *See also* Export Act Amdt. bill
Fair Tariff League, 3070
Farmers' bloc, 2791
Federal Reserve Bank, 3059, 4124, 4407
Federal reserve system, 4069
Fishing industry, 2940
Fish, market for, 2906, 2946, 3002
Fishing schooner, Siloam, capture, 2207
Fishing vesels, purchase of bait, 3705
Halibut fishery treaty with. *See* Treaties, Halibut
Modus vivendi, 2906, 2940, 3361
Use of Canadian ports by, 3361, 4480
Flour, ocean rates, 2127
Ford, Henry, presidential candidate, 2908
Fordney-McCumber tariff, 172, 2649, 2708, 2748, 2818, 2823, 2857, 2869, 2909, 2919, 2940, 2946, 2958, 2977, 2993, 2997, 3011, 3013, 3035, 3052, 3061, 3098
Cattle, 3293
Coal, 1275
Farmers' gains and losses, 3070
Pacific coast fisheries, 2734
Power of president to vary, 3902
France, trade with, 1991, 1997, 2011, 2209, 2213, 2222, 2276, 2396. *See also* Treaties, French
Free list, agricultural products, 2910
Free trade, 1403, 2738, 2746, 3013
Freight cars, interchange, 4697
French Canadians in, repatriation, 1462
French treaty. *See* Treaties, French Treaty
Grand Trunk lines, 3197
Grain prices, 297-8. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade

United States—*Con.*
Grain shipments through United States ports, 3763
Great Lakes disarmament, correspondence, 1307
Harding, late President, world peace, 2911
Highways, 3437
Hirtle, Carrie L., seizure, qu. 3323
Hogs, corn-fed, 2865
Immigration and, 1248
After Civil War, 1885
Agencies in, 1875
Obstacles to,, 1416
Policy, 1885
Imports and exports, 2821, 2928, 3061
Income tax, 2986, 4503
Exemptions for children, 1383
Reductions, 2913
Industrial development, 2751
Industrial organization and competition, 2992
Inflation, 2800, 3004
Influence in Canada, 2934. *See also* Magazines, M. (Mr. Hocken)
Interstate Commerce Commission, 3059
Fuel investigation, 1279
International boundaries, survey and demarcation, 3248
Japanese organizations, 2444
Labour delegates, detention at border, 2296, 2419, 2469, 2347, 2393
Labour demand, 1129. *See also under this title,* Emigration
Lake of the Woods water powers. *See that title*
Levels, qu. 2700
Liquor laws, 4295
Illicit traffic, alleged, 2208
McKinley tariff, 2910
Magazines and periodicals, 826
Manufactured products, 2751
Market for, 2856
Migratory Birds Convention, 3443
Movement of population to. *See* Emigration
National Reserve bank, 4145
Naturalization, 2443
Oriental problem, 2443
Oriental propaganda in, 1896
Pecuniary Clains Convention, 779
People from, stopped at border, 1167. *See also under this title* Labour delegates
Ports
Adulteration of Canadian grain, 3649, 3961
Competition. *See* Vancouver Harbour bill
Ocean, 2898
Postal rates, decrease of, 1779
Postal treaty, 4529
Potatoes, export to, qu. 621

United States—*Con.*
Prices, comparison of, 2742, 2916
Prosperity, 2657
Protection and, 2751
Pulpwood, export to, 3413, 3416. *See also* Export Act Amdt. bill
Railway system, 3057
Unification, 1618
Railways
Earnings, flour transportation, 2960
Grain shipments, diversion to, 2898
Reciprocity, offer to negotiate, 2649, 2650, 2707, 2806, 2829, 2831, 2843, 3847, 2905, 2917, 3454, 3473
Chicago Tribune, comment, 2733
Reciprocity agreement of 1911, 2718
Standing offer, 3016
Relations with, 2905
Rural credit system, 642, 2829, 2930, 4043, 4046, 4130, 4298
Rural depopulation, 2829
Rural mail delivery, 1781
Rush-Bagot treaty, negotiations, qu. 2700
St. Lawrence river waterway, 3208, 3705, 3762, 4513. *See also that title*
Self-interest, 2918
Senate, constitution of, 1373, 1378
Silk industry, 2397, 2400
Strikes, 1629
Sugar boycott, 2734
Surplus, 2823
Tariff 1113, 1119. *See also under this title,* Fordney-McCumber
Change of sentiment, 3013
Emigration and, 1093
Tinplate industry, 2400, 2751
Trade relations with, 2649, 2746. *See also* Reciprocity
Agents in Canada, qu. 284
Negotiations with, 3074
Revival, 2650
Unemployment, decrease of, 2650
Wages in, 1165. *See also under this title,* Emigration; Labour
War and, 2918
Washington, Canadian representative at, 2735. *See also* Canadian Representation
Welland canal construction, 3762
Wharves, built on Canadian territory, 2735
Wheat, duty, 2993

Universities. *See also* Education
Bank directors and, 4025, 4073
Capitalistic system and, 2725
Graduates emigrating to the United States, 2732
Independent thought stifled, 3074

Universities—*Con.*
Medical students, summer employment, 704
Scholarships, 878
Toronto, 878

Unopposed Motions for Paper
Accredited herds (Mr. Caldwell) 626
Agriculture dept. employees (Mr. Bouchard) 815
Alberta Drainage Company (Mr. Kellner) 3144
Arctic islands and northern Quebec (Mr. Parent) 814
Banff park, power rights (Mr. Shaw) 496
Banff springs and cave (Mr. Shaw) 496
Bank returns (Mr. Coote) 3264
British Columbia claims (Mr. Stevens) 708
Campbell, Mr. Orin, claim (Mr. Tolmie) 626
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, sale of vessels, (Sir Henry Drayton) 3705, 3822
Canadian National Railways
Equipment orders, (Mr. Meighen) 2701
Grand Trunk, United States terminals (Sir Henry Drayton) 815
Lifting of steel, (Mr. Kennedy, Edmonton) 1664
Orders in council (Sir Henry Drayton) 815
Regulations (Mr. MacLaren) 496
Canadian Pacific Railway, Quebec terminals (Mr. Parent) 815
Cattle trade with Great Britain (Mr. Meighen) 208
Civil Service
Appointments and promotions (Mr. Manion) 330; (Mr. Meighen) 208
Dismissals (Mr. Hanson) 856
Positions exempted (Mr. Irvine) 914
Customs and Excise, legal work (Mr. Black, Yukon) 856
Disallowance of Nova Scotia legislation (Mr. Hanson) 208; (Sir Henry Drayton) 249, 208
Dryden and Marshall, Messrs. (Mr. Maybee) 3705
Eastern Lands Development Company, (Mr. Lapierre) 626, (Mr. Carruthers) 1635
Euclid Hall and Brant House, closing (Mr. Church) 4303
Export liquor warehouse licenses (Mr. Stevens) 3144
Freight rates, shipping, coastal regulations (Mr. Coote) 2613
Government printing, Winnipeg (Mr. McMurray) 3144
Grand Trunk arbitration (Mr. d'Anjou) 1307
Halibut fishery treaty (Mr. Meighen) 1032

Unopposed Motions for Paper—*Con.*
Hayes, Mr. John J., dismissal (Mr. Irvine) 1868
Hudson Bay railway (Mr. Meighen) 208
Immigrant supplies, Quebec (Mr. Charters) 496
Lewis, John L., correspondence (Mr. Meighen) 250
Liquor, export, revenue, etc. (Mr. Good) 3704
Lindsay market scales (Mr. Thurston) 208
Margaree river salmon fisheries, (Mr. Hanson) 2700
New Brunswick export houses (Mr. Caldwell) 815
Newspapers and printing companies, contracts, (Mr. Black, Yukon) 1974
Nicomen island, protection (Mr. Tolmie) 626
Nipissing Indian reserve (Mr. Lapierre) 1307
North Oakville post office (Mr. Anderson) 914
Nova Scotia miners' strike (Sir Henry Drayton) 914
Orders in council
Canadian National Railways (Sir Henry Drayton) 815
P. C. 223 (Mr. Sutherland) 815
P. C. 1566 (Mr. Black, Yukon) 249
Oriental immigration (Mr. McQuarrie) 1307
Ottawa river water storage (Mr. Parent) 815
Printing contracts, newspapers, etc. (Mr. d'Anjou) 2298
Purchase of bait for fishing vessels (Mr. Forke) 3705
Railway lands, purchase or sales (Mr. Boys) 1739
St. Lawrence river waterway (Mr. Church) 3705
Sardine herring fishery (Mr. Duff) 2518
Six Nations Indian reserve (Mr. Senn) 1307
Soldier settlers, fire insurance (Mr. McMurray) 496
Sporting Mountain mail contract (Mr. Hanson) 856
Sydenham hospital (Mr. Ross, Kingston) 626
Technical and professional officials (Mr. Martell) 815
Testing of dairy cattle (Mr. Caldwell) 1307
Thompson, Mr. F. G., Winnipeg (Mr. Black, Yukon) 856
Toronto Suburban railway (Mr. Church) 2181
Trade commissioners (Mr. Putnam) 856
Vermilion town lots (Mr. Spencer) 1307
Wheat board, correspondence (Mr. McConica) 626
Winnipeg coal purchases (Mr. McMurray) 496

Unrest, Industrial. *See* Labour

Urban Population, loss of. *See* Emigration; Population

Vacancies. *See* Auditor General; House of Commons

Valcartier Camp Ground. *See* National Defence

Valleyfield, Canadian Bronze Powder Works, 1998, 2017

Valuation for Duty. *See* Customs

Vancouver (city)
Assay office, 3207
Bank of, failure, qu. 4011
Board of Trade,
Carvell, Hon. F. B., 1869, 1910, 3189
Freight rates, equalization, 1953
Bridge, 1008
Deadman's island, qu. 1362
Duty on goods passing from one Canadian port to another, 2519, 3272
False Creek bridge, 3375, 4708
Granville island taxation, qu. 1485
Immigration
Chinese, 1444. *See also* Chinese Immigration bill
Immigration sheds, 1447, 1896
Income tax offices, qu. 912
Japanese freighter with stowaways, 1451
Labour department, 1678
Orientals, business competition, 504, 1902, 2311
Point Grey sand head leases, 3671
Producers' Dairy Company, 2526
Proportional representation, 401
Second Narrows bridge, qu. 1258
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment employees, dismissals, qu. 2297, 3085, qu. 3137, 3822
Stanley park, foreshore protection, 1008
Vancouver Creosoting Company, Limited, 3231
Vancouver Island Milk Producers' Association 4266

Vancouver (port). *See also* Vancouver Harbour Bill
Ballantyne pier, 257, 258
Dry dock, 1002, 2671
Elevator, 1057, qu. 1487, 3769
Addition to, qu. 517, qu. 621
Facilities, 53. *See also* Vancouver Harbour Bill
Improvements, 2033
Grain shipments, 69, 1034, 3769
Harbour, 83, 110, 1002
Harbour commission, 387, qu. 912
Kitsilano reserve and, 383
Vacancies, 1372
Port development, 1051

Vancouver Harbour Advances Bill
Res. 198, 255; 1r., 269-270; 2r., com., 3r., 332

Vancouver Island, iron deposits, 2514

Van Koughnet, Mrs., Soldiers' Comfort Branch, Toronto, 4727

Vegetables. *See also* Root Vegetables; Treaties, French Treaty
Canadian Council of Horticulture, 2307
Canned, imports, 445
Competition from United States, 2977
Dehydration of, 4674
Freight rates from Maritime provinces, 626
Potatoes
Acreage and production, 2934
Diseases, 595
Duty, 2651, 2707, 2959, 2980, 3017, 3035, 3075, 3474
Free trade in, 2820
Freight rates, 137-138
French treaty, 1984
Grading, 598. *See also* Root Vegetables
Growers, 137
Imports, qu. 617, 2820, 2959
Inspection, 598
New Brunswick, 2763
Potato-growing industry, 308
Prices, 2820
Prince Edward Island, 131, 2763
Reciprocity in, 2993
Seed, inspection of, 2306
United States
Competition, 2977
Exports, qu. 621
Wharfage tolls, 975
Root vegetables, sale and inspection, 937
Tomato plants, customs duty, 4432

Velvets. *See* Customs Tariff Items; Treaties, French Treaty

Veniot, Premier, St. John river wharves, qu. 1488

Vermilion, Alberta, town lots, 1307
Purchases, 489
Rental by government, qu. 2417

Verret, Mr. Hector, retirement, 1826

Versailles, Treaty of, 46. *See also* Germany, Reparations; Treaties
International Labour Conference, 1631

Vessels. *See also* Canadian Government Merchant Marine; Marine; Shipping
Acadia, 1044, 3336
Alaskan wreck of, 1212, 1659, qu. 1763, 3160
Algerine, qu. 1763

Vessels—*Con.*
Arctic, 3944, 4012
Bayfield, 3336
Bonaventure, 1044
Boethic, 1044
Canadian, Chinese sailors on, 2334
Carrie L. Hirtle, seizure, qu. 3323
Cartier, 3336
Challenger, 1742
Crews, 2670. *See also* Immigration Act Amdt. bill
Dredge No. 12, qu. 1487
Eureka, 1364
Fishing. *See* Fish and Fisheries
Foreign. *See* Canada Shipping Act Amdt.
Gleeful, tug, qu. 1763
John D. Hazen, 3160
Lady Grey, 3160
Lambton, loss of, qu. 812, 3354
Lillooet, 3336
Llandovery Castle, loss of, 1745
Malaspina, 2207
Marvale, wreck, 3333
Mikula, icebreaker, qu. 1384, 2614, 3160
Minto, 1044
Montcalm, 2614, 3160
Monte Grappa, foundering, qu. 912
Murray Stewart, tug, qu. 203, qu. 386, 3354
Reliance, qu. 812
Restless, 3336
Siloam, seizure, 2207
Space for cattle. *See* Live Stock, Shipments
Stanley, 2614
Taibu Maru, 859
Trader, wreck of, qu. 1763
Tuscan Prince, wreck of, qu. 1763
Wireless equipment, 3355

Vetcraft Shops. *See* Soldiers

Veterans' Associations. *See* Pensions

Veterinary Surgeons, drugs. *See* Narcotic Drugs

Veto. *See* Disallowance

Vickers Company
Cancellation of contract, 1746
Hydro-planes, 1748
War claim, 1745
Canadian Vickers, qu. 2205
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 3780
Hopper barge construction, contract, 3350

Victoria, B.C.
Dominion astrophysical observatory, 3242
Dry dock, 1002

Victoria, B.C.—*Con.*
Harbour, dredging, 110, 1014
Old post office building, taxes, 1024
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment employees, qu. 3137

Victoria, vacancy. *See* Cape Breton North and Victoria

Victorian Order of Nurses, grant, 3954

Vien, Mr. Thomas (Lotbinière)
Ammunition, 886
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4079-4124
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3087, 3089
Business of the House, Speaker's rulings, 4076
Canadian National Railways, deficits, 4190
Common law of Great Britain, 2894
Copper bounty bill, 4375
Editorial Committee, French publications, 1670
French translation and printing, 1489, 1670
Halibut fishery treaty, 4467
Imperial Conference, 4639
Indemnity of members, 4237
Labour, right to organize, 2894
Macphail, Miss, members and party funds, 4237
Petition of right, fiats, 3222
Powell River Paper Company, 2894
Public ownership of railways, 4191
Race track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 713, 716, 737
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4237-46

Ville Marie wharf, 981

Vimy Ridge Memorial Site, 2, 3, 12
Gift of by France, 65, 2832
Accepted, 180
Agreement, 181
Joint res. of parliament, 811, 3819
Message from his Ecellency the Governor General, 1631
President, French Republic
Letter from, 1538
Joint res. to, 811

Vincent, Mr. J. U., 1806

Vocational Training. *See* Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment

Vote, Lack of Confidence. *See* Lack of Confidence

Voting in Divisions. *See* House of Commons, Divisions

Wages. *See* Cost of Living; Labour

Wainwright Buffalo Herd, 2773, 3407, 3941
Slaughter of, 3435, 3439, 4702

Waldron, Mr. Gordon, United Farmers of Ontario, 425

Walker, Sir Edmund, immigration, 1343

Wallace, Mr. J. A. (Norfolk)
Animal Contagious Diseases bill, 2133
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4027
Cold Storage Act Amdt. bill, 2056-9
Health of animals, 581
Historic sites, 3432
Port Dover, Ont., Fathers Dollier and Galinee, 3433
Income tax, revenue, cost, etc. qu. 1259
Life-saving station, Long Point, lake Erie, 3335
Oleomargarine, drawback on materials, 3503
Public expenditure, apportionment, 4560
Radiotelegraph stations, lake Erie, 3338

Want of Confidence. *See* Lack of Confidence, M. (Mr. Irvine)

Wanipigow River dam, 1000

War. *See also* Germany, Reparations; National Defence
British expeditionary force 3885
Burdens, 2967, 2981. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget
Canada's participation in, 4655. *See also that title;* Imperial Conference
Canadian expeditionary force, enlistments, qu. 1031
Causes of, 2725
Claims. *See* War Claims
Conditions following, 1231. *See also* Immigration
Debt, 2797. *See also* Pubic Debt
Capital levy 2722-28
Expenditure 2915, 2920
Naval 110
Responsibility for 3078
1914-1922, qu. 914
French-Canadians, bravery 2935
Glorification of, 2686
League of Nations and, 3993
Loans. *See that title*
Material, sale of, 2986
Medals 1743
Medical supplies, purchase of, 2921
Middlemen, 2921
Monuments and Memorials. *See* Monuments and Memorials; Vimy Ridge
Pensions. *See that title*

War—*Con.*
Profiteering, 2585, 2981
Profits, taxation of, 2788, 2985
Reparations. *See* Germany
Responsibility for. *See* Germany
Retired officers, serving in. *See* Militia Pension Act Amdt.
Revenues collected during, 2985
Rhineland occupation, cost of, qu. 2696
Scandals, 2815
Davidson commission, qu. 812
Taxation, 2788, 3028. *See also that title*
War profits tax, 2788, 2985
United States and, 2918

War Claims. *See also* Alien Enemy Property; Germany, Reparations
Adjustment of, qu. 1486, 1745
Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, qu. 3142
Canadian claims against Germany, 2496
Canadian Pacific Railway shares, 2496
German claims against Canadians, 2496
Investigation, statement of categories, 2500
Llandovery Castle, sinking of, 1745
Massey-Harris Company, settlement of, 2497
Militia services, 900
Statement of expenditure, 1747
Naval service, 900
Pugsley, Hon. William, appointment as commissioner. *See* Pugsley
Secretary of State, 2495
M. (Mr. Stevens) to reduce vote, 2502, neg. 2504
Statement of, 2496
Vickers, contract, cancellation, 1746

War Measures Act, Oleomargarine, 3528. *See also* Oleomargarine; M. (Mr. Carroll)

War Revenue Act. *See* Special War Revenue

War Service, Repatriation. *See* Naturalization Act

Ward, Mr. W. J. (Dauphin)
Budget, 2959. "Annual family squabble"; zigzag course of debate; arguments for and against protection; more important matters than the tariff; freight rates; suspension of coasting regulations, 2959; increase of lake grain rates; the "shipping barons"; discrimination by Canadian boats in favour of United States lake ports; milling in bond; United States railway earnings from transportation of flour, 2960; Crowsnest pass agreement; saving in railway rates absorbed by shipping

Ward, Mr. W. J.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
companies; western agricultural conditions and demands; talk of secession; tax sales in Manitoba, 2961; conditions in Saskatchewan; what is the matter with western Canada? mortgaged farms; remoteness from tidewater; high interest rates; increased dependence upon agricultural prosperity; gratuities to Grand Trunk and Canadian Northern directors and officials, 2962; cattle shipments to Great Britain, space and rates; public debt; taxation; interest payments; New York loan, April 1922; the spectre of debt; doing business with borrowed money, 2963
Canadian National Railways, retiring gratuities, 1483, qu. 1632, 1687, 2962
Unorganized districts, road-building, 3258
Welland canal construction, 3789

Warehouses. *See* Canada Temperance; Customs; Grain; Liquor

Warlike Stores. *See* National Defence, Ammunition

Warner, Mr. D. W. (Strathcona)
Agricultural conditions, 1423
Alberta coal
Freight rates, 3009
Resources, 1282
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 549, 555
Climatic conditions of West, 1423
Copper bounty bill, 3240
Edmonton Indian school, 2165
Emigration to the United States, 1422
Experimental farms, 467
Farm labour, 1424
Forest protection, 3418
M. (Mr. Michaud) 825
Fuel supply, 795
M. (Mr. Church) 1282
Hog grading, 592
Hudson Bay railway
Alberta coal, transportation, 1283
M. (Mr. Knox) 1055
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1425
Policy, 1421
Speeches, adverse effect of, 1423
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3513, 3516, 3519, 3539
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 758
Reference to, 1425
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 1151

Warner, Mr. D. W.—*Con.*
Rural mail delivery, western provinces, 1791
Tariff, immigration and, 1424
Tree-planting, 3418
Vancouver harbour bill, 266
Wheat-growing, 1423

Washington. *See also* United States
British Ambassador at, 858, 4457. *See also* Treaties, Halibut
Canadian representative at, 2735, 3017, 3085, 4001, 4664
Congressional library, 2693
Disarmament conference, 2911, 4000
Visit of Canadian ministers to, 3823

Waste Paper, disposal by government departments, qu. 1028, 1713

Water-Borne Traffic. *See* Freight Rates, Shipping; St. Lawrence River Waterway

Water Powers. *See also* Fuel Supply; Hydro Electric; Lake of the Woods; St. Lawrence River Waterway
Administration of, 3420
Alienation of, 3422
Canadian national parks, 3442, 3939. *See also under this title,* Dominion Forest Reserves
Banff, 3750, 3939
Carillon rapids, 659
Cedar rapids, 659
Development of, 3422
Dominion forest reserves and parks, 1256
Dominion Power Board, 3427
Eastern townships, 1248
Electric power, exportation, 658
Export duty, 2828
Suggested prohibition, 1272
United States to, 1266
Fuel supply, 3203. *See also that title*
Hudson Bay railway, 1040, 1065
Hudson Bay region, 1072
Grass river, 1065
Jurisdiction, 665
Lac Seul. *See* Lake of the Woods
Lake of the Woods, 3421, 3425, 4163. *See also that title*
Control Board, expenses, 4001
Leases, 3421
United States citizens to, 3426
National policy, development of, 1270
Nelson river, 3421
Niagara district, 3782
Niagara falls, 3940
Ottawa river, qu. 1974
Peace river district, 1433

Water Powers—*Con.*
Provincial ownership and jurisdiction, 3421
Railway electrification, 3422
Resources, 2750
Revenue, 2969
Rideau canal, qu. 622
St. Lawrence 2682
St. Lawrence river waterway, 3782
Surveys and investigations, 3203, 3420
Expenditure, 2969
Water Powers board, 3420
Water powers of the world estimated, 1270
Winnipeg river, 1214, 3421. *See also* Lake of the Woods

Waterhen Lakes, drainage, 3431, qu. 4303

Waterton Lakes
Highway, qu. 2085
Park, 3435

Waterways. *See* Canals; International Joint Commission; St. Lawrence River Waterway
Canadian National Railways and, 3057
St. Lawrence river. *See that title*

Watson, Dr. glanders, treatment of, 579, 2868

Ways and Means, Committee of, 2640, 3084, 3229, 3231, 3454, 3705, 3895, 3963, 4162, 4181
Bounties on manila fibre and copper bars or rods, 3231
British preference, 3454
Budget speech, 2640
Customs tariff resolutions, 3454-74
Inland Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 3229
Interim supply, 1539, 3705
Motion for, discussion, 3222
Notice of, 179
Supply bill, 4735
United States, reciprocity, 3454

Waugh, Mr. R. D., Saar Valley Commission, 3145, 3995

Wealth of Canada
Estimated, 2719
History of, 2728

Webb, Sydney, report, 2545
Sydney and Beatrice, Decay of Capital and Civilization, 2726

Wedge, Mr. George, employment, qu. 2697

Wednesday Sittings. *See* House of Commons

Weed Seeds. *See* Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill; Seed

Weekly Liner Committee. *See* Freight Rates, Shipping

Weights and Measures
Cartage charge 810
Inspection 810
Peterborough district, qu. 492, 810

Welland Canal. *See* Canals

Welland, Haldimand, Lincoln Counties. *See* Redistribution

Wells, Mr. H. G., Civilization and the War, 2722

Well-Drilling Machinery. *See* Customs Tariff Items

Welsh Coal. *See* Coal; Fuel Supply

West Indies
Fish markets, 3002
Steamship service with, 3377
Trade, 3382. *See also* Canadian Government Merchant Marine
West Indies delegates, 3392

West Ukrainian Republic. *See also* Ukrainians
M. (Mr. Campbell) 651, withdrawn, 658

Western Canada. *See* Western Provinces

Western Canada Colonization Association. *See* Immigration, Canada Colonization Association

Western Grain Standards Board. *See* Grain, Marketing

Western Provinces. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget; Freight Rates; Grain and Grain Trade; Immigration; Natural Resources. For individual provinces. *See their respective titles*
Agricultural conditions, 1196, 1201, 1439, 1880, 1889, 2766. *See also* Address; Agriculture; Banks and Banking; Budget; Immigration; Railways; *and under this title,* Conditions
Examples of successes and failures, 2767
Questionnaire and answer, 2772
Animal Contagious Diseases Act, administration, 2132
Bad farming, 1889, 2781, 2812
Branch lines construction, 4185
Conditions in, 1213, 1221, 1246, 1347, 1349, 1352, 1388, 1396, 1398, 1402, 1415, 1854, 1883, 1890, 2747, 2811, 2845, 2961, 2977, 3002, 4038, 4062, 4222

Western Provinces—*Con.*
Conditions in—*Con.*
"Calamity howlers", 2811, 2977
Christison, Mr. J. N., 1891
Goosen, Mr. Peter, 1892
Spence, Mr. George, 1891
Winter trips to British Columbia and California, 1252
Extravagance, 1889
Farm mortgages, 2962
Farmers' earnings, 2813
Field crops, 2846
Financial distress, 1890
Freight rates, 3190
Grain shipments. *See* Freight Rates; Grain; Vancouver Harbour Bill
Grievances, 3056-62
Immigration. *See that title*
Industries, 1889
Lack of, 4047
Interest rates, 1088. *See also* Banks and Banking
Mixed farming, 2772
Municipal taxation unpaid, 2768
Municipal and provincial extravagance in building, 1890
Natural resources, 1121, 2782, 2836, 2972
Needs of, 3000
Petroleum bounties, 2648
Redistribution, 4738
Remoteness from tidewater, 2962
Representation on Railway Commission, 3192
Ridicule and intimidation, 2813
Rural income tax-payers, 2845
Rural mail delivery, 1790
Rural shareholders of banks, 2846
Saline lake deposits, 3198
Secession talk, 2808, 2814, 2961, 2977, 3067
Settlement of due to railways, 2833
Solidarity, 3062
Surveys in, qu. 1866
Tariff and, 1424, 2747
Taxation, undue burden on, 2781. *See also* Taxation
Thornton, Sir Henry, statement, 2962
Transportation, 4222. *See also* Freight Rates; Grain
Treatment, 4191
Understanding with manufacturers, 3023
Unrest, alleged condition of, 4514
Wealth "stream drying up" 2757

Weyburn Security Bank. *See* Banks and Banking

Wharves. *See also* Harbours and Rivers; Public Works
Interest on investment, 976

Wharves—*Con.*
New Brunswick, transfer to federal government, 946
Revenue, 976
United States, built on Canadian territory, 2735
Wharfage tolls, 975

Wheat. *See* Grain and Grain Trade

Wheat Board. *See* Grain and Grain Trade

Wheat Stem Saw-Fly. *See* Agriculture; Insect Pests

Wheeler, Mr. Seager, 278

White, Mr. J. F. (London)
Agricultural implements, standardization, 809
British preference, woollen goods, 3470
Budget, 2964. Debt and taxation; expenditure; retrenchment in civil government; raisins and dried currants; duty; Australia, trade with; French treaty; artificial silk industry; hemp bounty; binder twine, discrimination against manufacturer, 2964; history of binder twine industry; price advance following abolition of duty; production, imports and exports, 2965; home and export prices; tariff stability; knowledge as to conditions of investment; reciprocity proposals; amendment, 2966; income tax; unearned income; indemnity of members; socialistic doctrine; Abraham Lincoln on rights of capital, 2967
Firebrick duty, 3482
Fuel supply, 809
Old age annuities, 1639
Opium and Narcotic Drugs Act, 697
Penitentiaries, 771
Pensions, disability entitling to, 679
Post offices, grade 3, qu. 4300
Printing bureau, new building, 1737
Proportional representation, M. (Mr. Good) 423
Radiotelegraphy, 3374
St. Lawrence river waterway, 3781
Tobacco imports, duties, qu. 1258
Unemployment relief, 690
Welland canal construction, 3781

White, Mr. James, salary, 4667

White, Sir Thomas, Reciprocity, "Noble Eighteen", 2908

White Mud River, fishway, 3362

White Star Dominion Line
Immigration, 1193
Ocean freight rates, 2127

Whitley Councils. *See* Civil Service

Whitney, Sir James, hydro-electric development, 1267

Wholesale Grocers. *See* Combines Bill

Widows, Pensions. *See* Pensions

Wild Life Sanctuaries. *See* National Parks and Reservations Bill

Wiley Estate. *See* Yukon

Williams-Taylor, Sir Frederick, 4019

Willison, Sir John. *See also* Immigration, Canada Colonization Association
Canada Colonization Association, 1323, 1328, 1429
Retirement from, 1164
Reminiscences, quotation from, 1182

Wilson, Mr. G. C. (Wentworth)
Hamilton-Brantford highway, qu. 624, 2492
Ontario projected highways, qu. 624

Windermere Highway. *See* Banff-Windermere

Windsor, N.S.
Dredging, 1010
Historic sites, 3406

Windsor, Ont., emigration, 1404

Wines. *See* Budget; Customs and Excise; Liquor; Treaties, French Treaty

Winnipeg
Coal purchases for public buildings, 496
Elmwood postal station, 4628
Emigration from, to United States, 1975
Fort Osborne barracks, 4628
Government printing, 3144
Winnipeg Saturday Post, qu. 3323
Grain sample market, qu. 345
Institutions and services of, 1214
Liberal Association, immigration, 1429
Lord Shaw, statement on immigration, 2833
Minto street armoury, qu. 2084
Proportional representation, 392, 411, 412, 433. *See also that title*
Stockyards, 2762
Ukrainians, resolution. *See* West Ukrainian Republic
Unemployment, 41-42, 435, 1124, 1215, 1644, 1883
Mayor, representations from, 1658

Winnipeg—*Con.*
Water powers, 3421, 3425. *See also* Lake of the Woods
Winnipeg Free Press, emigration, 2790

Winnipeg-St. Croix projected railway, 2898

Winnipeg River, 1214. *See also* Lake of the Woods

Wireless Telegraphy, 3337. *See also* Radiotelegraphy; Telegraphs and Telephones
Hudson Bay route, 1046
Industrial Group, Great Britain, message from, 4436
Navigation and, 3333
Northwest territories, 3944-5
Vessels, equipment, 3355-6
Wireless stations, 3374
Mayo, 4702

Wolves. *See* Animals, Wild

Wolvin, Mr. Lee H., 4281. *See also* Freight Rates, Shipping; Lake Grain Rates

Wolvin, Mr. Roy, 1704. *See also* Freight Rates, Shipping; Lake Grain Rates

Women
Civil Service, in, 1772
Dominion Council of Health, representation, 3649
Farm, 1844
Pensions, 1651. *See also that title*
Representation in parliament. *See* Macphail, Miss
Rights of. *See* Bankruptcy Act

Women's Labour League, 2718

Wood, Mr. E. R., 60

Wood, Mr. H. W., statement on budget, 2771, 2853, 2946

Wood, Mr. W. F., income tax conviction, qu. 3582

Wood. *See also* Lumber
Staves, duty, 3487

Woodbridge, Ont., postmaster, 1821, 1828

Woods, Mr. R. J. (Dufferin)
Bacon, grading, 593
Budget, 2846. A dual policy, 2846; tariff; slow movement of Liberal party toward reduction; reciprocity; market for agricultural products; effect of United States emergency tariff on Canadian exports; cheque tax; limitation, inequitable, 2847; agricultural

Woods, Mr. R. J.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
implements, tariff; speech of Mr. Meighen session of 1910-1911, "ramparts of gold"; protection increased by rise in price, 2848; boots and shoes, duty on; Canadian manufacturers, monopoly of home market and free access to United States; agricultural conditions, home markets practically worthless to farmers; world competition in agricultural products, 2849; tariff for revenue; duties too high to produce revenue; cigarettes; industrial centralization; disappearance of small manufacturing establishments, 2850; manufacturers, beneficiaries of cheaper production; reciprocity agreement of 1911; Liberals who opposed reciprocity, the "Noble Eighteen"; Sir Thomas White; manufacturers support government that will protect them; class legislation; Progressive group out for equal rights; tariff joint product of Liberal and Conservative parties, 2851
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2410
Ontario Temperance Act, 2410
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 740
Rural mail carriers, 1789
Seed inspection, 197
Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner) 1294
Wines native, prohibition of manufacture, 2411
Woollen industry, M. (Mr. Drummond) 934

Woods, Lake of. *See* Lake of the Woods

Woodsworth, Mr. J. S. (Centre Winnipeg)
Address in reply, 41. Omissions in speech from Throne; no lessening of burden of taxation; unemployment situation, 41; statements from organizations and municipalities, 41-42; immigration scheme; land settlement plan; past immigration policy, 43; financial condition; commercial treaties, 44; Near East crisis; Canada's national status; Mr. J. A. Hobson on imperialism, 45; British policy in foreign affairs; Lloyd George; ex-Premier Nitti of Italy, 46; Trades Union Congress at the Hague, 46-47; necessity for permanent peace, 47
Agricultural produce marketing agent, 4676
Annual drill, 866, 4636
Assiniboine river, damage by floods, 994,999
Autonomy, Canadian, 45, 4651

Woodsworth, Mr. J. S.—*Con.*
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4018, 4084-87, 4144-61
Bank premises, value of, 4085
Lawful association, amdt. 4084, neg. 4085
Officials, right of organization, amdt.. 4161, neg. 4161
Shareholders' audit, amdt. 4087, neg. 4090
Banting, Dr. F. G., 4439
Belle River harbour, 4608
Brandon, damage by flood, 999
British and foreign news service, 4712
Budget, 2718; amendment, Mr. Forke; free trade; greater economy in public administration; social readjustment; perpetuation of National Policy; tariff on implements of production, 2718; Liberal party promises forgotten; taxation of necessaries of life; raisins; Women's Labour League, telegram, 2718; Sir Wilfrid Laurier on protection; Montreal Unemployed Workers' Association, statement; legislative and administrative machinery; over-organization; economic resources; estimated wealth of Canada, 2719; natural resources; gold, one per cent of national wealth; annual production; manufacturing industries, production costs and profit; capital invested; provincial and municipal debts, 2720; per capita debt; unemployment, anxiety and general dissatisfaction; labour, viewpoint of; doctrine of free trade; industrial and economic changes; free trade England; unemployment and social difficulties; labour and socialism; British National Labour party, policy, 2721; suppression of capitalistic system; resolution introduced in British House of Commons; Lloyd George and British socialism; H. G. Wells, sinking of ship of civilization; Dr. J. J. Tompkins of St. Francis Xavier University, Catholic social principles, 2722; face to face with serious crisis; industrial revolution; individualistic production; the farmer; transportation systems; internationalism, 2723; thinking in terms of the parish rather than of the world; status of the worker; freedom and the introduction of the taxing system; agricultural and industrial workers; concentration of capital; John Maynard Keynes, "The Economic Consequences of the Peace"; markets, 2724; buying power; war, causes of; combinations and trusts;

Woodsworth, Mr. J. S.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
financial control; monopoly of credits; economic and social consequences of capitalism; control of educational agencies, 2725; Upton Sinclair, Capitalistic Control of the Press; control of government; federation of British industries; Canadian Manufacturers' Association; Sidney and Beatrice Webb, Decay of Capital and Civilization; wealth and poverty; privileges and monopolies, 2726; wage slavery; serious economic conditions; industrial democracy; socialism and state socialism; railways; spheres of federal and provincial control; coal mines; production for the use and not for profit, 2727; financial systems; labour platform; natural resources; public ownership and operation of public utilities and large scale industries; nationalization of banking system; abolition of class privilege; capital levy for war debt; taxation inequalities; History of Canadian Wealth; private property; natural resources; ownership and taxation of, 2728; conscription of men and wealth; new epoch in history; Rabindranath Tagore on civilization; radical changes necessary, 2729
Business of the House
Audibility, 4593
Supply, relevancy, 4602
Canada Gazette, 1709
Canada Colonization Association. *See under this title,* Immigration
Canada-West Indies
Steamship service, 3378
Treaty, 3379
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Advance, 3844
Competition with subsidized steamship services, 3384
Vessels, sale of, 3813
Canadian National Railways
Board, labour representation, 3636
Coal, Maccan and River Hebert mines, 1027
Management, responsibility and powers, 3635, 3699
Paris offices, 3699
Shopmen, resolution, 1338
Capital levy, 2728, 2909
Capital for settlers, 1089
China, civilization of, 2486

Woodsworth, Mr. J. S.—*Con.*
Chinese Immigration bill, 2338, 2485
Children, 2484
Merchants, 2484
Wives, 2484
Civil Service
Bonus, employees unmarried or without dependents, qu. 1257
Salary revision, 1793-4
Underpaid, 4672
Combines
Coal situation, 254
Legislation inquiry, 254
Combines bill, 2551
Criminal Code Amdt. bills
Betting information, 2282
Sedition, 616
Deputy ministers' salaries, 4672
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 2389
Doukhobors, 1340
Eight-hour day, 1643
English and French-speaking people harmony, 1341
External Affairs department, 3588
False Creek bridge, 4708
Farm labourers Winnipeg, 1976
Farm lands, prices, 1087
Freight rates on coal, 1345
Fuel supply, exploitation, 1344
German reparations, M. 280, 311
Governor General
Cars, repairs, 4691
Expenditure, 4627
Hansard, distribution of, 1715
Hector celebration, 4636, 4706
Hemp bounty bill, 4377, 4380
Hindu franchise, 4650-1
House of Commons
Estimates, 2691
Restaurant, 2692
Sergeant-at-Arms, 2691
Howat, Mr. Alexander, detention at border, 2296, 2347, 2393, 2419, 2469, 3155
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1336, 3637
Reorganization, 3324, 3400
Child, 1342
Chinese. *See also under this title,* Chinese Immigration
Exclusion, 2485
Students, 2485
Naturalization, 2196
Policy, 1336
Immigration Act Amdt. bill, 2433
Deportation without trial, 2433
Imperial Conference, 4650
Agenda, opportunity for discussion, 3453

Woodsworth, Mr. J. S.—*Con.*
Imperial Economic Conference, agenda, 3453
Imperial federation, 4651
International Labour Conference, 1643
Joint control of industry, 1655
Labour. *See also under this title,* Immigration
British Empire Steel Corporation, 1704-6
Control, etc, 1655
Delegates from United States detention. *See under this title,* Howat
Estimates, reasons for decrease, 1638
Immigration and, 1339
Industrial councils, 1654
Industrial disputes, public utilities, 1703
Miners' wages and price of coal, 1345
Organizations, federal and provincial jurisdiction, 2892
Right to organize, 2891
Bank officers and employees, 4084, 4161
Penitentiaries and, 772
Representation in parliament, 397, 3555
Strikes and unemployment, 1631
Labour Gazette, printing, 1712
Lake of the Woods regulation bill, 4176
Land policy, 1344
Land tax, 1344
Larkin, Mr. James, detention, 1163, 1212, 1309
Lausanne Conference, 54
Law, the late Bowman B., tablet, 1020
League of Nations, 3993
Library of Parliament, 2693
Magazines and periodicals, M. (Mr. Hocken) 844
Mennonites, 1341
Meyerscough, Thomas, detention at border. *See under this title,* Howat
Military expenditure, 866
National monument, Connaught place, 1021, 2686
National Policy, permanency, 4652
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2195, 2455-57
Naturalization, Mounted Police and, 779
Nova Scotia steel workers, strike, 1643
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3871
Pensions
European war and active militia, 3716
Old age, inquiry, 733, 1646
Royal commission, interim report, 2167
Post office employees, salaries, 1794
Powell River Paper Company, 2891
Printing bureau employees, 1623
Proportional representation, M. (Mr. Good) 396, 419
Railway electrification, 3425
Rideau hall expenditure, 4627
Roberts, Mr. J. H., imprisonment, 1660

Woodsworth, Mr. J. S.—*Con.*
Royal Canadian Mounted Police
Duties, seven-day week, 4514
M. for disbandment, 816, 1139, 1151
Naturalization, and, 779
Reorganization, 776
Rural credits, 4146
Rural mail carriers, remuneration, 1793
Russia, relations with, 3401
Russian trade mission, 986
Saar Valley Commission, 4652
Settlers' relief, 3448
Singapore naval base, 2469
Sydney steel strike, 287, 1643
Taxation, excessive, 1345
Toronto seed branch building, 4621
Trial by jury, 2433
Ukrainians, 1341
Unemployment. *See also under this title,* Labour
Insurance, 1638
Provision for, qu. 732
Resolution passed in 1922, 436
Relief, foreigners, 1883
Value of time lost, 1685
Winnipeg, 1124-5, 1644
Conference on, 1659
Union label on Labour Gazette, 1623
United States industries and Canada, 4380
Vickers, qu. 2205
War, glorification of, 2686
Water powers
Lake the Woods, 3425
Policy, 3424
Publicity, 3421
Public and private ownership, 3425
Winnipeg, 3421
Waugh, Mr. R. D., Saar Valley Commission, 3145
Winnipeg, Minto street armoury, qu. 2084

Wool, 2866. *See also* Agriculture; Budget; Customs Tariff; Live Stock; Textiles
Bounty on, 2866
Duty on, 447, 2866
Imports, qu. 617
Raw wool, exemption from sales tax, 2999
Sales tax, 2742
Wool-combing industry, qu. 1973, 2823, 2827, 2866
Trenton mill, 3461

Woollen Industry. *See* Textiles

Workmen. *See* Labour

World's Moral Ideas, International conference, 1205

Wrangel Island, ownership, 3360, 3948

Wrecking Plants, Pacific Salvage Company, qu. 1763

Wrecks. *See* Marine; Vessels

Writers. *See* Copyright Act Amdt. bill

Yarmouth, N.S., dredging, 944, 1011

York, Duke and Duchess, Congratulations on wedding, 2251, 2338

Yorkton Income tax office, qu. 384

Yorkton Enterprise, emigration to United States, 1404

Young, Arthur and Company. *See* Civil Service

Yukon Territory
- Administration
  - Congdon, Mr. F. T., qu. 3131
    - Correspondence, 2299
  - Justice, 705
  - Road construction, 3943
- British Empire exhibition, mineral exhibit, qu. 3143
- Council, 3943
  - Indemnity, 3943
- Egg inspector, qu. 2516

Yukon Territory—*Con.*
- Extent of, 87
- Gold output, 88
- Governor General, visit of, 85
- History, 85-89
- Klondike, 86
- Mineral resources, 85-86
- Mining fees, 1636
  - Quartz-mining, 249
- Naturalization, 2459
- Population, 3943
- Telegraph system, qu. 1662, qu. 2417, 2683, 3945
  - Revenue, qu. 2206
- Timber protection, qu. 2205
- Trial of Eskimos. *See* Northwest Territories Act Amdt.
- Wiley estate, administration, qu. 3131

Yukon Act Amdt. Bill
(Right to appeal from interlocutory judgement; jury trial; mining claims, property or location)
1r., 767-8; 2r., 4247; com., 4247; 3r., 4248

Young, Mr. C. T., qu. 1739

Zavitz, Dr., introduction of Mandeschuri barley, 483

Zinc. *See* Treaties, French Treaty